PARTNERSHIP IN PRACTICE:

Steps to Localisation

PREPARED BY FLORIE DE JAGER MEEZENBROEK | 2019

trócaire

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

A4H	Agenda for Humanity		KMSS	Karuna Mission Social Solidarity
C4C	Charter for Change		KPI	Key performance indicator
CHS	Core Humanitarian Standard		MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
CI	Caritas Internationalis		MIS	Management Information System
CIMO	Caritas Internationalis Member Organisation		MttM	More than the Money research report
			MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
CSO	Civil Society Organisation		NPAC	Non project attributable costs
FY	Financial Year		OD	Organisational Development
GHA	Global Humanitarian Assistance		PCAS	Partner Capacity Assessment Support Framework
HARP	Humanitarian and Resilience Programme			
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team		PCM	Programme Cycle Management
HPP	Humanitarian Programme Plan		PSS	Psycho Social Support
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative		ToR	Terms of Reference
ICR	Indirect Cost Recovery		UR	Unrestricted Resources
IF	Institutional Funding		WHS	World Humanitarian Summit

Trócaire working with partners in response to mudslides in Sierre Leone

INTRODUCTION

The concept of 'localisation of aid' has been at forefront of humanitarian discourse since the *World Humanitarian Summit*, 2016. As a partnership organisation, and a signatory to the *Charter for Change[1]*, the issue of localisation is an important one for Trócaire. The organisation is committed to strengthening its partnership approach and to moving towards 'greater localisation', as well as contributing to localisation processes at a global level. As part of this commitment, Trócaire commissioned a study in 2017, entitled *More than the Money*; the resulting report produced a series of recommendations for Trócaire to progress its commitments to localisation.

In the course of the study a definition of localisation emerged:

> *Aid localisation is a collective process involving different stakeholders that aims to return local actors, whether civil society organisations or local public institutions, to the centre of the humanitarian system with a greater role in humanitarian response. It can take a number of forms: strengthened and more equal partnerships between international and local actors, increased and 'as direct as possible' funding for local organisations, and a more central role in aid coordination. The long-term aim of localisation is to build the resilience of crisis affected communities by establishing links with development activities (p.11)[2].*

The aim of localisation, as highlighted in the study, is to improve the effectiveness and relevance of aid in the short term, and its impacts in the long term; localisation presents a number of ethical, strategic and economic challenges which, if effectively addressed, can support this aim. The recommendations proposed by *More than the Money*, along with Trócaire's other localisation commitments[3], highlight the need for a comprehensive set of actions to make localisation an effective, inclusive and worthwhile process for local and national actors, as well the communities they work with. Recommendations in the areas of financing, resources, partnership approaches, institutional funding, capacity strengthening, communication, internal policy and advocacy, are intended to complement each other across the organisation.

In order to support Trócaire in its analysis of the different recommendations put forward in *More than the Money*, and to identify pathways for implementation, a further study was commissioned; the findings are presented here as proposed pathways to implementation of greater localisation by Trócaire.

---

1. *https://charter4change.org/*

2. *Trócaire Groupe U.R.D.; "More than the Money – Localisation in Practice", 2017, p11. https://www.Trócaire.org/resources/policyandadvocacy/more-than-the-money-localisation-practice*

3. *These commitments are outlined in Annex 3 and include the Agenda for Humanity, which underpinned the World Humanitarian Summit, the Charter for Change and a proposed set of recommendations in the Caritas Internationalis Confederation*

PART 1: PARTNERSHIP

1.1 Overview

Localisation is about partnership, equitable engagement in humanitarian response and sustainable development, recognising the vital role played by national and local actors[4]. The report, *More than the Money*, identifies the tensions that can exist between local and international actors which may occur as result of power imbalances in partner relationships. The report proposes that changes in the quality of partnerships is needed to address such power imbalances. This requires a commitment to developing partnerships that emphasise principles of mutuality and respect in decision-making and resource allocation, and which facilitate locally-led response and development. Localisation also highlights the importance of supporting local initiatives and local actors over the long-term, to support the building of social capital and community resilience.

Part 1 of the report considers potential pathways to implementation of greater localisation in relation to partnership in two areas:

- The partnership approach
- The quality of partner relationships

1.2 Partnership approach

Trócaire has been a partnership organisation since its foundation in 1973, and partnership is at the heart of how Trócaire works. The partnership model is guided by the principles of solidarity, subsidiarity and accountability. Trócaire is committed to building long-term relationships based upon trust and mutuality. Working in partnership stems from the belief that a vibrant civil society is fundamental to a just world.

Trócaire has experienced significant organisational change over the last 5-10 years as part of its commitment to maintaining its relevance and viability in a changing global context. Organisational systems have been strengthened to continue to meet increasing international standards, the budget has grown through increased institutional funding, and programmes have evolved to achieve greater impact. These changes have had an influence on Trócaire's approach to partnership in practice.

On the one hand, the growth of institutional funding has added characteristics of sub-contracting to some partnerships, due to donor restrictions and the need for enhanced oversight; this presents a challenge for greater localisation. On the other hand, Trócaire's integrated programme model, with its increased focus on linking relief with development, has resulted in changes to the partnership engagement model, as partners assume more complementary roles towards achieving positive impact. This approach can facilitate much greater localisation. However, different practices have emerged in different country contexts. Current guidance tends towards a 'one size fits all' approach for partners; however, from a risk, programme quality and institutional capacity perspective, Trócaire's partners are quite diverse, and policies and strategies that govern partnership support and management should be adjusted accordingly.

In the past, Trócaire partnered with civil society and faith-based organisations, however, other actors are emerging, e.g., local government, knowledge institutions and the private sector, that should be considered as potential partners, and have a key role to play in localisation processes. Taking account of the changing context and evolving partnership practices, it is timely for Trócaire to review its partnership approach, from a localisation perspective, and to assess the role Trócaire could assume in relation to the promotion of localisation.

The localisation agenda and the recommendations of *More than the Money*, motivates Trócaire to review its partnership approach, and to strengthen it. Drawing upon decades of experience working in partnership, Trócaire can develop a more systematic approach to 'good practice' in partnership. **Trócaire's partnership approach should be intrinsic to how it sees its role in the sector evolving over the next 5-10 years.** The mid-term review of the Strategic Plan as well as the Country Model review, at the beginning of the 2019, are excellent opportunities to initiate a process of reflection. Driving this process forward, may be challenging, according to some respondents. Nonetheless, all those consulted presented a common understanding of the need for a review process and the important consequences this may have for Trócaire's vision, structure and resourcing priorities.

---

4. Trócaire, "On the road to 2020 – Grand Bargain Commitment to support National and Local Responders", p1. https://www.Trocaire.org/resources/policyandadvocacy/road-2020-grand-bargain-commitment-support-national-and-local-responders

1.2.1 Partnership Approach - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)

Reformulate values-based approach to partnership in line with changing context and Trócaire's vision for the future.

PARTNERSHIP APPROACH

✓ Immediate actions (0-6 months)	💬 Comments
• Continued cross-organisational engagement on localisation and identification of potential implications for Trócaire's vision and ways of working.	• Establish baseline position vis a vis existing strategy and approach. • Generate increased organisational-level understanding and buy-in.

1.2.2 Partnership Approach - Short-term milestone (6-18 months)

Articulate clear understanding of Trócaire's future role in the sector and clarify how a revised partnership approach fits into this.

✓ Short-term actions (6-18 months)	💬 Comments

• Establish strategic initiative on partnership.	• Move beyond humanitarian/development dichotomy.
	• Provide strategic direction on partnership approach, including:
	  o partner relations
	  o partner capacity strengthening
	  o organisational structure and resource allocation
	  o organisational targets (KPIs)
	  o monitoring framework

• Review Partnership Policy, supporting guidance, related documents and tools.	• Include the following topics in the review, at a minimum:
	  o principles and ways of working
	  o partnership ambition
	  o partnership modalities, categorisation of partners
	  o strategic engagement and management of partnerships
	  o operational implications of working in partnership
	  o comparative strengths of working in partnership
	  o languages of documents

• Review global partner portfolio and define clear pathways for engagement and management of each partnership.	• Available data and partnership portfolio reviews highlight weaknesses in strategic engagement and management of partnerships. • Current portfolio includes partners of 20+ years without clear understanding of benefits for either partner or Trócaire. • Clarity of purpose, expectations and targets for each partnership is needed (MoU).

1.2.3 Partnership Approach - Medium-term milestone (18 months +) *Establish clear position and ambition for partnership and ensure adequate structures and resources are in place to take this forward effectively (extended Strategic Plan)*		
☑	**Medium-term actions (18 moths+)**	💬 **Comments**
• Define and resource adequate structure to successfully deliver on working in partnership to promote sustainable development and social justice.		• Appropriate structures and resources, to improve ways of working in partnership, are critical to implementing localisation. • Trócaire should invest the necessary resources to ensure it continues to play a lead role in the sector as a partnership organisation.

1.3 Quality of partner relationship

The localisation discourse challenges all organisations to move away from sub-contracting approaches to greater support for, and facilitation of, locally-led response and development. At the root of this, is the quality of relationships with partners. This means building and maintaining relationships communities and local actors, that are equal and fair. In practice this means that all partners play a role in decision-making and have equitable input in, and influence over, the design and management of joint action, and take full part in reflections, reviews and learning initiatives. Inherent in the word 'partnership' are ideas of shared responsibility, mutual transparency and joint accountability[4].

Trócaire is committed to maintaining high-quality partnerships, which are valued by local partners. This came across strongly during interviews undertaken for this study and is supported from the findings of other analysis including the *Core Humanitarian Standard* self-assessment initiative, and partnership review processes. Partners value the quality and tone of Trócaire's approach, which they characterise as one of trust, mutuality, complementarity and shared ownership.

Nonetheless, there are different perspectives in terms of understanding Trócaire's approach, and some tensions can arise in partnerships. *More than the Money* highlights issues related to: access to, and competition for, funding; attitude and behaviour of staff; access to information; differences in salary rates; and the question of overhead costs and limited resources for partners to operate effectively.

For the most part, Trócaire staff are recruited based on their partnership management skills and experience.

However, new staff members sometimes struggle to adapt to Trócaire's partnership approach. It is essential to continuously develop the partnership skills of Trócaire staff. Respondents proposed the inclusion of partnership management in induction processes to provide guidance on what partnership means in practice, and to clarify organisational expectations on relationship management. Recommendations were made for the provision of training in soft skills, such as listening, facilitation, problem-solving and communication. Mechanisms for holding staff to account through performance management processes were also proposed.

Trócaire endeavours to involve local partners and communities in all phases of the project cycle, both as a partnership principle and as best practice from a programme quality perspective. This leverages the contextual awareness of partners and communities and helps to create collective understanding and learning. However, in some instances funding modalities can dominate programme strategies, and the space for partner and community engagement may be limited. This can contribute to a sub-contracting dynamic in relationships and compromise programme quality.

Due to the funding relationship Trócaire has with its partners, there is strong accountability from partners to Trócaire; this is not necessarily true, in a systematic way, from Trócaire to partners, and greater accountability could be achieved in a more structured and formal way. Clear guidance would improve balance and consistency in the approach to mutual transparency and accountability. Current good practice

---

5. DEPP/Start Network;" Localisation in practice: emerging indicators and practical recommendations", 2018. https://disasterpreparedness. ngo/learning/localisation-practice-emerging-indicators-practical-recommendations/

in some areas of the Humanitarian Programme Plan (HPP) portfolio, includes annual joint review processes. These reviews provide time and space for shared reflection and analysis of progress, identification of challenges and joint planning to move forward. It was proposed by one respondent, that feedback from partners could be included in annual country office reporting, accompanied by management actions to address any issues raised.

Other respondents suggested that a global *Partnership Charter* could be developed in consultation with partners, in which the overarching purpose, scope and principles of working in partnership are agreed upon; this could be subject to periodic review. Respondents also proposed that, along with existing Partner Agreements which underpin and define what are primarily contractual responsibilities, a separate Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)

could be developed with each partner. **A Partner MoU could capture shared ambitions and mutual understanding, and could be linked to longer-term strategic objectives, roles and responsibilities, risks and accountability.**

More than the Money also highlights how differences in salary between staff of local and international NGOs can create problems on the labour market and lead to high levels of staff turnover, partly as a result of the 'poaching' of highly-qualified and well-trained staff from local organisations. Respondents proposed that **the time is right for Trócaire to include an ethical recruitment statement in its recruitment policy**, which is currently under review. **Other ways to 'reinforce rather than replace' local capacity is through supporting local partners to strengthen their Human Resource Management systems, which is one area that local partners indicate they struggle with.**

1.3.1 Quality of partner relationship - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)
Trócaire recommits to a values-based approach, where trust and respect is key.

QUALITY OF PARTNER RELATIONSHIP

Immediate actions (0-6 months)	**Comments**
• Include assessment of quality and performance of partner relationships in upcoming real-time reviews and programme evaluations.	• Establish organisational understanding of current quality and performance of partner relationships from ongoing monitoring and evaluation processes.

1.3.2 Quality of partner relationship – Short-term milestone (6-18 months)
Mechanisms and systems are developed and working to ensure reciprocal transparency and accountability.

Short-term actions (6-18 months)	**Comments**
• Work closely with partners and communities in planning, designing, implementing and monitoring Institutional Funding (IF) projects.	• Ensure partners and communities are engaged in planning of Institutional Funding (IF) proposals and are involved in all stages of the project cycle will reduce risk of sub-contracting approach. • Programme guidance documents should clearly highlight all key decision-moments where partners and communities will be involved.
• Put in place systems for partners to hold Trócaire to account.	• Clearer systems for partners to hold Trócaire to account will improve consistency in the approach to mutual transparency and accountability and enable better monitoring of the quality and performance of partner relationships. • Trócaire's Safeguarding team can provide support to ensure mechanisms are robust, particularly in relation to high-risk partners.

• Develop *Partnership Charter* to outline the global purpose, scope and principles of working in partnership.	• Consultation with partners across all country programmes will ensure both Trócaire and partners perspectives are accounted for.
• Develop MoUs with each partner that capture shared ambitions and mutual understanding linked to longer-term strategic objectives.	• MoUs should capture annual targets, roles and responsibilities, risks and mutual accountability and should be reviewed periodically to assess progress and to facilitate adjustment.
• Include an ethical recruitment statement in Trócaire's recruitment policy[6].	• Identify tangible and sustainable ways to support partners to strengthen Human Resource management capacity.

1.3.3 Quality of partner relationship - Medium-term milestone (18 months +)
Partnerships are inclusive, equitable and empowering; mutual accountability mechanisms are effective; feedback is acted upon and contributes to changing practices, leading to better quality programming.

Medium-term actions (18 months+)	Comments
• Develop an induction package on principles and management of partner relationships.	• According to one respondent: 'trust is key to partnerships and relationships can deteriorate due to staff turnover within Trócaire and partners, and renewed effort is needed to build the relationship'.
• Develop training package for staff to develop social skills for working in partnership.	• Social skills include listening, facilitation, problem-solving and communication, and will benefit the quality of the partner relationships and programme outcomes.
• Introduce a standalone performance management objective on partnership for all staff working directly with partners.	• As partnership is so central to Trócaire's ways of working at country level, it is important to hold staff to account.
• Streamline and standardise partner processes and procedures.	• Inefficiency in processes which partners are expected to engage with can be frustrating and can negatively influence partner relationships and programme quality; simplifying and harmonising systems and processes can alleviate this. • Trócaire could work with other, like-minded agencies, to harmonise due diligence and to streamline other assurance processes to minimise duplication of effort by partners. This could facilitate greater programme integration.
• Support local partners to strengthen their Human Resource Management (HRM) systems to reduce the loss of skilled staff to international agencies.	• Identify tangible ways to provide greater HRM support, for example, 1) Internal HR resources could be developed in such in way that they can be shared with and adapted by partners; 2) peer coaching among Trócaire management could be replicated with partners; 3) outsource HR capacity development.

---

[6]. *See for more guidance on ethical recruitment guidelines: https://www.chsalliance.org/files/files/Resources/Tools-and-guidance/Transforming%20Surge%20Capacity%20-%20Ethical%20Recruitment%20Guidelines.pdf*

PART 2: PARTNER CAPACITY STRENGTHENING

2.1 Overview

Central to the achievement of localisation is supporting local organisations to become effective and resilient organisations that play a leading role in emergency preparedness, response and recovery. Long-term commitment to strategic partnerships is critical when working towards building sustainable organisational capacity, supporting capacity-strengthening, and providing appropriate contributions to overhead costs.

Part 2 of the report considers potential pathways to implementation of greater localisation in relation to partner capacity strengthening, in one key area: Capacity strengthening approach

2.2 Capacity strengthening approach

An integral part of Trócaire's partnership approach is to accompany partners in the development of their organisational skills, abilities, systems and resources[7]. Trócaire supports capacity development[8] of partners in institutional and programmatic competencies through a range of strategies. Providing accompaniment during different stages of the grant and partnership is a key approach, as this promotes continuous joint learning and good practice.

Trócaire developed the *Partner Capacity Assessment and Support Framework* (PCAS) to facilitate partners to identify areas of organisational strength and weakness, and to use this as the basis for developing a capacity strengthening plan. Local partners own and take leadership of the plan and may work with different agencies to support its implementation through financial and technical support. Providing accompaniment to partners during different stages of a grant or partnership is a preferred strategy of Trócaire, as this supports continuous learning. Additional strategies include the development of tools and approaches, trainings and workshops, peer coaching among partners, learning exchange visits, academic opportunities, sharing of technical resources and the provision of seed funding to pilot innovative ideas or to put new knowledge and skills into practice.

In general, local partners indicate appreciation for the capacity strengthening support provided by Trócaire; although some challenges exist with the current PCAS model. Given evidence of uneven application of PCAS across country offices, the tool and guidance for its use

are currently under review. The intention is to make PCAS more flexible and practical, to align it with the *Core Humanitarian Standard* (CHS), and to provide better guidance on how to assess progress. In the current version of PCAS, humanitarian capacity is poorly captured, and a range of options are being considered to ensure this area is strengthened, in line with other capacity domains.

Trócaire does not currently provide guidance on how to approach capacity strengthening in a way that supports continuous improvement in knowledge, skills and capabilities. **Trócaire should be alert to the risks of delivering a rigid blueprint for capacity strengthening of partners which could inadvertently threaten the mandate of local civil society and community-based organisations, by proposing a model of capacity based on (I)NGOs.**

Another important area for development is in relation to monitoring and evaluation of capacity building support provided by Trócaire to partners. The current PCAS framework does not include an M&E framework that can objectively evaluate Trócaire's performance in relation to capacity support. Specific indicators could be developed and monitored over time. This could be supplemented by a qualitative approach such as "*most significant change*" or "*outcome harvesting*". Having such a framework in place, would make it easier for Trócaire to demonstrate added-value in partner capacity development.

There is considerable investment needed to take forward the highlighted pieces of work and to deliver a capacity strengthening framework in a professionally competent way. Dedicated in-house expertise at different level and technical areas is needed for Trócaire to assume its capacity building role more effectively. If done well, this will make Trócaire more competitive in mobilising resources for partner capacity development and locally-led response and development.

---

[7]. *Trócaire, "Partnership in practice – Fostering local agency and sustainable solutions (draft document)", 2018.*

[8]. *According to the PCAS framework; Trócaire understand capacity development as the process of developing the skills, abilities, systems and resources of an organisation in a logical, systematic and timely manner, so that the organisation can fulfil its overall mission to optimum effect and operate to its full potential in everything that it does.*

2.2.1 Capacity strengthening approach - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)
Establish a framework for partner capacity strengthening.

⚙ CAPACITY STRENGTHENING APPROACH

✔ Immediate actions (0-6 months)	💬 Comments
• Finalise review of existent PCAS framework and provide additional guidance.	• Consult with country teams and partners to identify key gaps and limits of current PCAS and establish scope and ambition for revised version.

2.2.2 Capacity strengthening approach - Short-term milestone (6-18 months)
Increase organisational understanding, capacities and resources to assume partner capacity building role effectively.

✔ Short-term actions (6-18 months)	💬 Comments
• Design and develop Trócaire's approach to learning and partner capacity development.	• Ensure that commitment to learning and continuous improvement in knowledge, skills and capabilities is explicit and clearly articulated. • Recognise that staff need to be trained on the skills and processes needed to provide capacity development support.

2.2.3 Capacity strengthening approach - Medium-term milestone (18+ months
Ensure capacity strengthening of local partners is resourced, partner-driven, measurable and impactful.

✔ Medium-term actions (18 months+)	💬 Comments
• Expand the PCAS framework to take account of other competencies.	• Ensure scope of framework moves beyond focus on financial capacity, risk and compliance. • Facilitate greater flexibility in the tool for partners to identify their own areas of priority. • Ensure that diversity and complementarity of partners is not undermined by a rigid model of capacity strengthening support.
• Develop M&E framework for capacity strengthening.	• Capacity strengthening should be measurable at both individual and organisational levels. • Use a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures which can be monitored over time. • Provide evidence for Trócaire, through available M&E data, to demonstrate added-value in capacity strengthening.
• Develop the skills of Trócaire staff to support partner capacity strengthening.	• Understanding how different people learn and what strategies support learning and knowledge sharing are critical to support for effective partner capacity strengthening.
• Use upcoming review processes to inform strategic decision-making regarding structure and resources of country programmes.	• Ensure coherence between programme management, technical support and capacity strengthening processes. • Consider investing in greater internal expertise in organisational development and related technical competencies.

PART 3: FUNDING AND RESOURCES

3.1 Overview

For the localisation agenda to move from rhetoric to reality, a tangible shift in power must take place; central to this is the issue of funding and resources. A core component of the *Grand Bargain* and *Charter for Change* is the increase in direct funding to local responders, along with greater transparency regarding resource transfers to local NGOs.

Part 3 of the report considers potential pathways to implementation of greater localisation, in relation to funding and resources, in three key areas:

- Transparency of aid
- Direct funding to local partners
- Partner resources

3.2 Transparency of aid

The *World Humanitarian Summit* provided significant momentum to the demand for better quality, availability and use of data, in relation to financing for crisis prevention and response[9]. It is broadly accepted that improved data on financial and in-kind resource flows will facilitate greater operational efficiency, accountability and effectiveness in a response. However, organisations, including Trócaire, are facing challenges in terms of access to, and provision of, accurate and consistent information.

Currently, Trócaire is not IATI[10] compliant; however, a third-party organisation has been engaged to carry out an assessment of the extent to which the existing CRM system can generate the information required for IATI, and to map out current gaps. It is expected that it will be possible to upload initial data onto the IATI platform by 2019.

Some respondents suggested that greater clarity is required to ensure staff understand where the responsibility for this work sits, as it relates to compliance, accountability and transparency in relation to both financial and programmatic data, and therefore cuts across different departments. Further, it is anticipated that, in time, partners will be required to be IATI compliant, if full traceability of funds is to be ensured. For Trócaire, reaching full partner compliance with IATI would represent a substantial achievement.

Currently, Trócaire provides information about the level of resources transferred to partners in its Annual Report. This information is not, however, disaggregated by programme type, e.g., humanitarian or development. Further, precise figures in relation to the value of funds directed towards partner capacity strengthening, are not available. Trócaire's global accounting system can specify the value of ancillaries which are dedicated to partner capacity strengthening, but does not specify other associated costs, including, for example, budgetary allocation for institutional development, which is embedded in grants to partners. Therefore, the current data provided by the system only captures a portion of total investment and does not accurately demonstrate Trócaire's commitment to partner capacity strengthening.

Trócaire working with partners Caritas Germany and KMSS in Myanmar

9. *Chloe Parrish; "Better information for a better response – the basics of humanitarian transparency", Development Initiatives, p.2, 2016.*

10. *See for more information on IATI standards: https://iatistandard.org/en/*

3.2.1 Transparency of aid - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)
Detailed accounts can be provided of the amount of funds and the value of resources provided to each partner.

TRANSPARENCY OF AID

Immediate actions (0-6 months)	Comments
• Complete IATI compliance project.	• Ensure mechanisms for data capture are available and accessible to all teams and country offices.

3.2.2 Transparency of aid - Short-term milestone (6-18 months)
Ensure Trócaire can provide accurate data on the full costs of programming, including resources transferred to partners as well as funds invested in partner capacity strengthening, using categorisation recognised by International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) Standard[11].

Short-term actions (6-18 months)	Comments
• Adjust systems as necessary to enable generation of data that is compliant with IATI requirements.	• Ensure that systems are adjusted to enable capture of data in relation to the total value of capacity strengthening investments.
• Clarify roles and responsibilities in relation to IATI compliance.	• Ensure that all teams and offices are clear on their responsibilities in relation to data capture.
• Upload all data on IATI platform.	• Include publication of data in relation to capacity strengthening in Annual Report.
• Carry out assessment of support needs of partners for IATI compliance.	• Ensure IATI compliance is part of partner capacity strengthening support.

3.2.3 Transparency of aid - Medium-term milestone (18+ months)
Trócaire is publishing high quality, consistent and timely information on its humanitarian and development activities which inform effective emergency preparedness, humanitarian assistance and sustainable development efforts.

Medium-term actions (18 months+)	Comments
• Further define Trócaire's approach and commitment to transparency of information and communicate this internally and externally.	• A wider commitment to transparency, beyond IATI, will require consultation with staff, partners and other stakeholders to consider information needs. • Ensure that the approach takes account of how sensitive information is handled and includes clarity on what information will not be shared and why.
• Establish a quality control mechanism for data that is produced internally and is published externally.	• Ensure that all teams have access to the necessary knowledge, skills and resources to ensure quality standards are maintained, in particular in relation to data protection, including GDPR.
• Continue to develop tools to facilitate effective, data-driven, management decision making.	• Ensure staff at different levels, and in different locations, can access reports and analysis, to optimise decision making and contribute to organisational improvement targets.

[11.] *See for more information on IATI standards: https://iatistandard.org/en/*

3.3 Direct funding to local partners

As a partnership organisation, Trócaire transfers most of its programme funding to local partners. In the financial year 2017/18, this represented 74% of the humanitarian budget. Moreover, Trócaire supports partner organisations to diversify their funding base in order to minimise risks of dependency and to support organisational growth. Such support takes many forms; for example, sharing calls for proposals, reviewing concept notes, capacity building in relation to proposal development and grant management. Trócaire also supports partners to raise their profile with other INGOs, foundations and donors.

However, it remains challenging for local partners to access direct funding from major donors. Reasons for this include failure to meet donor requirements; high levels of competition with more well-established (I)NGOs; limited ability to mobilise resources required by donors (e.g., matching funds, pre-financing, payment by results); as well as donor failure to meet *Grand Bargain* commitments to increase funding to local actors. This last reason may be due to several different factors, such as fiduciary concerns, risk adversity, absorptive capacity, delays in adjusting established funding modalities and pressure from tax-payers.

A range of proposals have been put forward to increase access to direct funding by local actors, including investing in a selected number of partners and supporting them to access direct funding through building organisational profile, strengthening grant management and compliance capacity, generating own resources, increasing absorptive capacity and lobbying donors to provide more accessible funding schemes for CSOs. However, it should be noted that available capacity support for this process is limited, unless there is dedicated institutional funding which can resource such initiatives; for example, this was the case with *Karuna Mission Solidarity Society* (KMSS) under the *HARP* grant, a DFID funding mechanism in Myanmar[12]. Learning from the experience in Myanmar is essential. The Trócaire team is planning, together with KMSS, to conduct a multi-year research project to understand and document the successes and challenges of the transition process.

The *More than the Money* report, as well as *Caritas Internationalis*, draw attention to the apparent unfairness of INGOs competing with national and local civil society organisations for in-country funding opportunities, when INGOs have access to greater opportunities at an international level. **This raises a question of whether it is appropriate for organisations, such as Trócaire, to compete for funding where in-country partners exist who are well-placed to secure funding.** In relation to humanitarian funding this would mainly apply to pooled funds; however, according to two respondents, recent experiences suggest that partners may not always choose to take the lead and apply directly to a pooled funding mechanism. Some partners are reluctant due to the burdensome management requirements as well as associated risks. Accordingly, some partners have preferred to be supported by Trócaire in the administrative process, and to be part of a consortia as subgrantee.

Respondents proposed that Trócaire needs to be more strategic in its approach to Institutional Funding opportunities. It was suggested Trócaire could adopt a more targeted approach in which the funding requirements for each of the organisation's strategic goals should be clearly set out, opportunities for funding analysed in accordance with those requirements, and a decision taken as to whether the opportunity fulfils, in whole or in part, the requirements. Furthermore, respondents highlighted the need for stronger advocacy to donors in order to highlight the added value Trócaire can bring, as well as identifying where risks of inadequate grant management could undermine the localisation process.

Additionally, *More than the Money* raises the risk of a cliff edge effect when the "humanitarian bubble" bursts. **During an emergency response it is important to make use of the opportunity to raise the organisational profiles of Trócaire and local partners by delivering quality assistance, documenting successes and liaising with stakeholders and donors during the response.** This can provide Trócaire and partners the opportunity to leverage funding throughout the response, and into the recovery and development phase. This approach worked well in Sierra Leone where two local partners that had received quite small grants from Trócaire for a pilot phase during the outbreak of Ebola became key local actors leading the response in their respective districts of operations. Through the important recognition and legitimacy received from local communities, stakeholders and donors they were able to attract other funding sources for recovery and long-term development.

---

12. https://www.harpfacility.com/

3.3.1 Direct funding to local partners - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)
Trócaire has a clear overview of how it currently supports or undermines partners to diversify their funding base.

DIRECT FUNDING TO LOCAL PARTNERS

Immediate actions (0-6 months)	Comments
• Map and analyse where Trócaire is supporting partners to diversify funding, and where it is competing for funding with local partners.	• Ensure good practice is captured and shared.

3.2.3 Direct funding to local partners - Short-term milestone (6-18 months)
Trócaire adopts a proactive approach to supporting partners to access direct funding and applies a more critical perspective on decisions to apply for in-country funding opportunities.

Short-term actions (6-18 months)	Comments
• Develop guidelines and tools for country offices to be more proactive in their support to partners to access direct funding, including capacity strengthening support in grant writing, compliance and visibility.	• The review of the Country Operational Model should take account of the current gap in this type of proactive support.
• Establish a decision-making framework to critically review in-country funding opportunities that support localisation commitments on access to direct funding.	

3.2.3 Direct funding to local partners - Medium-term milestone (18+ months)
A selected number of Trócaire partners are successfully accessing direct funding from key donors to implement locally-led programming initiatives.

Medium-term (18 months+)	Comments
• Review and strengthen Trócaire's global institutional funding strategies and practices in view of localisation commitments on access to direct funding.	• The approach needs to be strategically aligned with Trócaire's localisation commitments
• Ensure learning is captured from working with new and emerging IF strategies and practices across Trócaire country offices.	• Current new modalities include working in Consortia (e.g., Malawi) and in arrangements where a local partner is taking the lead and Trócaire is sub-applicant (e.g., Honduras). These offer good learning opportunities.
• Provide dedicated support to a selected number of partners with greatest potential to access direct funding.	• Country teams should review partner portfolios and identify partners with greatest potential to access direct funding.

3.4 Partner resources

As outlined above, Trócaire partners encounter substantial challenges in trying to access direct funding. Furthermore, where partners are successful in accessing direct funding support, it is often the case that the grants do not cover all associated costs of implementing and managing a project. This can leave partners in a precarious financial situation. The reasons for this are varied and can include specific donor restrictions around eligibility of costs, challenges in dividing administration costs adequately among several agencies, as well as pressures to develop competitive proposals with low indirect/direct cost ratios. *More than the Money* notes that, while international actors are increasingly engaging with local actors, it is rare that the increased risks frequently faced by local actors are fully acknowledged, and this is often reflected in levels of resourcing and funding to partners. Local actors are often under-resourced in human and logistical assets, e.g., staffing levels, transport, means of communication, physical protection, and they may also be constrained in terms of their ability to provide for staff wellbeing and security. As a result, local actors may not be equipped to carry out their mandate in a safe and effective way.

For the most part, local partners do not have adequate restricted or unrestricted funds to cover their core costs, including risk management, organisational development, the fulfilment of statutory obligations as well as ensuring adherence to relevant international and technical standards. Local actors often have very limited opportunities to build up reserves, which are critical during lean periods. Such reserves can provide match funding or be invested in piloting innovative ideas, capturing learning and developing alternative business models.

Trócaire is, in principle, committed to the idea of full cost recovery of project delivery costs for partners, including support for core services. However, realising this principle in practice can be a challenge, given overall constraints on available resources.

Respondents have proposed a range of strategies to support partners to more effectively coordinate and optimise their use of limited resources; such strategies include practical support in the development of core operational budgets and facilitating local partners to come together to explore ways of pooling resources for maximum collective benefit.

Other ideas proposed include actively supporting partners to explore income-generation and fundraising activities; for example, in Kenya during a recent response in the Turkana region, a local partner initiated a fundraising campaign through leveraging relationships with local banks. *More than the Money* cites other examples of revenue generation initiatives by local organisations. Such models are potentially viable options for some organisations and in some contexts. However, while such strategies may be more effective in middle income countries, they are likely to be less viable in low income or insecure contexts. **Trócaire has accumulated significant experience in a diversity of fundraising approaches beyond institutional funding and should position itself to provide greater support to partners in this, and to share its expertise and learning accordingly**.

One option available to Trócaire to address this challenge is to look in greater depth at the possibility of sharing indirect cost recovery (ICR) with local partners or providing a percentage of unrestricted funds to partners to support organisational development. This is a complex issue and raises some questions: Would such an approach apply to all partners and projects, or only for certain categories of partners and projects? Would such a contribution be in addition to project-related administration costs for partners, as is provided for currently? How would contributions to overheads be provided? These questions are relevant and valid and require thoughtful consideration.

The proposal to share ICR with partners would have financial implications for Trócaire. For the financial year 2018/19, Trócaire's unrestricted income through ICR is around €1.6 million. Changing Trócaire's ICR policy[13] could lead to a substantial reduction in available unrestricted funds. As one respondent noted: *"we should address ICR in a pragmatic way and consider the practical reality that currently we are not able to afford it"*. *Another respondent proposed that a first step to more equitable resource distribution would be to allocate one third of ICR to Head Office, one third to the country office, and one third to the local partner(s). It was proposed that this could be part of a move towards ultimately dividing ICR on a 50/50 basis between Trócaire and partner(s) at an agreed point in the future.* Notwithstanding the pragmatic sincerity of such proposals, at the current time some donors do not permit the sharing of ICR with partners; this is currently the policy of Irish Aid.

For the most part, those consulted agree that it is important to continue engaging with donors around the level of risk borne by INGOs that work in partnership with local actors in endeavouring to fulfil

---

13. *Trócaire's current ICR policy is that the ICR is equally shared between Head Office and Country Office, but not with local partners.*

donor-imposed management and accountability (see also *More than the Money*). Further, respondents suggest that donors should accept that support costs to national and local partners should be categorised as direct eligible costs.

It is worth noting a recent success achieved by a group of UK-based CSOs to co-create, with DFID, a model for cost transparency and cost recovery that could provide greater transparency, as well as a fairer future, for even the smallest NGOs, in the delivery of donor grants. The basis of this model is calculating non-project attributable costs (NPAC)[14] and is being piloted at the time of writing.

In relation to Trócaire's approach to cost-recovery, there appears to be a general view that culture and practice could be improved. According to one respondent: *"There is organisational support needed to become more effective in cost-recovery in its entirety"*. Respondents pointed to other INGOs, with lower levels of unrestricted funding than Trócaire, that are managing more effective costs recovery processes and could offer models of innovative practice.

---

14. *https://www.bond.org.uk/news/2018/09/dfid-grants-a-new-model-for-cost-transparency*

3.4.1 Partner resources - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)
Partner project budgets adequately recognise the full costs of project delivery, including operations, coordination and learning, as well as staff wellbeing and risk management.

PARTNER RESOURCES

Immediate actions (0-6 months)	**Comments**
• Develop revised partner budgeting guidelines to support full costing of project delivery.	• Project grants should cover all project-related administration costs and contribute to core operational costs.

3.4.2 Partner resources – Short-term milestone (6-18 months)
Trócaire has a strategic understanding of issues related to cost recovery and unrestricted funding for local partners and has identified areas that require new thinking and new approaches.

Short-term actions (6-18 months)	**Comments**
• Establish a cross-organisational team (strategic initiative) to analyse and assess the challenges of cost recovery and unrestricted resources (UR) for partners and propose outline principles and a framework for a new approach.	• There is broad commitment in Trócaire to support full cost recovery, but it is important to acknowledge that partners also need access to unrestricted funds beyond the project period.
• Develop policy and guidelines on core funding support for local partners.	• Ensure policy and guidelines take account of: o Existing challenges in cost-recovery o Has clear standards and guidelines for cost recovery o Provides the basis for shared agreement on modalities of core support[15] o Defines strategies to advocate to donors on cost recovery and partner support costs
• Provide the necessary resources to support partners to develop core operational budgets and strategies ways to optimally resource and manage core costs.	• Consider bringing development partners of local partners together to look at ways in which they might coordinate and pool resources more effectively.

---

15. Concerns raised, which should be clarified, include *whether UR support should be provided across all partners and projects or only to certain categories and if UR support should be in addition to administration costs which partners are already receiving.*

✓ **3.4.3 Partner resources – Medium-term milestone (18 months+)** *Partners have access to increased flexible funding to cover core costs and organisational development needs to increase programme quality and organisational viability.*			

🗹 **Medium-term actions (18 months +)**	💬 **Comments**
• Work with partners in a targeted and consistent way to strengthen overall capacity in generating unrestricted funding.	• Income generation and fundraising activities are additional ways for partners to generate UR, particularly in middle-income countries.
• Identify and learn from alternative business models from other (I)NGOs	

Trócaire working in partnership with SAWA for Development and Aid, assisting Syrian Refugees in the Bekkaa Valley, Lebanon

Trócaire supporting partners Basmeh and Zeitooneh in Lebanon

PART 4:
VOICE AND INFLUENCE

4.1 Overview

If commitments under the localisation agenda are to be successful, it is critical that local actors have presence and influence in the spaces where key issues are discussed, and decisions are made. Local actors must be recognised as a legitimate and equal stakeholders in such processes, and sectoral policies and procedures should facilitate local organisations to take a leadership role in humanitarian response. Ceding space and power, as well as adjusting policies and procedures, presents a challenge to traditional actors. Commitment 2 of the *Grand Bargain*, on localisation, is explicit around supporting and complementing national coordination mechanisms, where these exist, as well as greater inclusion of local responders in international coordination mechanisms, in accordance with humanitarian principles.

Part 4 of the report considers potential pathways to implementation of greater localisation, in relation to voice and influence, in three key areas:

- Coordination
- Advocacy and policy influence
- Communication

4.2 Coordination

In order to address crisis-related challenges, efficient and effective coordination and collaboration is crucial. As highlighted in *More than the Money*, the involvement of local actors in coordination mechanisms is frequently marginal. At national level, seats on the Humanitarian Country Team have, for the most part, been attained by means of targeted and persistent advocacy. Local actors are often poorly represented, and even where present, can face significant barriers to their ability to play a meaningful role in this important decision-making space. At a sub-national level, local coordination mechanisms are often overlooked by international actors and parallel structures can emerge. This ultimately undermines optimal resource allocation and fails to take account of the longer-term responsibilities of local authorities for ongoing relief and protection, once international actors have left. To date, coherent and systematic strategies for handing over responsibility to local authorities have yet to emerge and coordination remains anchored around international actors.

Trócaire would benefit from clarifying its position in relation to engagement with local authorities considering the localisation agenda. Establishing effective relationships with local authorities before, during and after a response, may, in many contexts, enable greater coherence and sustainability in the provision of support.

Trócaire can play a useful role in supporting civil society actors in their efforts to be effectively represented in coordination forums, acknowledging that Trócaire has, like many of its local partners, frequently found it difficult to successfully engage with national-level coordination forums. Assuming an advocacy and lobbying role, to support greater space for, and inclusion of, civil society will be important along with providing technical advice to local partners on how coordination mechanisms work. As one respondent noted, "*we need strong elbows to ensure that civil society is at the table*". At the current time, all *Humanitarian Programme Plan* (HPP) projects include an outcome on coordination and collaboration; associated costs, which can be resource heavy, are budgeted for.

4.2.1 Coordination - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)
Understand the challenges that affect Trócaire and partners in accessing national-level humanitarian coordination forums.

COORDINATION

Immediate actions (0-6 months)	Comments
• Document case studies and lessons learned of Trócaire and partners' experiences in creating greater civil society space in humanitarian coordination forums.	• Documenting successes and challenges will enable country teams to recognise the importance of such mechanisms and opportunities for engagement.

4.2.2 Coordination – Short-term milestone (6-18 months)
Trócaire leverages space for its partners to actively take part in national platforms and coordination mechanisms at national and sub-national levels.

Short-term actions (6-18 months)	Comments
• Engagement and lobbying of humanitarian coordination systems and disaster management bodies at different levels, on the inclusion of local actors.	• It is important that Trócaire begins to clarify its position and approach vis a vis engagement with local authorities, particularly in complex and insecure environments.
• Provide continued support to local partners to participate and effectively represent civil society in coordination and disaster management bodies.	• A potential new area of focus could be to support local partners to broaden alliances and organise civil society for greater representation and collective influence and action.

4.2.3 Coordination – Medium-term milestone (18 months+)
Trócaire's partners are effectively representing civil society in national task forces and coordination mechanisms and influence decision-making which favours a locally-led response.

Medium-term actions (18 months+)	Comments
• Development of a policy brief on civil society space in humanitarian settings. • Support the development of MOUs between local actors and established disaster management and coordination bodies.	• As this is a dynamic and shifting agenda, new research will be critical to establishing a longer-term policy position for Trócaire. • Outlining key roles and responsibilities in MoUs will be critical for timely and effective response.

4.3 Advocacy and policy influence

Trócaire was actively engaged in discussions and preparations ahead of the *World Humanitarian Summit*, 2016, as well as participating in the Post-Summit review in Ireland. Trócaire continues to contribute to the global discourse as a signatory and active member of the *Charter for Change* and played a key role in developing *Caritas Internationalis'* position on localisation. The analysis provided by *More than the Money* is framing the localisation discourse internally in Trócaire and is helping to shape engagement on the issue with other actors, including Irish Aid. The report was an excellent opportunity to illustrate contextual realities for local actors and is being used by several Trócaire country programme offices to engage with key stakeholders on the issue. A great deal has been achieved over the past two years, highlighting the importance of dedicating targeted resources for advocacy within humanitarian programming. **It is timely to deepen advocacy engagement, at multiple levels, particularly as it appears that the localisation agenda may be losing some traction**. Some of those consulted for this report made the following observations:

"Donors make questionable decisions, the reasons for going down localisation are not the right ones and often based on value for money approaches"

"..donors are not delivering to what they have signed up to. It is just a rhetoric; it's lip service. It's a very slow process and at local level you don't feel the positive effects of it yet"

"It seems like the localisation agenda has hit a wall, there is less energy behind it besides the Charter for Change"

"We still have to change many hearts and minds, also within the Caritas Internationalis Confederation".

Potential opportunities for advocacy and lobbying include the *Caritas Internationalis* General Assembly (2020) and the development of a new Irish government *Civil Society Policy*. As highlighted in *More than the Money,* it is important for Trócaire to support the voices of southern civil society to participate in local and global discourse on localisation, and to facilitate local actors' contribution to discussions, ensuring their views are heard and their challenges acknowledged and understood. The recently finalised *Trócaire Advocacy Manual* is a useful resource for both development and humanitarian partners.

A number of key advocacy messages emerged from *More than the Money,* as well as from respondents for this report that Trócaire should continue to focus on:

1. Donors should increase funding to local and national responders and support multi-year investment in their institutional capacities.

2. Donors should create more inclusive, streamlined and flexible funding mechanisms that promote stronger partnerships and increase direct access by local, frontline NGOs to humanitarian funding; for example, availability of local funding schemes without match funding or pre-financing requirements.

3. Localisation is about strengthening the capacity and leadership of a diversity of local actors, each of which has a valuable and complementary role to play in humanitarian response. It should not only focus on large, national NGOs who may be capable of meeting donor requirements; this includes the need for greater opportunity and resources for women-focused organisations, to promote gender transformative humanitarian and development programming.

4. Opportunity and space should be created for local actors to play a central role in aid coordination; civil society should be effectively represented in all coordination mechanisms and an enabling environment should be created to facilitate effective participation.

4.3.1 Advocacy and policy influence - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)	
Trócaire continues to proactively engage on the localisation debate, particularly in Ireland and within Caritas Internationalis.	

ADVOCACY AND POLICY INFLUENCE

Immediate actions (0-6 months)	**Comments**
• Develop briefing paper for Trócaire country offices and CI members with key advocacy messages on localisation.	• Ensure key messages are aligned with *More than the Money.*

4.3.2 Advocacy and policy influence – Short-term milestone (6-18 months)	
Trócaire is expanding and deepening its advocacy work on localisation within Europe and at country-office level.	

Short-term actions (6-18 months)	**Comments**
• Establish clear links with organisations and civil society networks who share a common approach to localisation for coordinated advocacy efforts on localisation at national and global level.	• Ensure existing links and networks are sustained and strengthened and new opportunities for linking are identified and pursued.

4.3.3 Advocacy and policy influence – Medium-term milestone (18 months+)	
Trócaire is a recognised actor at global level for driving the localisation agenda and influencing humanitarian aid.	

Medium-term actions (18 months+)	**Comments**
• Development and implementation of advocacy strategy on localisation. • Strengthen the capacity of local humanitarian partners in advocacy.	• It is important to remember that working with local actors is not a risk-free endeavour and advocacy on localisation, if done poorly, could harm the localisation process.

4.4 Communication

Commitment 8 of the *Charter for Change* specifically relates to communication to the media and the public about partners. It states that, in all communications to the media and the public, signatories will promote the role of local actors and acknowledge the work they carry out. This relates closely to Commitment 4 of the *Core Humanitarian Standard* on communication, participation and feedback, including the requirement that external communications, including those used for fundraising, are accurate, ethical and respectful, and present communities and people affected by crisis, as dignified human beings.

Consistently promoting the role that partners play, as well as the added value Trócaire brings to partnerships, is an important action point and is, to a large extent, happening at the current time. Nonetheless, as alluded to in the final action point above, there is an ongoing need to create a deeper understanding among staff, of how to effectively profile the partnership approach in order to communicate this to external stakeholders. Respondents noted the importance of improved profiling of partners internally, as well as externally.

In the area of Development Education, there may be greater scope to raise awareness on Trócaire's partners; this may be less true, for example, in the case of the Fundraising function of Trócaire. The message platform, "*until loves conquers fear*", developed for the purposes of public fundraising, may not resonate with all segments of the public. It was developed with the primary aim of appealing to the so-called 'ambitious achievers' market segment, who may be less persuaded by communications in relation to local partners and the partnership modality. It is understood that this segment may be more motivated to donate by communications and messaging that emphasise the individual donor's personal role in contributing to the alleviation of suffering. Some tension is evident between the commitments outlined in *Charter for Change* and the *CHS*, and the marketing and brand positioning requirements of Trócaire for fundraising purposes.

Notwithstanding this apparent tension, opportunities exist for deeper public engagement beyond what may be a less nuanced fundraising strapline; as one respondent noted: *"the message platform is the entry point only, after that there is more space to engage. Partnership could be highly relevant and can embrace the vision of a lot of people. The localisation model will help us to be relevant with the audience."*

Furthermore, the means by which it is possible to profile partners also depends on the communications or media formats available to staff and partners. It would be useful to look at the guidelines of other agencies who share similar values and commitments. It could also be interesting to look at the practices of other *Charter for Change* members, for example, one C4C member currently features a substantive monthly communications product that promotes the work of a local partner and is widely shared on social media. **It is essential that any partner that features in communications should be fully consulted, and that any security considerations are fully assessed**. Other opportunities, such as dual branding of relief items and communications material, are also ways in which to better promote the role of partners. Further ideas that should be explored include communications training for partners; the development of a communications and security checklist; MoUs clarifying communication, visibility and branding arrangements between Trócaire and partners; and the development of jointly agreed media protocols to gather personal stories for fundraising, communication or advocacy purposes.[16]

---

16. *Charter for Change – From commitments to action, Progress report 2017-2018* https://charter4change.files.wordpress.com/2018/08/c4c_progressreport_2018_web1.pdf

4.4.1 Communication - Immediate milestone (0-6 months)
Trócaire continues to improve its representation and profiling of the work of partners in its external communications, including those used for fundraising purposes.

🌐 COMMUNICATIONS

☑ Immediate actions (0-6 months)	💬 Comments
• Prioritise implementation of CHS Improvement Plan in relation to communications.	• Better internal communications and profiling of partners will support improved external communications.

4.4.2 Communication - Short-term milestone (6-18 months)
Organisational capacity and action on communications is in line with Charter for Change and CHS commitments to promote and acknowledge the role of partner organisations.

☑ Short-term actions (6-18 months)	💬 Comments
• Produce substantive communications products on a monthly basis, that profiles the work of partner organisations.	• Ensure a risk-based approach to security considerations of all external communications, in full consultation with involved partners.

4.4.3 Communication - Medium-term milestone (18 months+)
Trócaire consistently promotes the role that partners play in humanitarian response and sustainable development and clearly articulate the added-value Trócaire brings to the partnership.

☑ Medium-term actions (18 months+)	💬 Comments
• Review the ongoing implementation of CHS improvement actions and identify new opportunities to innovate and creatively profile the role of partner organisations and the importance of localisation.	• Localisation requires that the work of local partners is widely publicised and publicly acknowledged.

ANNEX 1
LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED

Names	Organisation	Position
Trócaire HQ		
Julie Breen	Trócaire	TEACH programme Coordinator
John Condon	Trócaire	Partnership Advisor
Orla Duke	Trócaire	Humanitarian Advisor (Programme Development and Funding)
Sean Farrell	Trócaire	Director International Division
Sorcha Fennell	Trócaire	Head of Region - Central West & Southern Africa
Dearbhla Fitzsimons	Trócaire	Head of Standards & Compliance
Noreen Gumbo	Trócaire	Head of Humanitarian Programmes
Karen Kennedy	Trócaire	Head of Strategy and Impact
Gus McNamara	Trócaire	Head of Finance
Olive Moore	Trócaire	Head of Programmes
Deirdre Ni Cheallaigh	Trócaire	Programmes Manager
Angela O'Neill De Guilio	Trócaire	Head of Global Partnership and funding unit
Joe Shannon	Trócaire	Director of Human Resources, Learning & Development
John Smith	Trócaire	Director of Public Engagement
Country Programmes		
Daniel Gebremedhin	CST joint office	Project Coordinator START
Conor Molloy		Country Director Ethiopia
Tania Cheung	Trócaire Myanmar	Head of Humanitarian Programmes
Win Tun Kyi	Karuna Mission Social Solidarity (KMSS)	Director
Hkaw Bawm	Karuna Mission Social Solidarity (KMSS)	TASK team
Bawk Hkun	Kachin Development Group (KDG)	Program Coordinator
Saah Nyambe Lebreton	Trócaire DRC	Country Director
Hervé Bund	Trócaire Honduras	Country Director
Jose Ramón Avila	Asociación de Organismos No Gubernamentales (ASONOG)	Executive Director
Other actors		
Matthew Cogan	Irish Aid	Deputy Director, Humanitarian Unit
Saskia Harmsen	Oxfam	Change Manager Charter for Change
Michael Mosselmans	Christian Aid	Head of Humanitarian Policy, Practice and Advocacy
Réiseal Ní Chéilleachair	Concern Worldwide	Head of Advocacy Ireland and EU
Daniel Osnato Jasmine Jahromi	Save the Children - Denmark	Senior Humanitarian Advisors

ANNEX 2. RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMITMENTS BY TRÓCAIRE TO STRENGTHEN LOCALISATION

1. PARTNERSHIP			
Commitments/recommendations			
MttM	Trócaire should **update its partnership policy**, drawing on decades of experience to strengthen humanitarian and development partnerships.	C4C	**Reaffirm the Principles of Partnership**: We endorse, and have signed on to, the Principles of Partnership, (Equality, Transparency, Results-Oriented Approach, Responsibility and Complementarity).
C4C	**Address subcontracting:** Our local and national collaborators are involved in the design of the programmes at the outset and participate in decision-making as equals in influencing programme design and partnership policies.	C4C	**Stop undermining local capacity**: We will identify and implement **fair compensation** for local organisations for the loss of skilled staff if and when we contract a local organisation's staff involved in humanitarian action within 6 months of the start of a humanitarian crisis or during a protracted crisis, for example along the lines of paying a recruitment fee of 10% of the first six months' salary.
CI	**Reporting formats**: Building on the successful model of Caritas Internationalis Appeals, reflecting the sector-wide commitments of the Grand Bargain work streams and noting the New Way of Working, **the Confederation will promote a common reporting modality.**	MttM	Commit to **partnerships beyond the length** of a contract via a Memorandum of Understanding that captures shared ambitions and goals, linked to longer term strategic objectives.

2. PARTNER CAPACITY STRENGHTENING			
Commitments/recommendations			
C4C	**Robust organisational support and capacity strengthening:** We will support local actors to become robust organisations that continuously improve their role and share in the overall global humanitarian response. We undertake to pay adequate **administrative** support. A test of our seriousness in **capacity building** is that by May 2018 we will have **allocated resources** to support our partners in this.	CI	In a humanitarian response, the collective commitment of the confederation is to **strengthen and promote the capacity and sustainability** of the national Caritas members. Capacity assessments consider the long-term vision of the organisation, planning beyond the immediate capacity requirements to deliver a humanitarian response. A commitment to **capacity strengthening** will feature in every partnership agreement between an international and domestically operating CIMO. Additionally, at least 2% of each emergency appeal will be invested in the capacity of the national members responding to a humanitarian crisis.
MttM	Work strategically with partners on **organisational capacity building & capacity strengthening methods**, cognisant of other capacity building endeavours underway supported by other donors (e.g. secondment, multi-year support, etc.).	MttM	Develop a **framework to evaluate/value** the capacity building support provided by Trócaire to partners.

A4H	Work closely with partners in our commitment to adopt, use and monitor **the Core Humanitarian Standard** (CHS) to improve coherence in standards to improve quality, accountability, effectiveness and efficiency in humanitarian response.	A4H	Strengthen and improve our partnerships with national organisations in programming and delivering **principled and coordinated humanitarian assistance**.
MttM	Encourage and actively facilitate **exchanges** between international donors/partners of the same local organisation to move from a project-based approach to an institution strengthening approach.	MttM	Support and **foster local learning**, and the exchange of experiences and innovations between local actors as well as between local and international actors.
CI	**Investing in Surge Capacity: The investment in surge capacity across the confederation is key to strengthening capacity, reputation and recognition of national actors as humanitarian responders.** Noting the need for cross organisational surge support, particularly south-south, to provide relevant technical expertise in a humanitarian response, CIMOs supporting surge capacity will be acknowledged and compensated for secondment.	MttM	**Avoid cyclical short-term project-based approaches** that do not effectively support partners to strengthen their operational and institutional capacities.

3. FUNDING & RESOURCES			
Commitments/recommendations			
C4C	Increase **transparency** around resource transfers to southern-based national and local NGOs.	A4H	Improve **transparency** on the full cost of humanitarian action, including the resources we transfer to our members.
C4C	... We undertake to pay adequate **administrative support**. A test of our seriousness in capacity building is that by May 2018 we will have allocated resources to support our partners in this. We will **publish** the percentages of our humanitarian budget which goes directly to partners for humanitarian capacity building by May 2018.	MttM	Increase **consortium approaches** with local partners in order to provide them with new funding opportunities and approaches to funding and jointly advocate with donors on the value of the contribution of each actor within the consortium.
C4C	**Increase direct funding to southern-based NGOs for humanitarian action:** We commit that by May 2018 at least 20% of our own humanitarian funding will be passed to southern based NGOs. We commit to introduce our NGO partners to our own direct donors with the aim of them accessing direct financing.	CI	**Access to funding:** Where a national Caritas member is well-placed to access and secure funding to sustain a high quality humanitarian response, other **confederation members will refrain from competing for or securing nationally available funding such as pooled funds or funds available from institutional donors present in-country.** In addition, confederation members will increasingly collaborate with and support national Caritas members to secure direct funding from institutional donors.
MttM	Review funding strategies to avoid competing with local partners over the same funding sources (e.g. CBPF), and prioritise funding opportunities not directly accessible to local organisations.	CI	Noting the essential requirement of funds to cover indirect costs, promote organisational development and support long-term programme commitments, **the Confederation commits to providing at least 5% of humanitarian funding budget towards coverage of core/administrative costs of implementing partners of humanitarian actors in a response.** CIMOs will advocate internally and externally on the practical necessities of core funding for organisations. Core funding investment will be necessary to strengthen standards of programming, transparency and overall accountability of humanitarian programming. …Additionally, at least 2% of each emergency appeal will be invested in the capacity of the national members responding to a humanitarian crisis**.**

MttM	Work with partners to develop institutional funding strategies that include analysis on minimum core costs required for 'lean' periods (i.e. in between grants).	**MttM**	Support partners in receipt of funds indirectly, in partnership with Trócaire to plan for strengthening systems and competencies to gradually receive large grants and manage higher levels of risk.
MttM	Work with local partners to secure specific funding for institutional capacity building.	**MttM**	Explore how capacity building towards sustainable organisations can be provided within the current funding environment with specific attention to women-led organisations and the promotion and retention of women in local NGOs.

4. VOICE AND INFLUENCE			
Commitments/recommendations			
C4C	We commit through **advocacy and policy** influence to North American and European donors (including institutional donors, foundations and private sector) to encourage them to increase the year on year percentage of their humanitarian funding going to southern-based NGOs.	**MttM**	Work with partners to **advocate with donors for multiyear funding** in specific contexts, especially protracted settings which sit between humanitarian and development contexts.
C4C	**Emphasise the importance of national actors:** We undertake to advocate to donors to make working through national actors' part of their criteria for assessing framework partners and calls for project proposals.	**MttM**	In all advocacy on localisation, Trócaire should include the Grand Bargain commitment to increase and support **"multi-year investment"** in the institutional capacities of local and national responders through collaboration with development partners and incorporating capacity strengthening in partnership agreements" which tends to be forgotten in favour of the commitment to increase direct funding.
A4H	Trócaire works with partners to advocate for more **efficient, inclusive and streamlined funding mechanisms** that promote stronger partnerships and increased direct access of local and national frontline responding NGOs to humanitarian funding.	**MttM**	Support the **coordination** of local NGOs to strengthen local civil society and establish more strategic links for advocacy with Shifting the Power.
MttM	Trócaire should advocate and actively support the inclusion of local partners in global discussions about localisation or organising global exchanges at the local level to ensure local actors are able to contribute to the discussions so that their views are heard and challenges are recognised and explored.	**CI**	**Coordination & representation** – Given that increasing collaboration and consultation are priorities for the Confederation, national CIMOs will be encouraged to increase engagement at national, regional and local coordination mechanisms as possible. Recognising obstacles that may exist such as funding, capacity, technical knowledge and language barriers, **the confederation will collaborate to support and promote the expertise and influence of national members in humanitarian coordination.**
MttM	Trócaire should raise awareness at country level and in international forums about the **risks** related to localisation if it is not managed well at the global level.	**A4H**	**Invest in Humanity** Support national partners to strengthen in-country engagement in humanitarian action.
C4C	**Communication to the media and the public about partners:** In any communications to the international and national media and to the public we will promote the role of local actors and acknowledge the work that they carry out and include them as spokespersons when security considerations permit.		

Trócaire team members with partners SAWA for Development and Aid and Basmeh and Zeitooneh in Lebanon

Trócaire

Irish Aid
Rialtas na hÉireann
Government of Ireland

Trócaire