SUMMARY REPORT

2023 IOM-NGO HUMANITARIAN CONSULTATION: COMPLEMENTARITIES FOR A CULTURE CHANGE ON LOCALIZATION AND MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION

INTRODUCTION

On 11 October 2023 in Geneva, IOM convened the sixth annual IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultation to formulate actionable recommendations to better operationalize localization and respond to the current gaps in putting people, their needs, and capacities at the center of crisis response.[1] The Consultation brought together 87 participants, including 58 representatives of 52 NGOs – of which 32 local and national NGOs (L/NNGOs) – in 25 countries, in a hybrid online and in-person format.

Participants identified the key entry points for further progress towards more equitable IOM-L/NNGO partnerships including in terms of overhead sharing, duty of care and risk sharing, two-way IOM-L/NNGO capacity strengthening, enabling L/NNGO leadership of, and meaningful participation in, humanitarian coordination structures, and leveraging localization for Accountability to Affected People (AAP)[2] and more meaningful participation of affected communities. These exchanges will inform IOM's efforts to transform the way it devolves power, including financial power, as well as information and knowledge, to its local partners.[3]

OPENING AND SETTING THE SCENE

IOM underlined the importance of partnerships for efficient and effective collective responses in an increasingly complex global humanitarian landscape, noting that expanding, broadening, and deepening NGO partnerships was the priority for IOM's new administration under the leadership of Director General Amy Pope.[4]

Setting the scene, IOM framed the day's discussions in terms of leveraging respective strengths: the Organization's large humanitarian footprint, ability to scale up, respond, and mobilize resources rapidly, as well as its leadership and coordination roles, convening power, and technical and administrative capacity. On NGOs' side, their contextual and technical knowledge and information, operational capacity, key advocacy functions, and in particular, L/NNGOs' proximity to affected communities and unique positioning to devise approaches that deliver the best outcomes for the affected populations. ICVA anchored this reflection in the Principles of Partnership and urged a recognition that trust was

---

[1] See Annex II for a brief overview of the annual IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultations and more information on IOM's wide-ranging partnerships with local and national NGOs (L/NNGOs) in crisis response.

[2] Alongside the centrality of protection, PSEA, and gender-based violence, AAP is one of the four so-called non-negotiables of Humanitarian Country Teams priorities and commitment by humanitarians to use power responsibly: to take account of, give account to, and be held to account by the people we seek to assist.

[3] In line with IOM's institutional localization commitments – see Annex II for more information.

[4] As per IOM Strategic Plan 2024-2028, developing more equitable partnerships with national and local actors is one of the organization's key enablers of success. Increased localization is central to achieving the objective to effectively save lives and protect people on the move.

another key framing issue – trust of the affected people in the humanitarian system and of the local and national actors vis-à-vis their international NGO and UN counterparts. SCHR acknowledged that a meaningful shift towards locally led responses was a challenge for all international actors across the board, including INGOs. SCHR emphasized the Outcome Document of the Grand Bargain Caucus on Intermediaries as a step forward for intermediaries[5] to better respond to the needs of local actors and the affected people, and called for frank dialogue on putting those commitments into practice, particularly from the L/NNGO point of view, to incentivize best practice and speed up the necessary changes on the ground.

The Consultation proceeded in two interactive sessions that focused on IOM-NGO complementarities to deliver on shared commitments to localization and AAP, respectively.

SESSION I – OPERATIONALIZING THE HUMANITARIAN LOCALIZATION AGENDA

Session I consisted of a presentation of IOM's draft **Localization Framework and Guidance Note for IOM's Humanitarian Response**, which NGO participants welcomed stressing the importance of field rollout to ensure that both IOM staff and partners are fully aware of the provisions of the Framework and Guidance Note, with a special emphasis on **overhead sharing**. The presentation was followed by a discussion in plenary with a panel and Q&A and in break out groups.

In a moderated plenary dialogue, L/NNGO representatives and IOM counterparts discussed **joint approaches to localization**, with each speaker making short introductions followed by exchanges on the panel and with the audience that spanned across the localization aspects – partnerships and funding, capacity strengthening, coordination, visibility, and participation. The interactive discussion singled out concrete good practice examples and strategic points of IOM-L/NNGO complementarity – for example, empowered LNGOs that cascade a localized CCCM technical training to communities in Indonesia, with new local actors emerging as local cluster co-leads as a result; the coupling of funding with multi-pronged capacity strengthening in LNGO partnerships in Ethiopia; the leveraging of IOM-LNGO complementarities for humanitarian access in hard to reach areas in Moldova; and the nurturing of partnerships beyond the paradigm of compliance to support sustainable responses to protracted displacement in Cox' Bazar, Bangladesh. The discussion also identified challenges and gaps to accelerating equal local partnerships, particularly in terms of more direct access to funding, due diligence requirements, and systematic integration of capacity strengthening components.

- The throughline of discussions on operationalizing localization was the need for more equal partnerships: overhead sharing and a more inclusive and supportive approach to risk sharing and management, duty of care, and partner staff wellbeing, particularly in high-risk environments.

- Routine exchange of information with sister UN agencies on due diligence and L/NNGO partnerships via the United Nations Partner Portal (UNPP) is critical to reducing the administrative burden on local partners, and so is the harmonization of reporting requirements through the rollout of the 8+3 narrative reporting template.

- Systematic capacity exchange should be a two-way, bottom-up process with L/NNGOs in the lead, particularly those partners with strong internal governance and established procedures on staff assessment and development.

---

[5] First-line recipients of funding.

In Session I break out groups, participants identified ways to increase recognition of L/NNGO partners and promote good practice of IOM partnerships. Group rapporteurs reported back to plenary the key recommendations, with a view to seizing opportunities and overcoming gaps and barriers on the ground.

SESSION II – ACCOUNTABILITY TO AFFECTED PEOPLE (AAP) AND LOCALIZATION: EXPLORING LINKAGES AND SYNERGIES TO PUT PEOPLE AT THE CENTER

Building on complementarities to accelerate localization identified in Session I, Session II focused on meaningful participation and ways to respond to gaps in putting people, their needs, and capacities at the center of response. It consisted of a presentation of **IOM's Institutional AAP Framework**, followed by a panel discussion and a Q&A and exchanges in break-out groups.

IOM's AAP Framework establishes the Organization's common approach to implementing and mainstreaming AAP throughout its crisis related work. It helps ensure quality and responsive programming and enforce the Organization's zero tolerance against sexual exploitation and abuse and other misconduct.[6] Partner coordination is one of the five operational pillars of the Framework, including the commitment to promote collective approaches to AAP with L/NNGOs and other humanitarian partners, incorporate AAP in cooperation agreements, monitor and evaluate compliance, and promote flexibility with donors to enable programming adaptive to affected people's feedback and views.[7] IOM underlined that, given their proximity to the affected populations, L/NNGOs are key to gaining and maintaining trust of the affected communities. They are instrumental to the affected people holding humanitarians to account, being taken into account, and being given an account of the programming, as well as ensuring course correction in response to complaints, feedback, and changing needs.

The interactive panel discussion identified the synergies between localization and AAP efforts to respond more effectively and sustainably to affected populations' priorities – including addressing protection risks and contributing to community resilience – and close the gaps in the way information and power are shared with the affected people. The speakers shared experience on AAP in practice in different contexts from the point of view of a LNGO, a NNGO, a NNGO

> L/NNGOS ARE KEY TO RESPONSIVE PROGRAMMING AND MUST BE EMPOWERED TO COURSE CORRECT ACCORDING TO INPUT FROM COMMUNITIES. INVESTMENT IN L/NNGOS AND THEIR AAP CAPACITY IS THEREFORE STRATEGICALLY IMPORTANT FOR THE EFFECTVENESS OF RESPONSE.

forum, and a global alliance on quality and accountability. Good practice examples included using a local community training on emergency shelter construction in Ethiopia as an opportunity to identify ways and complement, as opposed to replacing, the existing knowledge and capacities of the community; the establishment of inclusive, refugee-led, refugee-managed community-based committees, supported on an ongoing basis for logistics and technical aspects by a NNGO in Türkiye; joint NNGO advocacy at the HCT level in Lebanon to voice the needs and feedback of affected people and bring the NNGO perspective to a collective approach on AAP; and the leveraging of the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) as a sector-wide contract on quality and accountability that puts local and international actors on

---

[6] The commitments of the Framework were developed in line with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's (IASC) commitments to AAP and adapted to meet IOM's operational realities.

[7] Like the Localization Framework and Guidance Note presented in Session I, IOM's AAP Framework and its commitment to partner coordination on AAP go hand in hand with the recent IOM guidance on grant and implementing partnerships management (IN/287 and IN/288, respectively).

an equal footing, with many small LNGOs meeting the standard equally well or better than large organizations, owing to the chain of accountability.

In the subsequent Q&A in plenary, participants emphasized the key role of L/NNGOs in the humanitarian-development nexus. Most often, L/NNGOs are experienced in both humanitarian and development response and provide a lifeline not only for the survival, but also the recovery of the affected populations. To empower and facilitate L/NNGO role in the transition from humanitarian to development, international actors need to devise clearer transition planning and develop exit strategies broader than those linked to the end of project or funding. Break out groups subsequently discussed the enablers, barriers, and good practice in supporting L/NNGOs to appropriately represent the affected people and play a leadership role to promote accountable, participatory responses, with rapporteurs presenting the key points in plenary.

L/NNGOS ARE UNIQUELY POSITIONED TO RESPOND TO THE DE FACTO NEEDS OF THE AFFECTED PEOPLE – WHICH IN INCREASINGLY PROTRACTED DISPLACEMENT CONTEXTS GO BEYOND THE HUMANITARIAN AND INCLUDE SECURITY OR LIVELIHOODS – AND ARE THUS CENTRAL TO BUILDING TRUST OF COMMUNITIES WHO DO NOT DISTINGUISH BETWEEN TYPES OF NEEDS, SECTORS OR SILOS.

- LNGO leadership and active involvement in coordination strengthens the degree to which the affected people are represented in coordination structures. At the same time, there must be direct channels of meaningful participation for communities to voice their concerns.

- Overhead sharing is key to resourcing L/NNGO partners to develop and operate inclusive community participation methods, meaningful complaints and feedback mechanisms, and effective compliance tools and processes. Funding flexibility is a significant enabler for a programming responsive to people's needs, feedback and complaints.

- Similarly, harmonization of reporting requirements and information sharing on due diligence are conducive to freeing up essential partner staff time for AAP.

- Systematizing two-way capacity exchange between IOM and L/NNGOs can provide essential contextual knowledge to IOM while validating the know-how of L/NNGOs, including on AAP.

CLOSING REMARKS AND WAY FORWARD

IOM informed participants of the wider engagement the Organization pursues with the civil society on knowledge exchange, joint advocacy, capacity building and other policy areas of mutual, strategic interest, beyond the operational humanitarian partnerships with NGOs that are the focus of the IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultations. Partnerships are a key priority for IOM's new administration and IOM will be developing a more systematic dialogue with civil society organizations, with a view to feeding the outcomes into programming, institutional policy development, and strategy. NGO partners are welcome to reach out with feedback, including suggestions on how best to reinvigorate the regular consultative engagement and dialogue.

IOM summarized the key takeaways from the Consultation, including on importance of **indirect cost recovery, risk sharing and duty of care, and two-way capacity strengthening**, and re-affirmed its

institutional commitment to equal partnerships with local actors. Discussions emphasized that international actors including IOM needed to create a more enabling environment so L/NNGOs can better leverage their context-informed approaches for meaningful participation and fulfil AAP-related compliance requirements. This includes **more funding to ensure accountability and meaningful participation of communities – including participation in decision-making – and more flexible funding**. Moreover, IOM will continue to **advocate for the leadership of local partners in coordination structures** to speed up localization and bring more people-centered approaches into the humanitarian and development programming as early as possible: when L/NNGOs are given leadership roles in humanitarian coordination structures, they can effectively represent the voices and grievances of crisis-affected people because of their local and indigenous knowledge. IOM is institutionally committed to continue working closely with valued, trusted NGO partners at all levels.

IOM-NGO COMPLEMENTARITIES TO ADVANCE LOCALIZATION AND MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION: KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

To catalyze the delivery on IOM's localization commitments in crisis response and leverage localization for increased operational effectiveness through more context-informed, responsive, and participatory programming, the Organization should:

➢ Take concrete steps to continue the operationalization of the **Grand Bargain Risk Sharing Framework** and the rollout of the **United Nations Partner Portal (UNPP)**

➢ Ensure its **Localization Framework and Guidance Note for IOM's Humanitarian Response**, **IN/288 Implementing Partnerships Management Handbook**, and **IN/287 Administering Financial Grants in IOM Operations** are promoted across the Organization and with L/NNGO partners to support the equality of local partnerships, expand their scope, and support accountability and participation. Most urgently, strengthen awareness of and adherence to existing guidance on **overhead sharing**, **advance payments**, **simplified reporting requirements**, and **risk sharing** and facilitate more **systematic organizational and technical capacity strengthening and exchange,** partner participation, and visibility

➢ Continue supporting **L/NNGO partner leadership in coordination structures**.

ANNEX I – DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS: DETAILED OVERVIEW

SECTOR-WIDE CHALLENGE/GAP	CURRENT CHALLENGE LYING UNDER IOM'S CONTROL	RECOMMENDATION
SHORT/IMMEDIATE TERM		
Information sharing is insufficient among intermediaries[8] on L/NNGO partnership and the outcomes of due diligence assessments. This is a failed opportunity to alleviate the high administrative burden on L/NNGO partners.	Having joined the UN Partner Portal (UNPP) in 2023, IOM is in the process of setting up mechanisms for routine sharing of L/NNGO partner and due diligence information with sister UN agencies and for using Portal information to reduce the procedural due diligence burden on local L/NNGO partners.	1. **Continue investing in and prioritizing the rollout of the UNPP at the field level.[9]**
Localization cannot be leveraged towards increased efficiency and effectiveness without donors rethinking, in the immediate, their risk appetite and the breadth of costs they agree to cover. Risk transfer to L/NNGOs, as opposed to risk sharing, is still the de facto default for intermediaries. The Grand Bargain Risk Sharing Framework is welcome and must urgently be operationalized.	Risk management is insufficiently supported for IOM's local partners operating on the frontlines in high-risk environments; for example, IOM should never request a partner to reduce security costs in a conflict without considering the operational context. IOM L/NNGO partners' duty of care is not covered in insecure environments, nor is L/NNGO staff wellbeing.	2. **Start operationalizing the Grand Bargain Risk Sharing Framework.[10]**

---

[8] First-line recipients of funding.

[9] In 2023, IOM joined nine other UN agencies currently using UNPP for implementing partnerships management (UN Secretariat, UN Women, FAO, UNDP Crisis Bureau, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and WHO). The UNPP is a shared open-source platform to support harmonization and simplification of business processes related to working with implementing partners including Governments and NGOs/CSOs. It is a solution that centralizes information and outreach to new and existing NGO registration, due diligence screening and calls for expression of interest management. UNPP offers: Access to partners profiles informing country missions on the partners field presence (globally UNPP has over 35,000 partner profiles); Access to other UN Agencies' verification and risk profiles (due diligence assessment) of prospective partners thereby reducing the partner selection process; Key partner profile data extraction for analysis; A platform to publish calls for expression of interest.

[10] The Framework provides a basis for interested humanitarian actors to pursue risk sharing to enable more effective delivery of support to affected people. It is not a directive tool, but rather a principled yet adaptable approach through which humanitarian actors working in a delivery chain of assistance can collectively define and agree on the risks that exist, and how best to respond to them.

Background: In line with the recognition, in the 2023 Grand Bargain Framework, of 'risk sharing' as an area cutting across all Grand Bargain objectives, at the 2023 Annual Meeting, the Grand Bargain Signatories including IOM endorsed the Risk Sharing Framework developed by the Risk Sharing Platform under the leadership of the ICRC, InterAction, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of The Netherlands. Grand Bargain Signatories are expected to launch initiatives within their organizations to implement the Framework and share progress on its implementation at the Grand Bargain Annual Meetings.

In terms of risk sharing in IOM, MOPAN assessment pointed out gaps in this regard. While the Localization Framework and Guidance Note for IOM's Humanitarian Response represents an important step to introduce the notion of risk sharing across operations, IOM would benefit from more concrete measures and guidelines to operationalize the Risk Sharing Framework. IOM's Risk Management Policy and Framework (IN/213, Rev 1), for instance, does not describe risk sharing, and IOM's Implementing Partnerships Management Handbook (IN/288) only marginally mentions it in the definition of implementing partner.

Persisting double standards exist on duty of care, with coverage for intermediary but not local partner staff, even though the latter are often first responders in insecure environments. GB Risk Sharing Framework is a welcome first step to further build on.	The Localization Framework and Guidance Note provides practical recommendations on equitable risk sharing with partners. Good practice example: Following the Türkiye/Syria earthquake, UN agencies agreed to cover L/NNGO staff evacuations costs in Türkiye.	
Intermediaries must share overhead with L/NNGOs in line with their commitments.	IOM field staff working with L/NNGO partners, and NGO partners alike, are unaware of IOM internal instruction allowing overhead sharing (up to 7%; IN/288 sections C 5.5.3-C 5.5.4).	**3. Promote the following guidance across IOM and among its L/NNGO partners:** → **Localization Framework and Guidance Note for IOM's Humanitarian Response** → **IN/288 Implementing Partnerships Management Handbook** → **IN/287 Administering Financial Grants in IOM Operations**
Intermediaries' reporting requirements are still not sufficiently harmonized nor simplified, nor matched by the budgets they allocate to L/NNGO partnerships.	Support to administrative/organizational capacity of L/NNGO partners for IOM goes hand in hand with the need for the simplification and harmonization of the reporting requirements. IN/288 and Localization Framework and Guidance Note both contain provisions recommending the use of the simplified, harmonized 8+3 narrative reporting template.	
Due diligence and partnership requirements of intermediaries are insufficiently understood by many L/NNGOs and often prove prohibitive.	IOM's due diligence requirements are insufficiently known and understood among its prospective L/NNGO partners.	**In so doing, ensure the following provisions in particular are well understood:**
Persisting inequalities exist in contractual arrangements between intermediaries and L/NNGOs, including on visibility, ownership of data, risk management, etc.	IN/288 sets the parameters for L/NNGOs to negotiate contractual arrangements with IOM.	- **Overhead sharing – encourage L/NNGOs to claim overhead** - **8+3 harmonized narrative reporting template** - **IOM partnership requirements and scope for negotiation of contract terms** - **Advance payments and funding flexibility** - **Need for a capacity strengthening plan and donor**
Funding transfers to LNAs can take longer than the timeline of the agreement/response, creating budgeting gaps that L/NNGOs may not have the capacity to bridge.	IOM's L/NNGO partners in emergency contexts must have more funding flexibility. Advance payments are essential. This is emphasized in the Localization Framework and Guidance Note. IN/288 defines parameters for advance payments as a key aspect of equal partnerships. IOM needs to take concrete steps to address bottlenecks slowing down its legal and financial partnership procedures.	

IOM UN MIGRATION

Due diligence assessment is an opportunity for capacity strengthening. Even if the assessment identifies gaps that prevent a L/NNGO from accessing funding, intermediaries have a responsibility to use its outcomes as basis for further training and can consider partnering with the private sector or academic institutions to do so.	Localization Framework and Guidance Note contains practical recommendations on using the due diligence process as a capacity strengthening opportunity.	**advocacy for relevant resourcing** - **Regular partner consultation and dialogue** - **Localization Guidance Note recommendations on partnerships and funding including equitable risk sharing, participation, coordination, capacity strengthening, and visibility/advocacy**
The push towards localization needs to be accompanied by more appetite for systematic inclusion of capacity strengthening, especially but not exclusively administrative/organizational cap. strengthening, in donor budgets (failure to do so amounts to a barrier to empowering L/NNGOs to directly access donor funding).	IOM often uses monitoring visits as a capacity strengthening opportunity which is a good practice but cannot replace dedicated capacity strengthening initiatives. Localization Framework and Guidance Note and IN/288 both contain provisions and practical recommendations on the need for a capacity strengthening plan and donor advocacy for relevant resourcing.	
Insufficient and ineffective communication is a barrier to more equality in existing partnerships with L/NNGOs. This includes insufficient regard for local actors' planning processes and timelines; intermediaries' use of technical jargon, acronyms, and inflexible use of English as the default language; lack of effective or regular information sharing and messaging on intermediaries' mandate, portfolio, and planning.	IOM does not sufficiently consider L/NNGOs' internal planning and timelines when scheduling visits or capacity strengthening activities. A significant communication gap exists whereby even trusted longstanding partners have a limited awareness of IOM's portfolio, programmes, and planning. The acronyms and technical jargon IOM uses are insufficiently understood and can impede effective, equitable communication. Localization Framework and Guidance Note provides practical pointers on partner participation and the use of accessible language. Good practice examples: ➢ IOM's leadership on localizing the CCCM framework in Indonesia. ➢ In Indonesia and Ethiopia, IOM leverages its convening power and global CCCM role to bring together L/NNGO and local and national government partners to jointly develop a CCCM work plan. All actors contribute to the	

	activities covered in the work plan, ensuring relevance of the activities to the local context and facilitating "locally led localization".
Intermediaries often grow to consistently rely on few L/NNGOs instead building a larger pool of partners by investing in capacity development. This can overstretch these key L/NNGOs and ultimately be destructive.	Avoiding harm through the overburdening of partners needs to be a consideration when making partnership decisions for IOM, as outlined in the recommendations within its Localization Guidance.
The persisting barriers to direct L/NNGO access to donor funding, and lack of opportunity for direct exposure to donors, create trust issues vis-à-vis intermediaries. L/NNGO participation in discussions between donors and intermediaries is essential, including for accelerating the standardization and harmonization of due diligence. Grand Bargain National Reference Groups provide a forum for this but do not include LNGOs.	Even where IOM consistently relies on L/NNGO partnerships for a large portion of its response, these partners have limited direct exposure to donors, perpetuating the difficulties for partners to access donor funding directly and negotiate general partnership terms. Localization Framework and Guidance Note includes practical recommendations on donor advocacy, partner visibility, and participation.
It is of strategic importance to invest in L/NNGOs and their capacity, including good programming, integrity and compliance mechanisms, and to empower them to effectuate course correction according to the input from communities. Many NNGOs operate robust AAP procedures and tools without any dedicated funding. AAP structures are not sufficiently included in donor budgets. More investment is needed to support the awareness and understanding of AAP in smaller L/NNGOs and among the affected people. (The power differential between the affected people and local actors does exist and is not challenged enough.)	IOM needs to support a more enabling environment for L/NNGO partners to fulfil AAP-related compliance requirements, build effective complaints and feedback mechanisms, ensure meaningful participation of communities, and empower them to translate this into changed programming responsive to community input. Overhead sharing can assist L/NNGO in funding their AAP structures. Roll out of the 8+3 narrative template, and information sharing via the UNPP, can reduce the reporting and diligence/administrative burden on partners, freeing up valuable L/NNGO staff time for AAP.

Humanitarian coordination structures are international-centric. Co-leadership arrangements and active participation of L/NNGOs in coordination is an asset for trust-building essential for ensuring that local knowledge and the voices of the affected people are more represented in coordination structures. (L/NNGO advocacy to voice the needs and feedback of affected communities cannot and does not replace direct channels of communication and meaningful participation from affected communities.)	In many contexts, IOM has been successfully supporting local leadership of humanitarian coordination structures.[11] IOM should continue supporting L/NNGOs to effectively represent the voices and grievances of crisis-affected people.	**4. Continue to advocate for the leadership of local partners in coordination structures.**
MID-TERM		
Localization is transformational and requires a holistic approach, as opposed to a piecemeal focus on some aspects to the detriment of others. Localization is not reducible to funding – which however remains critically important. Funding for localization is not reducible to quantity; quality also matters. Tracking progress on localization should look at how funding is granted – e.g. reporting requirements, funding quality, funding flexibility – and not only the volume.	IOM needs to further leverage its multi-pronged approach to localization in both its operations (e.g. support to local-led coordination structures, close relationships with operational partners at the field level, etc.) and policy (e.g. the Localization Framework and IN/288 and IN/287 provisions conducive to advancing localization).	➢ On the mid-term, develop **targets** to track progress on all aspects of localization[12]
The increase in available quality funding has been accompanied by increased requirements on donor side. This is an impediment to intermediaries to cascade the terms to their L/NNGO partners.	The timelines of IOM's funding agreements with long-standing partners are often shorter than those of the funding IOM receives from donors. IOM partnership agreement timelines should mirror those IOM has with donors, as a matter of practice.	➢ Clarify and ensure guidance is in place on **longer-term agreements** (with a funding commitment/implication) with trusted L/NNGO partners, with timelines

---

[11] For example, in 2022, 41% of IOM-led coordination mechanisms were co-led with national NGOs or governmental entities.

[12] In addition to the commitment to increase funding transfers to local partners for humanitarian response (with targets of 7% in 2024 and 10% by 2026) – for more information on this target, please see Annex II.

IOM UN MIGRATION

		mirroring those of donor funding IOM receives
Large salary differences between intermediaries and L/NNGOs make poaching of qualified L/NNGO staff a common occurrence, weakening L/NNGO capacity.	IOM needs to take steps to prevent the dynamic that amounts to L/NNGO staff poaching.	➢ Develop ethical guidance in terms of recruitment to address the issue of **poaching** and staff turnover in L/NNGOs
Language matters. The term "Implementing Partner" impedes on the equality and sustainability of partnership and should be replaced with another term, e.g. "Cooperating partner" or other.	IOM is still using "implementing partner" terminology including in its most recent partnership guidance.	➢ IOM should identify a suitable substitute term and consider phasing out the "Implementing partner" terminology
To empower and facilitate L/NNGO role in the transition from humanitarian to development, international actors need to devise clearer transition planning and develop exit strategies broader than those linked to the end of project/funding. Intermediaries need to better resource L/NNGOs to link the learning that comes out of feedback, complaints, and participation mechanisms to their planning, which will further support them in transitioning from a humanitarian to a development role. From the nexus perspective, development programs with a crisis modifier that enable immediate response once triggered by a shock are an enabler for sustainability.	IOM needs to support its L/NNGO partners in clearly communicating to communities the boundaries of what humanitarians can and cannot do/provide (due to donor limitations) and proactively seek to avoid setting false expectations, while linking communities with peace and recovery-related needs to relevant programming. Short-term emergency programming should always be rolled out with a clear exit strategy and a continuation of local capacity strengthening components after the end of the project. The Localization Framework and Guidance Note provides recommendations on co-designing an exit plan with L/NNGOs following any partnership and capacity building activities; extended concrete guidance should be developed on systemic inclusion of exit reflections and plans in emergency programming and partnerships.	➢ Develop guidance and tools on systematic inclusion of **exit plans** in emergency response partnerships
Capacity strengthening should be approached as capacity exchange. International actors should recognize comparative advantage of L/NNGOs and benefit from their good practice	IOM has made an institutional commitment to expand its partnerships with local actors. IOM missions will not be able to leverage this for operational effectiveness without a systematic inclusion of capacity strengthening components in projects and	➢ Systematically include dedicated capacity strengthening initiatives in projects and budgets and

in dealing with challenges – including good governance and compliance challenges – in a local context. Secondments of programme or support staff are particularly meaningful from international actors towards L/NNGOs.	budgets for L/NNGO partnerships. IOM country and field offices should systematically integrate L/NNGO partner capacity strengthening at both the short term/project level (by planning dedicated capacity strengthening programmes for L/NNGO partners) and at the mid-term (including institutional capacity strengthening for longer-term L/NNGO partners) and can also consider outsourcing this to external companies or academic institutions to develop curricula that can be used by any partner. In particular, working with academic bodies improves sustainability. IOM should resource and empower L/NNGOs to lead on how capacity development is conducted – while keeping in line with donor requirements and the project perspective. Moreover, formalizing elements of capacity strengthening from L/NNGOs to IOM would help certify and recognize local knowledge. Good practice examples on capacity strengthening: ➢ In Cox' Bazar, IOM hired a consultant to deploy in a partner LNGO to conduct an initial assessment and strengthen the planning, policy and governance aspects. ➢ In Lebanon, working groups, in partnerships with different CBOs and NGOs, established a curriculum that was shared with other organizations. ➢ A joint capacity development project where an INGO, a consortium of L/NNGOs, and a LNGO worked to support two LNGOs implementing a project in three countries.	develop a **strategic approach to capacity strengthening** ➢ Develop a **capacity strengthening package** with different options for joint/partner-led learning needs assessment, with options to use external expertise, tools and solutions ➢ Continue connecting L/NNGO partners to **free online learning platforms** accessible to non-UN staff (e.g. Kaya) ➢ Revive the opportunity for NGO partners to earn **professional humanitarian certifications** with sector-wide recognition while investing in communication and outreach to increase partner awareness. Partners are responsible for making use of these opportunities
L/NNGOs with strong AAP components can lead knowledge exchange and capacity strengthening.	IOM can support L/NNGOs with a strong AAP profile to mentor less experienced partners, e.g. on establishing a code of conduct, PSEA framework and other mechanisms, to capacitate partners and increase their eligibility for more funding.	➢ IOM should strengthen the **enabling environment** for its L/NNGO partners for **AAP** in line with the Organization's

IOM UN MIGRATION

Country-level AAP structures or working groups are often primarily geared towards international actors and insufficiently inclusive of NNGOs.

L/NNGOs need more support from international actors on collective approaches to AAP, and for the presence and participation of L/NNGO voices in AAP fora at the national level to inform and strengthen practice.

It is on the sub-national level that localization and AAP converge, since real participation of affected communities is possible locally. L/NNGO fora have a critical role to play to promote this input and feed the knowledge and expertise of LNGOs operating at the local level into national-level discussions, including their participation or leadership in sub-national level clusters, sectors, or working groups.

NGO fora bringing together INGOs and NNGOs are valuable; dedicated L/NNGO fora allow for a bigger role of NNGOs. | IOM should support the formation L/NNGO national-level structures on AAP and should participate in these structures as an observer, as appropriate. | AAP Strategy (forthcoming). Actions may include supporting technical capacity exchange, L/NNGO coordination for AAP, and L/NNGO leadership on needs assessments |
| Intermediaries often call for L/NNGO proposals having already made decisions on implementation (i.e. target community and individuals, actions to take). Short deadlines for application mean L/NNGOs often have no possibility to conduct their own assessments, verify the targeting, or engage the affected people.

L/NNGOs should lead needs assessments; assessments at the local level should always be developed from the ground up, as opposed to copy pasted from the national level.

There is an overreliance, system-wide, on rapid assessments or rigid, quantitative assessment approaches that enable only a limited understanding of needs. | IOM tenders often have very short deadlines impeding on the ability of L/NNGO partners to conduct assessments to ensure their proposals reflect the needs on the ground.

IOM should only conduct rapid needs assessments as the last resort and should empower partners to lead needs assessments. | |
| Promoting local actor participation or leadership of process-heavy coordination fora needs to be coupled with ensuring of appropriate resourcing. Participation or leadership of coordination fora often overstretches L/NNGOs and impedes | IOM should explore the possibility of providing more funding support for L/NNGO staff participating in or co-leading coordination structures. | ➢ Consider more funding support to L/NNGOs to ensure they can adequately leverage their **leadership or** |

on ability to engage in day-to-day field level implementation of their own programmes. Faced with these challenges, some local actors are dubious about the value added of participation in coordination, while those in a co-lead role are often not able to leverage this to the furthest due to overstretched capacities.		participation roles in coordination.

IOM UN MIGRATION

ANNEX II: BACKGROUND TO 2023 IOM-NGO HUMANITARIAN CONSULTATION

Developing more equitable partnerships with national and local actors is one of IOM's key enablers of success.[13] In particular, IOM is committed to increased localization to effectively save lives and protect people on the move. This means more participation and leadership of governments and local actors in crisis response and, in line with IOM's institutional Grand Bargain commitments to the humanitarian localization agenda, providing more support and funding transfers to local and national actors (LNAs).[14]

IOM's operational partnerships with NGOs in crisis contexts

- IOM's humanitarian partnership and cooperation with NGOs has been expanding steadily as IOM's crisis response has grown. Humanitarian NGOs are key actors in saving and protecting lives in an efficient, accountable and principled manner and provide IOM with invaluable knowledge and information, operational capacity, and assistance in essential advocacy functions.

- In 2022, 87% of local and national actors (LNAs) receiving IOM's funding for humanitarian response were national NGOs (NNGOs). To IOM, local and national NGOs (L/NNGOs) contribute essential contextual awareness and input and help expand access to vulnerable populations in hard-to-reach areas. Conversely, through joint activities, IOM supports the strengthening of L/NNGOs by opening up opportunities for capacity exchange and for L/NNGO participation in international coordination structures, in addition to access to financial resources. Indeed, in 2022, IOM supported 2,087 local partners (L/NNGOs and governments alike) with institutional and technical capacity strengthening across 71 country offices, while 41% of IOM-led coordination mechanisms were co-led with national NGOs or governmental entities.

A substantial – and growing – part of IOM's crisis response operations take place in partnership with humanitarian NGOs, both in terms of the scope of services provided and of the breadth of geographical coverage. To further current and prospective humanitarian NGO partnerships, since 2015, IOM has been annually convening IOM-NGO Humanitarian Consultations as a regular forum for frank and open exchanges on joint engagement.[15] Local and national NGOs (L/NNGOs) specifically bring a unique perspective and expertise to joint response.

Over the years, NGO and IOM participants in the Humanitarian Consultations have consistently raised the importance of IOM-NGO complementarities in delivering on respective commitments to localization and AAP. These discussions have informed the development of the institutional Localization Framework and Guidance Note for IOM's Humanitarian Response (2024) and have also shaped the central themes of the sixth annual NGO Humanitarian Consultation.

---

[13] Under the IOM Strategic Plan 2024-2028.

[14] Going forward, IOM is formally committed to increasing its funding transfers to LNAs for humanitarian operations globally, as part of the organization's commitments to the humanitarian localization agenda under the Grand Bargain. More specifically, IOM has committed to transferring 7% of its humanitarian funding to LNAs in 2024 and 10% by 2026. IOM's partnerships with LNAs in crisis response are already extensive, with 76 IOM country offices implementing projects together with LNAs in 2022.

[15] The Humanitarian Consultations are focused on operational response to crisis and are complementary to – and distinct from - IOM's thematically wider consultations with the broader civil society. They are an opportunity for IOM and NGOs to engage in dialogue, discuss shared values and unity of purpose, identify respective strengths and limitations, reflect on current challenges facing the humanitarian sector, exchange best practices, develop key recommendations to further joint engagement, and examine the realities of the implementation of the Principles of Partnership to better foster their application.
The Consultations started in 2015 as part of IOM's efforts to engage NGO partners in the elaboration of its institutional humanitarian policy C/106/CRP/20, which formally recognizes that strategic and successful humanitarian partnerships must draw on the strengths of each party to ensure responses effectively assist and protect those in. Similarly, as a founding member of the Global Humanitarian Platform, IOM has endorsed the Principles of Partnership that aim to ensure equality, transparency, result-oriented approaches, responsibility and complementarity across humanitarian partnerships.

ANNEX III – AGENDA

Time	Session	Facilitators/Panelists/Speakers
08:30 – 09:00	Registration	
09:00 – 09:15 09:15 – 09:30	**Opening and welcoming remarks** **Setting the scene**	Ugochi Daniels, IOM Deputy Director General for Operations Federico Soda, IOM Director of Department of Operations and Emergencies Mirela Shuteriqi, ICVA Executive Director ad int. Gareth Price-Jones, SCHR Executive Secretary
**Session I – Operationalizing the Humanitarian Localization Agenda** *This session will consist of a presentation of IOM's draft Localization Framework and Guidance Note for IOM's Humanitarian Response, followed by a moderated plenary dialogue between representatives of NGOs and IOM on joint approaches to localization and how to better leverage complementarities towards changing the culture and accelerating the operationalization of the humanitarian localization agenda. Each speaker will make short introductions, which will be followed by discussions on the panel and with the audience. In break out groups, participants will then explore field realities of the operationalization of localization, focusing on identifying scalable good practice in key partnership aspects.*	
09:30 – 09:45	**Overview: Draft Localization Framework and Guidance Note for IOM's Humanitarian Response (2023, forthcoming)** For IOM, localization is an enabler for effective, efficient operations that are responsive to the needs of the crisis-affected communities, allowing for greater sustainability, community acceptance, trust, and accountability, as well as a deeper understanding of the local context. IOM's operational footprint in a wide range of contexts provide the Organization with direct frontline perspectives, while its humanitarian leadership and coordination roles, along with its unique engagement in supporting national and local actors, place IOM at the center of this global trend. At the same time, IOM acknowledges changes and progress on localization in practice remain slow. The objective of the Localization Framework and Guidance Note for IOM's Humanitarian Response is to support IOM Country/field offices with the operationalization of the localization commitments in humanitarian programs, building on existing institutional tools and policies, with the overall objective of speeding up delivery on IOM's institutional Grand Bargain commitments. In presenting the Framework and Guidance Note to key NGO partners, IOM seeks to receive their valued perspective on its approach to	**Speaker**: Metehan Temurcin, IOM Senior Emergency Preparedness and Response Officer

09:45 – 10:45	operationalizing localization. **Panel discussion: Advancing Humanitarian Localization in Practice** IOM's draft Localization Framework and Guidance Note identifies actionable recommendations in the key areas of partnership and funding, capacity strengthening, coordination, participation, and visibility of its local and national partners. This panel and plenary discussion shall provide background for the break out group sessions, setting the scene for an examination of IOM-NGO joint approaches to localization to identify practicable, scalable good practice examples that leverage complementarities and strengthen localization in different contexts and operating environments.	**Speakers**: Dhinar Riski, YAKKUM Emergency Unit Project Manager, Indonesia Stefano Bresaola, IOM Indonesia Programme Coordinator Eshetu Tilahun, Development for Peace Organization Director, Ethiopia Alexandr Goncear, Resonance Director, Moldova Saiful Islam Chowdhury, Chief Executive, PULSE Bangladesh Richard Munuhe, IOM Bangladesh Partnerships and Grants Manager **Facilitators**: Christina Burwell, IOM Ethiopia Rapid Response Fund Manager Metehan Temurcin, IOM Senior Emergency Preparedness and Response Officer
10:45 – 11:00	Coffee/Tea Break	
11:00 –12:00 12:00 – 12:45	**Break out sessions** During break out group sessions, based on their work experience, participants will discuss how IOM and NGOs can work jointly to fulfil respective localization commitments in aspects such as partnership and funding, capacity strengthening, coordination, participation, and visibility. A number of guiding questions will be shared with the break out groups. Group rapporteurs will report back to plenary the key recommendations, with a view to seizing opportunities and overcoming gaps and barriers on the ground. **Reports from the break out groups** Break out group self-appointed rapporteurs report back to plenary a set of key recommendations on how to accelerate progress on localization at the field level.	**Break out group facilitators**: Urbens Wilbert Dieuveuil, Initiative Citoyenne pour les Droits Humains, Haiti Michel Anglade, Save the Children Geneva Mudassar Javed, SHARP Pakistan María Alejandra Rodríguez Buitrago, Oxfam Colombia **Plenary discussion facilitators**: Angela Staiger, IOM Senior Humanitarian Policy Advisor Mirela Shuteriqi, ICVA Executive Director ad int.

12:45 – 13:45	Lunch	

Session II – Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) and Localization: Exploring Linkages and Synergies to Put People at the Center

Building on the discussions on localization during Session I, this session aims at exploring its linkages with AAP. Focusing on meaningful participation, the session will seek to identify ways to respond to the current gaps in putting people, their needs and capacities at the center of response to more effectively and sustainably respond to affected populations' priorities. Following the presentation of IOM's Institutional AAP Framework, through a panel discussion followed by a Q&A, the session will specifically examine synergies between AAP and localization efforts, looking at the practical power dynamics and accountability in practice, to identify avenues to expand and enhance the influence that input of communities has on programming, as well as IOM and NGO complementarities in ensuring that people's participation drives the response.

13:45 – 14:15	**Overview: IOM's Institutional AAP Framework** IOM's AAP Framework establishes the Organization's common approach for implementing and mainstreaming AAP throughout its crisis related work and helps ensure quality and responsive programming in line with the evolving needs of beneficiaries, affected populations and communities and enforce the Organization's zero tolerance against sexual exploitation and abuse and other misconduct. The commitments of the Framework were developed in line with the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's (IASC) commitments to AAP and adapted to meet IOM's operational realities.	**Speaker:** Christie Bacal-Mayencourt, IOM Senior Accountability to Affected Populations Advisor
14:15 – 15:15	**Panel Discussion: Common Approaches to Enable Full and Active Participation** This session will look into the synergies between localization and AAP approaches to respond more effectively and sustainably to affected populations' priorities, including addressing protection risks and contributing to community resilience. Despite the increased investment system-wide in efforts to include crisis-affected communities and align with their needs, people impacted by crisis feel aid is failing in this regard. Through a panel followed by plenary Q&A, participants will examine the current gaps in the way information and power are shared with the affected people and practical ways to close these gaps.	**Speakers**: Alejandra Acebo Crespo, Lebanon Humanitarian and Development NGO Forum Advocacy Advisor Hussien Farah, Community in Action Against Poverty Director, Ethiopia Kadir Beyaztaş, ASAM Deputy General Coordinator, Türkiye Tanya Wood, CHS Alliance Executive Director **Facilitator**: Christie Bacal-Mayencourt, IOM Senior Accountability to Affected Populations Advisor
15:15 – 15:30	Coffee break	
15:30 – 16:30	**Break out Groups on leveraging AAP and localization at the field level in support of meaningful participation** Break out groups will discuss important opportunities, challenges and good practice examples, specifically looking at how to leverage respective complementarities in putting people at the center of humanitarian action,	**Break out group facilitators**: Dhinar Riski, YAKKUM Emergency Unit, Indonesia Inga Dubina, Interaction Moldova

16:30 – 17:15	with a specific focus on meaningful participation towards strengthening self-reliance; and building trust and improving transparency. **Reports from the break out groups**	Jeanne D'Arc Hobeika, MSD Lebanon Iuliia Novobranets, R2P Ukraine **Plenary discussion facilitators**: Angela Staiger, IOM Senior Humanitarian Policy Advisor Gareth Price-Jones, SCHR Executive Secretary
17:15 – 17:30	**Closing Remarks and Way Forward**	**Speakers**: Catherine Northing, IOM Head of International Partnerships Division Federico Soda, IOM Director of Department of Operations and Emergencies

ANNEX IV – PARTICIPANTS: ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION AND LOCATION

	Organization	Location
1	Abs Development Organization for Woman and Child (ADO)	Yemen
2	Abs Development Organization for Woman and Child (ADO)	Yemen
3	ACT Alliance - Action by Churches Together	Switzerland
4	Action Aid	Kenya
5	African Initiative for Relief and Development (AIRD)	Uganda
6	ALDEF	Kenya
7	All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI)	India
8	AMEL Association	Lebanon
9	Apoyar	Colombia
10	Ashor Iraqi Foundation for Relief and Development (ARD)	Iraq
11	Association for Solidarity with Asylum Seekers and Migrants (ASAM)	Türkiye
12	Barnfonden	Sweden
13	Bondeko Refugee Livelihoods Centre	Uganda
14	Bondeko Refugee Livelihoods Centre	Uganda
15	Center for Support and Development of Civic Initiatives "Resonance"	Moldova
16	Central Roma Council	Poland
17	CHS Alliance	Switzerland
18	Church World Service	Switzerland
19	Community in Action Against Poverty (CAAP)	Ethiopia
20	Concern Worldwide	Ethiopia
21	Development for Peace Organization (DPO)	Ethiopia
22	Dominican Red Cross	Dominica
23	EduNowa	Poland
24	Edunowa	Poland
25	HAMI Association for Protection of Refugee Women	Iran
26	HIAS	Uruguay
27	HIMAYA DAEEM AATAA (HDA) Association	Lebanon
28	ICVA	Switzerland
29	ICVA	Switzerland
30	ICVA	Switzerland
31	IFRC	Switzerland
32	IMPACT Initiatives	Switzerland
33	Initiative Citoyenne pour les Droits de l'Homme	Haiti
34	Interaction (Vzaimodeistvie)	Moldova
35	Interaction (Vzaimodeistvie)	Ukraine
36	International Association for Refugees	Bosnia and Herzegovina
37	International Rescue Committee	Lebanon

38	IOM	Bangladesh
39	IOM	Belgium
40	IOM	Ethiopia
41	IOM	Indonesia
42	IOM	Lebanon
43	IOM	Moldova
44	IOM	Poland
45	IOM	Switzerland
46	IOM	Sudan
47	IOM	Switzerland
48	IOM	Switzerland
49	IOM	Switzerland
50	IOM	Switzerland
51	IOM	Switzerland
52	IOM	Switzerland
53	IOM	Switzerland
54	IOM	Switzerland
55	IOM	Switzerland
56	IOM	Switzerland
57	IOM	Switzerland
58	IOM	Switzerland
59	IOM	Switzerland
60	IOM	Switzerland
61	IOM	Switzerland
62	IOM	Switzerland
63	IOM	Swtizerland
64	IOM	Turkiye
65	IOM	Turkiye
66	IYD	Turkiye
67	Jesuit Refugee Service	Switzerland
68	Lebanon Humanitarian and Development NGO Forum (LHDF)	Lebanon
69	Lutheran World Federation	Switzerland
70	Médecins du Monde	Japan
71	MERCY Malaysia	Malaysia
72	Migration Services and Development (MSD)	Lebanon
73	Mukti	Bangladesh
74	Oxfam	Colombia
75	PAK Mission Society	Pakistan
76	Peaceland Foundation	Switzerland
77	Plan International	Switzerland
78	Prosvita	Ukraine
79	PULSE	Bangladesh
80	Right to Protection (R2P)	Ukraine
81	Save the Children	Switzerland

82	SEAD Foundation	Pakistan
83	Society for Health Extension and Development (SHED)	Bangladesh
84	Society for Human Rights and Prisoners' Aid (SHARP)	Pakistan
85	Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR)	Switzerland
86	Tamdeen Youth Foundation	Yemen
87	YAKKUM Emergency Unit (YEU)	Indonesia