ELEVATING EVIDENCE: LOCALISATION IN THE 2019 BANGLADESH FLOOD RESPONSE
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FOREWORD

In May 2016, the humanitarian community endorsed the Grand Bargain commitments that resulted from the World Humanitarian Summit. The credo: “We engage with local and national responders in a spirit of partnership and aim to reinforce rather than replace local and national capacities”. While some progress has been made on localization since then, progress remains slow at global level. To leave no one behind, quality partnerships are required at all levels between national and local authorities, development partners and civil society organizations.

At country level, it is imperative to take concrete steps to translate global commitments into action, in operational settings and not only in the policy space. Structured approaches are needed to allow a variety of stakeholders to work together in a mutually benefiting way in support of the localization agenda for more effective humanitarian responses.

The role of governments is critical, in leading humanitarian efforts and in creating a supportive environment for all stakeholders to work in particular, ensuring the space for NGOs and CSOs to engage in preparedness and response is maintained. Such space and the full representation and engagement of civil society organizations and local governments in policymaking and planning are essential for local actors to contribute to reducing risks and disaster impacts as well as supporting humanitarian interventions. While localization calls for a more diverse humanitarian system, it is also important to continue to reinforce and uphold humanitarian principles, quality and accountability in humanitarian responses and to focus on protection of the most vulnerable.

In Bangladesh, this baseline report is the first of its kind for a response to a natural hazard induced disaster. The study was part of the Humanitarian Response and Recovery Plan developed by the Humanitarian Coordination Task Team (HCTT) in response to the 2019 monsoon floods. The report builds an evidence base, a reference point for measuring progress on localization in future responses of the humanitarian community in support of the Government-led interventions coordinated by the Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief (MoDMR).

I thank all partners in Bangladesh who contributed to the important findings and I thank the Humanitarian Advisory Group and NIRAPAD for their dedication and professionalism in preparing this report.

Mia Seppo
United Nations Resident Coordinator
United Nations in Bangladesh
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2019 monsoon flooding in Bangladesh affected more than 7.6 million people across 28 districts and caused widespread displacement. The government-led response, supported by local, national and international civil society stakeholders, sought to provide life-saving assistance, restore safety and dignity to vulnerable populations and facilitate rebuilding and recovery. The humanitarian community identified progress on the localisation commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit as a priority for the response.¹

Localisation of humanitarian action in Bangladesh has been an important focus in recent years, including in the Rohingya response. Various partnership and program initiatives as well as research, have focused on progressing commitments such as the Grand Bargain and Charter for Change.² With the onset of widespread flooding in 2019, the humanitarian community identified an opportunity to strengthen localisation in this disaster response. The Humanitarian Response and Recovery Plan committed to identifying a common approach to measuring localisation in the response, and undertaking an analysis using this common framework to serve as a baseline for future responses.

About this report

This report presents the findings of the localisation baseline, using an adapted Measuring Localisation approach and framework used in the Pacific, as a common means of tracking progress at the country level.³

The report analyses progress in seven areas: leadership, coordination and complementarity, partnerships, funding, participation and policy influence. It also identifies emerging positive practices that support localisation, key challenges, and considerations for the humanitarian community for future responses. The study builds on the wealth of knowledge and evidence generated by other initiatives intended to support localisation in Bangladesh.

Key findings

Progress on the localisation of humanitarian action was evident in several areas in the flood response, including in supporting national and local leadership, coordination and complementarity, some partnership areas, and some funding areas. The study found evidence that the localisation agenda, including evidence and practices from other responses in Bangladesh, influenced the flood response in multiple ways. These were a strengthened national leadership role; more reliance on local and national networks; increased consultation with local organisations prior to international response; and a better understanding of value-add and complementary roles of international actors. There continue to be key challenges in supporting localised partnerships, including addressing power differences, increasing role for local and national civil society, funding opportunities, appropriate capacity support and community participation in the response. Outlined below is a summary of key findings, and some considerations for further strengthening localisation in the future.

---

¹ Humanitarian Response and Recovery Plan – Monsoon Floods, (August 2019 – April 2020)
² For example these include: Bangladesh being selected as a Localisation Demonstrator Country for the Grand Bargain Field Mission, the Start Fund Bangladesh initiative, Oxfam’s Humanitarian Response Grant Facility (HRGF), and research including Oxfam and ODI, Money Talks: A synthesis report assessing humanitarian funding flows to local actors in Bangladesh and Uganda, March 2018; and HAG and NIRAPAD, When the Rubber hits the Road: Local leadership in the first 100 days of the Rohingya response, 2018.
SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

The below table outlines a summary of findings, using the Measuring Localisation framework and indicators. Levels of evidence for progress are: none, limited, some and strong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PROGRESS</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>LIMITED</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LEADERSHIP**

**Impact indicator:** **SOME-STRONG EVIDENCE** that national actors define and lead on humanitarian action

**Indicators:**
1. **Some-strong evidence** that local and national actors lead response and dominate decision-making
2. **Some-strong evidence** that international actors support and strengthen national leadership
3. **Some evidence** that international actors work with and respect in-country leadership structures and mechanisms

**COORDINATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY**

**Impact indicator:** **SOME EVIDENCE** of application and respect for commonly agreed approaches to ‘as local as possible and as international as necessary’

**Indicators:**
1. **Some-strong evidence** of national representation and engagement in coordination forums and meetings
2. **Some evidence** of clearly defined parameters for international actors complementing local and national actors in humanitarian response
3. **Some evidence** that humanitarian response is delivered in a way that is collaborative and complementary (i.e. based on an analysis of the specific strengths/weaknesses of different humanitarian actors)
4. **Limited evidence** that national civil society coordination mechanisms are funded and have technical capacity to operate in humanitarian response

**PARTNERSHIPS**

**Impact indicator:** **LIMITED EVIDENCE** of equitable and complementary partnerships between local, national and international actors

**Indicators:**
1. **Limited-some evidence** that partnerships are based on equitable and ethical partnership practices
2. **Limited evidence** of longer-term strategic partnerships that aim to build systems and processes that mirror the ambition and goals of the local/national partner
3. **Limited evidence** of increased power and decision-making of local and national actors within partnerships

---

4 Where there is no evidence of action, this does not mean that no action is taking place but that it did not emerge as part of the baseline process. See methodology on p.15.
FUNDING
Impact indicator: **LIMITED EVIDENCE** that national and local organisations have financial independence that allows them to respond more efficiently

Indicators:
1. **Limited–some evidence** that local/national actors have access to direct funding with few or no barriers
2. **Limited evidence** of increased humanitarian funding to local and national actors
3. **Limited evidence** that local and national actors have increased decision-making power over financial matters

CAPACITY
Impact indicator: **SOME EVIDENCE** that local and national organisations are able to respond effectively and efficiently, and have targeted and relevant support from international actors

Indicators:
1. **Limited–some evidence** of national and regional surge capacity and use of local/national over international expertise
2. **Some evidence** that international actors do not undermine capacity of national actors in emergency response
3. **Some evidence** that contextualised humanitarian standards, tools and policies are available
4. **Some evidence** that legislation and plans are in place to support national response capacity

POLICY INFLUENCE AND ADVOCACY
Impact indicator: **LIMITED EVIDENCE** that humanitarian action reflects the priorities of affected communities and national actors

Indicators:
1. **Limited** that policies are informed by local and national voices, including communities
2. **Some evidence** that national actors are recognised as key stakeholders in discussions regarding policies and standards that may have significant impact on them
3. **Limited evidence** that local and national actors can influence donor priorities in country, including program design and implementation

PARTICIPATION
Impact indicator: **LIMITED EVIDENCE** that communities lead and participate in humanitarian response decision-making

Indicators:
1. **Limited evidence** of development of community/contextualised standards for all actors working in that context
2. **Limited evidence** that communities have increased opportunities to shape programming, including evaluating INGO work
THE WAY FORWARD

The findings of this baseline study indicate that progress on localisation was visible in the Bangladesh flood response, but room for further improvement remains. Some areas for strengthening identified in previous localisation research also emerged in this baseline study. This study can be replicated for future response assessments using the Localisation Framework and measurement approach.

Based on the findings of the baseline assessment of the 2019 monsoon flood response, action in the following four areas is recommended to advance action on localisation:

1. Create a more robust structure to facilitate localisation and monitor progress
2. Strengthen localisation in existing coordination and response mechanisms
3. Strengthen localisation actions in response for international actors and donors
4. Increase opportunities for local and national actors to respond to disaster more effectively.

Specific actions under each overall recommendation are articulated below and a broad timeframe proposed. It is suggested that the Humanitarian Coordination Task Team (HCTT) and all relevant stakeholders agree on a specific timeline for implementing these actions.

The way forward – key steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Create a more robust structure to facilitate localisation and monitor progress</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue to monitor progress in response by conducting a localisation review for each disaster response that involves international support in Bangladesh using the Localisation Framework used in this baseline study. Consider establishing a HCTT localisation working group to coordinate activities, as well as monitor and report on progress</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agree on a common means of reporting, analysing and publishing funding to local and national partners for each international response to track localisation commitment progress</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review and strengthen information sharing platforms for local and national NGOs to increase their participation and contribution in disaster response</td>
<td>Mid term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support local and national actors to assess international support in response by jointly creating a standardised method for local and national organisations to assess international partners</td>
<td>Mid term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 HPG, Capacity and complementarity in the Rohingya response in Bangladesh, 2018; IFRC, Mission Report: Grand Bargain Localization Workstream Mission to Bangladesh, 2018
## 2. Strengthen localisation in existing coordination and response mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consider supporting the designation of national NGOs to function as a second co-lead to clusters with current co-lead UN agencies and INGOs</td>
<td>Short–mid term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase local and national actor representation and participation in the HCTT and clusters by working with national NGO representatives</td>
<td>Short–mid term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formalise the district coordination focal point structure with designated local or national NGOs assigned on a rotating basis for all districts. Training to be provided annually to new cohorts of focal points before onset of monsoon season</td>
<td>Short–mid term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strengthen access to information by ensuring that national coordination meeting notes (including HCTT and cluster), as well as other coordination guidelines, are shared in local (Bengali) language in addition to English</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Continue to support the Government of Bangladesh’s disaster response decentralisation efforts – especially to local coordination structures</td>
<td>Mid-long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Strengthen localisation actions of international actors and donors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prioritise use of local surge capacity resources. National surge rosters to be developed within HCTT/clusters</td>
<td>Short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support ethical partnership practices by committing to providing transparent financial project information to local and national partners</td>
<td>Mid term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop longer-term agreements and completing due-diligence processes with local and national actors in priority districts prior to traditional disaster seasons. Prioritise multi-year partnerships with local and national organisations in disaster-prone areas that support capacity strengthening priorities identified by local and national actors</td>
<td>Mid–long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consider formally designating a portion of response funds for local and national actors only</td>
<td>Short–mid term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Increase opportunities for local and national actors to respond to disaster more effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strengthen corporate/private sector financing opportunities (beginning with UN Global Compact members) to directly fund local NGOs for disaster response</td>
<td>Mid–long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local and national NGO platforms to explore additional sources of financing, including financing from member organisations</td>
<td>Mid term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Explore options with key stakeholders to establish emergency disaster funds at local level to be accessed by local NGOs</td>
<td>Mid–long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Local and national organisations to consider setting up consortiums where relevant (specific to locality or sector) to increase opportunities to access funding</td>
<td>Mid term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SNAPSHOT OF LOCALISATION IN THE RESPONSE

This overview provides a snapshot of the some of the key results from the self-assessment survey. Additional data on funding statistics is provided throughout the document.

LEADERSHIP

Do you think that international actors respect and work with in-country leadership structures and mechanisms?

- 100% ALL THE TIME OR MOSTLY
- 31% ALL THE TIME OR MOSTLY

Do you think that local and national NGOs lead on decision making in humanitarian emergencies in your country?

- 58% ALL THE TIME OR MOSTLY
- 25% MOSTLY
- 17% SOMETIMES
- 0% RARELY

COORDINATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY

Are your ideas and suggestions heard in the coordination forums?

- 33% ALL THE TIME
- 50% MOSTLY
- 17% SOMETIMES
- 0% RARELY

To what extent are local and national civil society actors able to participate in and contribute to coordination processes at national and sub-national level?

- 17% ALL THE TIME
- 33% MOSTLY
- 33% SOMETIMES
- 8% RARELY

PARTNERSHIPS

Do your partnerships fund operational staff of your organisation (staff not linked to project)?

- 17% YES ALWAYS
- 12% YES SOMETIMES
- 50% NO NEVER

Do the partnerships fund overhead costs not linked to projects (e.g. administration / office rent)?

- 33% YES ALWAYS
- 12% YES SOMETIMES
- 25% NO NEVER
**FUNDING**

How often do you feel that your organisation is financially stable?

- **ALL THE TIME**: 42%
- **MOSTLY**: 25%
- **SOMETIMES**: 19%
- **RARELY**: 12%
- **NEVER**: 8%

Do you feel national and local actors receive a fair proportion of funding compared to international actors in the context of the flood response?

- **ALL THE TIME**: 0%
- **MOSTLY**: 6%
- **SOMETIMES**: 13%
- **RARELY**: 6%
- **NEVER**: 75%

**CAPACITY**

Do international actors focus on the areas of capacity strengthening that local actors prioritise for flood response related interventions?

- **ALL THE TIME**: 44%
- **MOSTLY**: 56%
- **SOMETIMES**: 0%
- **RARELY**: 0%

Do you feel that the capacity of the in-country partner is strengthened by international support?

- **ALL THE TIME**: 100%
- **MOSTLY OR MOSTLY**: 56%

**POLICY INFLUENCE**

To what extent are you or your organisation involved in influencing / feeding ideas into the development of humanitarian policies and planning processes in your country?

- **ALL THE TIME**: 33%
- **MOSTLY**: 50%
- **SOMETIMES**: 19%
- **RARELY**: 8%

**PARTICIPATION**

Does your organisation take opinions of affected people into account during design and implementation of programmes?

- **ALL THE TIME**: 50%
- **MOSTLY**: 42%
- **SOMETIMES**: 44%
- **RARELY**: 19%
- **NEVER**: 6%
সার-সংক্ষেপ

২০১৯ সালের মৌসুমি বন্যা বাংলাদেশের ২৮টি জেলার ৭৬ লাখেরও বেশি মানুষ ক্ষতিগ্রস্থ হয়েছিল। এর ফলে ব্যাপক জনগোষ্ঠীকে স্বাগতিক হতে হয়েছিল। এমনকি, জীবন, প্রাণ এবং জীবনরোমাঞ্চলের সমস্ত সংস্থার সাহায্যের ক্ষেত্রে সাড়াদাঙ্গ কার্যক্রম পরিচালিত হয়েছে যার মাধ্যমে ছিল জীবন রক্ষকারী সহায়তা প্রদান, বিনিয়োগ মানুষের নিরাপত্তা ও মর্যাদা রক্ষা এবং পুনরুজ্বালাও পুনরুজ্বালা করে সাহায্য প্রদান। মানবিক সহায়তায় নিয়োজিত কমিউনিটি ও প্রত্নতাত্ত্বিক সামুদ্রিক সাহায্য কর্মচারীর অভিপ্রেত করার জন্য সুসংগঠিত করে সেগুলোর অভিপ্রেতিকে চিহ্নিত করেছে।

এই প্রতিবেদন প্রস্তুতি

এই প্রতিবেদন জীবনচক্র বিষয়ে বেলেমীন তথ্য পরিবেশন করে হচ্ছে। এটি মূলত মৃত্যু জীবনচক্র বিষয়ে অপ্রত্যাশিত পরিবর্তনের জন্য প্রশ্ন হিসেবে মানুষের অর্থনৈতিক অবস্থা এবং কাঠামো ব্যবস্থার প্রক্রিয়া বর্ণনা করে। এই প্রতিবেদন কেন্দ্রস্থল, সমস্ত এবং পরিবেশনকারী, অপরাধী, অপরাধী এবং সামাজিক প্রভাব এই সাহায্য বিষয়ে তথ্য পরিবেশন করা হয়েছে। বিভিন্ন প্রচার থেকে উদ্ভূত জন ও প্রশাসনের ওপর নির্ভর করা বাংলাদেশ স্বায়ত্তর প্রস্তুতির উদ্দেশ্যে এই প্রতিবেদন পরিচালিত হয়েছে।

প্রধান ফলাফলসমূহ

মৌসুমি বন্যা পরিচালিত মানবিক সহায়তা কার্যক্রম জীবনচক্রের বিভিন্ন বিষয়, যেমন- জীবন ও প্রাণের সাহায্য, কমিউনিটি ও আর্থিক পরিবর্তন, জীবনের এবং আর্থিক জীবনের শিক্ষাকেন্দ্র প্রয়োজন। এবং সাহায্যের ফলাফল এবং আর্থিক পরিবর্তন বিষয়ক তথ্য সহ অন্যান্য তথ্যবিজ্ঞান। এখানে জীবনের প্রথম সাপ্তাহিক প্রসারিত হয়েছে মূল চালানের মাধ্যমে তার তত্ত্বাবধান ও প্রশিক্ষণের ভাবনা, জীবন ও জীবনের সূচনা সমাজসেবক পরিবিফলকের সাহায্য এবং সাহায্যের সমাজসেবীর অংশগ্রহণ বৃদ্ধি করা। যদিও মূল তথ্যগুলো সংক্ষিপ্ত, এবং উভয়ের মধ্যে জীবনচক্র আরো চালানোর জন্য কিছু বিবেচনা করা যায়।

1. মানবিক সংস্থা ও প্রাণবিন্ন পরিকল্পনা - মৌসুমি বন্যা, (আগামি ২০১৯ - এপ্রিল ২০২০)
2. উন্নয়ন চিন্তার বেলেমীনের কথা বলা যে প্রাণবিন্ন হচ্ছে- প্রাণ ব্যাপক বিষয়ে দিকে উন্নয়ন চিন্তার বিশ্লেষণ করবো, যাতে বলা বাংলাদেশ ইন্টারনেট, আফ্রিকার ইন্টারনেটসিটি ফার্মেন্ট প্রক্রিয়া নির্দেশিত, এবং বিশ্ব ব্যাপক, যেমন- অ্যাক্টিভ ও ইন্টারনেট, ভাল উদ্দেশ্য বাংলাদেশ এবং উন্নয়ন করতে বিশ্ব জীবনচক্রের মানবিক সংস্থা ও প্রাণবিন্ন প্রক্রিয়ার একটি সমাহিত বিশ্লেষণ, মার্ক ২০১৮; এবং ইউইএইচএস সংস্থাপনা কর্তৃক ২০১৮ সালের প্রথম সালিনসাই প্রক্রিয়া ২০০ মিলিয়ন প্রাণবিন্ন সংক্ষেপ প্রতিটি 'একটি মানুষ যা বাংলাদেশে বসবাস করে গেছে'।
প্রধান ফলাফলসমূহের সংক্ষিপ্তসার

নির্দেশ পার্থক্যিত ব্যবস্থাসমূহের সংক্ষিপ্তসার দেয়া হয়েছে, এমনকি শান্তিকরণের কর্মসূচীগুলোর পরিবর্ধন করা হয়েছে এবং সূচক দেওয়া হয়েছে। আগতির প্রমাণসমূহের ক্ষেত্রে কোনো আর্গুন নেই, সীমিত আর্গুনি, কিছু আর্গুনি, এবং বার্ষিক আর্গুনি- এই চারটি সূচক দ্বারা বায়া করা হয়েছে।

প্রভাব সূচক

আতিষ্ঠ পর্যায়ের সংযোগসমূহ মানবিক সহায়তা কার্যক্রমের সময়কালে সংজ্ঞায়িত করেছে এবং নেতৃত্ব দিয়েছে এর কিছু বলিষ্ঠ প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

প্রভাব সূচক: বাংলাদেশের জনিমূলক এবং অপ্রতুল উৎপাদনের উপাদানকে এই বালনাগুলোর সাহায্য সহ সমস্ত এবং এ প্রজননের কিছু প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

প্রভাব সূচক: জনিমূলক, জনিমূলক এবং আর্গাতিক সংযোগসমূহের মধ্যে সমতাত্মক এবং বিপরীত আর্গাতিকের সীমিত প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

প্রভাব সূচক

সমন্বয় ও পরিসেবকচর্চা

আর্জনক সংযোগসমূহ মানবিক সহায়তার ক্ষেত্রে সীমিত কিছু প্রমাণের মাধ্যমে অনেকগুলো প্রমাণ দেওয়া যায়।

সূচক

ংশিদারিষ্ট

আর্জনক সংযোগসমূহ মানবিক সহায়তার ক্ষেত্রে কিছু প্রমাণের মাধ্যমে অনেকগুলো প্রমাণ দেওয়া যায়।

সূচক

1. আর্জনক সংযোগসমূহ মানবিক সহায়তার ক্ষেত্রে কিছু প্রমাণের মাধ্যমে অনেকগুলো প্রমাণ দেওয়া যায়।

2. সীমিত আকারের বীর্যমানচর্চা সংযোগসমূহের ক্ষেত্রে পাওয়া যায় যা জনিমূলক/জনিমূলকের অন্তর্যান ও সমতাত্মক পক্ষে ও প্রক্রিয়া তৈরিতে অন্তর্যান রয়েছে।

3. অর্জনদারিষ্ট ক্ষেত্রে জনিমূলক ও জনিমূলক সংযোগসমূহের মধ্যে সমতা এবং নিম্নাপাশ সীমিত প্রমাণ পাওয়া বায়।

4. এং প্রক্রিয়াক ক্ষেত্রে আর্জনকসমূলক মানবিক সহায়তার ক্ষেত্রে সীমিত কিছু প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

আদর্শ প্রধান সময় জনিমূলক ও অর্জনকসমূহের সাহায্য দেওয়া সাধারণ এবং অপ্রতুল উৎপাদনের উপাদানের সাধারণ সাহায্য দেওয়া এবং সাহায্য প্রদানের সীমিত প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।
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বাংলাদেশ ২০১৯ সালের বন্যা সাহায্যে জনিমূলকরণের উত্তীর্ণতা সূচী
অর্থনীতি

সুচুক: জাতীয় ও স্বাধীন সংঘাতীয় আর্থিক স্বাধীনতা রয়েছে যা তাদেরকে আরো দক্ষতার সাথে কাজ করতে সহায়তা করে এর সীমিত প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

সন্তান

সুচুক: জাতীয় ও স্বাধীন সংঘাতী কর্মকর্তাদের এবং দক্ষতার সাথে কাজ করতে পারতে এবং আর্থিক সংঘাতী কর্মকর্তাদের কাছ থেকে প্রয়োজনীয় এবং সংস্থার সাহায্য পাচ্ছে এরকম কিছু প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

নীতিমালার প্রভাব এবং অ্যাডভোকেসি

সুচুক: জাতীয় ও আঞ্চলিক পর্যায় সঙ্গে যুক্তির সীমিত প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায় এবং আর্থিক অভিজ্ঞতাকে অভিজ্ঞ করে জাতীয়/আঞ্চলিক অভিজ্ঞতাকে আবার ভাবেরে সীমিত প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

অংশগ্রহণ

সুচুক: মানবিক সংঘাতী কর্মকর্তাদের কাছে আত্মহত্যার অংশগ্রহণ এবং জাতীয় সংঘাতীকে অগ্রিমার্থের প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

সুচুক: নীতিমালা জনসাধারণ সংঘাতী কর্মকর্তাদের কাছে সূচিত জনসাধারণ এবং জাতীয় সংঘাতীকে অগ্রিমার্থের প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

সুচুক: নীতিমালার জনসাধারণ সংঘাতী কর্মকর্তাদের কাছে সূচিত জনসাধারণ এবং জাতীয় সংঘাতীকে অগ্রিমার্থের প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।

সুচুক: জনসাধারণের প্রয়োজন এবং আর্থিক অভিজ্ঞতাকে আবার ভাবেরে সীমিত প্রমাণ পাওয়া যায়।
এগোবার পথ

বাংলাদেশ এইচআইসি অফিসিয়াং ব্যবহার ব্যবস্থা করা হয়েছে যার মাধ্যমে বাংলাদেশ এইচআইসি পরিচালিত ক্ষমতার উন্নয়ন ও অনুপ্রস্তুতি প্রকাশের জন্য নিয়োগ চাইতে ধারাবাহিক করা হয়।

2019 সালে বিভিন্ন প্রতিষ্ঠান কর্তৃত্বের জন্য নিয়োগ চাইতে ধারাবাহিক করা হয় যার মাধ্যমে বাংলাদেশ এইচআইসি পরিচালিত ক্ষমতার উন্নয়ন ও অনুপ্রস্তুতি প্রকাশের জন্য নিয়োগ চাইতে ধারাবাহিক করা হয়।

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>নম্বর</th>
<th>প্রাধান্য</th>
<th>বিভাগসমূহ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>১</td>
<td>সাধারণ সরকারি এবং অনুপ্রস্তুতি মনিটরিং এর জন্য আরো একটি কাঠামো চাইতে ধারাবাহিক করা হয়।</td>
<td>সরকারী মনিটরিং</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>২</td>
<td>বিভিন্ন সংগঠনের ব্যবহার ব্যবস্থা করা হয়।</td>
<td>সরকারী মনিটরিং</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>৩</td>
<td>প্রতিষ্ঠান কর্তৃক যুক্তির উপর তিনি চাইতে ধারাবাহিক করা হয়।</td>
<td>সরকারী মনিটরিং</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>৪</td>
<td>পুর্বাধিকারী ব্যবহার ব্যবস্থা করা হয়।</td>
<td>সরকারী মনিটরিং</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. এইচআইসি নির্দেশ প্রডাকশন ব্যবস্থা করা হয়।

এইচআইসি, বাংলাদেশ বিরাইন্স সামরিক এবং অপরিহার্য, ২০১৬;
এইচআইসি, বিভাগ উত্তর: বাংলাদেশ সুপারকাইনিক স্পেসিফিক বিভাগ ইউসিও, ২০১৮
বাংলাদেশ, ২০১৬
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>নং.</th>
<th>সমস্ত এবং সাঝাদানের বিদ্যমান বাঙালির মধ্যে সামাজিক পরিপালন করা হবে।</th>
<th>সমর্থকলা</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>জাতীয় এনিজওগুলোকে স্বীকার করা এবং আকৃতিক এনিজওগুলোর সাথে সংঘর্ষ করার সাথে বিভিন্ন সমস্যার সমাধানের পথ দেওয়ার প্রতিষ্ঠিত বিষয়ে বিচার করা হবে।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>জাতীয় এনিজও প্রতিষ্ঠিতদের সাথে একটি সম্মেলনের মাধ্যমে স্বাগতিক এবং সংঘর্ষের বুদ্ধি বিদ্যা প্রকাশ করা হবে।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>সকল বেলোক ব্যবসায়িক সকল খাতা প্রতিষ্ঠিতকে প্রতিষ্ঠিতকে সূচিত করা হবে। সেকাল মাত্রা সাধারণ অন্তর্জাতিক সমালোচনা করা হবে।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>(এনিজওগুলোর একটি সমালোচনার মাধ্যমে) জাতীয় সমষ্টির লোগো প্রতিষ্ঠিতকে সূচিত করার মাধ্যমে সমস্ত সম্প্রদায়ের অভিজ্ঞতা করা হবে। এই সকল সমস্ত সম্প্রদায়ের বিশেষজ্ঞদের মাধ্যমে।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>মাদানদেশের দুর্ঘটনা সাঝাদানের বিকাশের সময় প্রয়োজনীয় সংস্থার প্রদান আবহাও রাখা হবে, বিশেষ করে সমস্ত সাঝাদানের সমাজের অধিকাংশ।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>নং.</th>
<th>আন্তর্জাতিক সংঘ ও দুর্ঘটনা কর্মকাণ্ডের শাসনের পরিপালন করার হবে।</th>
<th>সমর্থকলা</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>বিদ্যমান অন্তর্জাতিক সংঘের সকল সম্পত্তি সম্পন্ন অংশগ্রহণ করার হবে। একই সাথে এইপিসিটি এবং ক্লৰারসলুড়ের সাথে জাতীয় এনিজওগুলোর ভূমিকা সম্পর্কে প্রতিষ্ঠিতকে করা হবে।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>জাতীয় এনিজও অন্তর্জাতিক সম্পাদকদের বিশেষ অংশগ্রহণ করার প্রতিষ্ঠিতকের মাধ্যমে সম্পর্কিত অংশগ্রহণের চায়ের সরবরাহ করা হবে।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক অংশগ্রহণকারী দুর্ঘটনার সময় আত্মন্ত্রণ এনিজওগুলোর সাথে জাতীয় এনিজওগুলোর সাথে দুর্ঘটনায়কের চুক্তি ও প্রয়োজনীয় প্রতিষ্ঠা সম্পন্ন করা হবে।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>জাতীয় এবং জাতীয় সংস্থাগুলোর অন্যতম একটি দুর্ঘটনা প্রমাণ এটিপথিকুক্তের মাধ্যমে সমাজের অধিকাংশ।</td>
<td>অন্তর্জাতিক মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>নং.</th>
<th>আরো কর্মকাণ্ডের দুর্ঘটনায় সাঝাদানের উপযোগী স্থানের জন্য মূল্যায়ন বৃদ্ধি ঘটাতে হবে।</th>
<th>সমর্থকলা</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>কার্যকরী/প্রজেক্ট স্থানের আধিক সাংবাদিক সম্পাদনা করা হবে (আদিকলসার অ্যানাল কম্পাস সম্পাদনের মাধ্যমে সূচিত করার কথা বলা হয়।) বাড়ি করে তারা দুর্ঘটনায় সাঝাদানের জন্য জাতীয় এনিজওগুলোর সম্পর্কিত তথ্য প্রদান করার।</td>
<td>মাধ্যমে মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>জাতীয় এনিজও প্রতিষ্ঠিতদের সাথে সামরিক সংস্থাসমূহ ভিডিও উপস্থাপন করা হবে।</td>
<td>মাধ্যমে মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>মূল স্টেডিওসারের সাথে বিদ্যমান সকল অংশ ডুর্ঘটনা তথ্য প্রদান করা হবে। বাড়ি করে তারা জাতীয় এনিজওগুলোর কোন তথ্য প্রদান করার।</td>
<td>মাধ্যমে মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>প্রবেশ নিষেধ জাতীয় এবং জাতীয় সংগঠনগুলোর পরিচিতিমান পরিচালনা বৃদ্ধি ঘটাতে হবে (জাতীয় অধিন ধাতকমিটিতে) বাড়ি করে তাদের আইডিয়ালোর সূচনালো বৃদ্ধি ঘটার।</td>
<td>মাধ্যমে মাধ্যমে।</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
নেতৃত্ব

আপনি কি মনে করেন যে, বনায় সাড়দানের সময় আন্তর্জাতিক কমীয়ীকরণে নেতৃত্ব করার চেষ্টা করেন? ১০০% সরবরাহ বা বেসরকার সরবরাহ

আপনি কি মনে করেন যে, মানবিক জোরস্ব অবস্থায় স্থানীয় ও জাতীয় পর্যায়ের এলাকাগুলো সিদ্ধান্ত রাখে ক্ষেত্রে নেতৃত্ব দিলে থাকেন?

সমষ্টি ও পরিপূরকতা

সমষ্টি ফোরামগুলোতে কি আপনার ধারণা ও সুপারিশসমূহ ঠিকমত পোনা হয়ে থাকে?

স্থানীয় ও জাতীয় পর্যায়ের সিভিল সোসাইটির কমিশনে জাতীয় ও আঞ্চলিক পর্যায়ের সমষ্টি সর্বনিম্নকরণ করতে পারেন এবং অবদান রাখতে পারেন?

অংশীদায়িত্ব

আপনাদের অংশীদায়িত্ব কি সাহায্যের প্রাপ্তি স্টের এর বারো দিনের মধ্যে অর্থের যোগান দেয় (যেমন উপকারক সাহায্য কেনা বিতর্ক করে যুক্ত না)।

আংশীদায়িত্ব কি এগুলোর সাথে যুক্ত নয় এমন কোন উভচরক বারের জন্য অর্থের যোগান দেয় (যেমন-স্বাস্থ্যসম্পর্কীয় ব্যয়/অফিস ভাড়া)?
আর্থিকতা

কখন মনে করেন আপনার প্রতিষ্ঠান অর্থনীতিতে ভিত্তিকীর্ত্তিতার মধ্যে রয়েছে?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>সংখ্যা</th>
<th>অংশ</th>
<th>বেশিরভাগ</th>
<th>মাঝে মাঝে</th>
<th>কখনো কখনো</th>
<th>কখনো নয়</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>সবসময়</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>বেশিরভাগ সময়</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>মাঝে মাঝে</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো কখনো</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো নয়</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

বন্যা সাড়াদানের ক্ষেত্রে জাতীয় ও স্থানীয় সংস্থাগুলো কি আর্থিক সহায়তা তুলনায় নাযা অনুপত্তে অর্থায়ন পেয়েছে বলে কি আপনি মনে করেন?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>সংখ্যা</th>
<th>অংশ</th>
<th>বেশিরভাগ</th>
<th>মাঝে মাঝে</th>
<th>কখনো কখনো</th>
<th>কখনো নয়</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>সবসময়</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>বেশিরভাগ সময়</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>মাঝে মাঝে</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো কখনো</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো নয়</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

সক্ষমতা

বন্যা সাড়াদান সম্পর্কিত কার্যক্রমে সক্ষমতা বৃদ্ধির ক্ষেত্রে স্থানীয় সংস্থাগুলো থেকে বিবির্ভাগকে আর্থিকসহায়তার জন্য আর্থিক সংস্থাগুলো কি সেগুলোতে মধ্যে মনের বাক্য দিয়ে থাকে?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>সংখ্যা</th>
<th>অংশ</th>
<th>বেশিরভাগ</th>
<th>মাঝে মাঝে</th>
<th>কখনো কখনো</th>
<th>কখনো নয়</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>সবসময়</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>বেশিরভাগ সময়</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>মাঝে মাঝে</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো কখনো</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো নয়</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

নীতিমালার প্রভাব

আপনারা বা আপনাদের প্রতিষ্ঠান দেশের মানবিক সহায়তা কেন্দ্রে নীতিমালা এবং পরিকল্পনা প্রণালী প্রক্রিয়ায় কতটুকু প্রভাব বিকাশ / অভিজ্ঞতা প্রদান করতে পারেন?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>সংখ্যা</th>
<th>অংশ</th>
<th>বেশিরভাগ</th>
<th>মাঝে মাঝে</th>
<th>কখনো কখনো</th>
<th>কখনো নয়</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>সবসময়</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>বেশিরভাগ সময়</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>মাঝে মাঝে</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো কখনো</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো নয়</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

অংশগ্রহণ

কর্মসূচি প্রণয়ন ও বাণিজ্যের সময়ে কি আপনার প্রতিষ্ঠান কর্মীরা মানুষের মতামত বিবেচনায় নেয়?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>সংখ্যা</th>
<th>অংশ</th>
<th>বেশিরভাগ</th>
<th>মাঝে মাঝে</th>
<th>কখনো কখনো</th>
<th>কখনো নয়</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>সবসময়</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>বেশিরভাগ সময়</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>মাঝে মাঝে</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো কখনো</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>কখনো নয়</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The monsoon flooding in Bangladesh in 2019 affected more than 7.6 million people across 28 districts and caused widespread displacement. The government-led response, supported by local, national and international civil society stakeholders, sought to provide life-saving assistance, restore safety and dignity to vulnerable populations and facilitate rebuilding and recovery. Progressing the localisation commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit was identified as a priority for the humanitarian community’s response.

Strengthening the localisation of humanitarian action in Bangladesh has been a key focus over the last four years. Several initiatives have sought to progress World Humanitarian Summit localisation commitments such as the Grand Bargain, and the Charter for Change, in particular in relation to the response to the Rohingya crisis. In the 2019 flood response, the international humanitarian community recognised the opportunity to build upon these existing initiatives and learning, and committed to agree on and implement a common approach to measuring progress.

“Partners recognize that the HRP [Humanitarian Response and Recovery Plan] is an opportunity to make progress on the localization agenda following the commitments made at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016. Generating an evidence base on localization is important in order to demonstrate that change is happening and its impact ... A framework to measure localization will be developed to serve as a baseline against which progress will be assessed on a regular basis.”

About this report

This report provides an analysis of localisation in the flood response and serves as a baseline for future responses. The Network for Information, Response and Preparedness Activities on Disasters (NIRAPAD), supported by Humanitarian Advisory Group (HAG) and the UN Resident Coordinator’s Office, undertook a rapid analysis of localisation in the context of the 2019 monsoon flood response to meet the objectives outlined in the HRP. This included the adaptation of a localisation measurement approach, used in four Pacific countries, to serve as a common measurement framework.

The report is divided into seven key areas: leadership, coordination and complementarity, partnerships, funding, capacity, policy influence, and advocacy and participation.

Localisation initiatives in Bangladesh

Localisation of humanitarian action in Bangladesh has been an important focus in recent years. There have been several initiatives, including Bangladesh being selected as the first ‘demonstrator country’ for the Grand Bargain Localisation Workstream Field Mission in September 2018. Many of the international organisations involved in this response are also Charter for Change and Grand Bargain signatories.

---

6 Humanitarian Response and Recovery Plan – Monsoon Floods (August 2019 – April 2020)
7 https://charter4change.org and https://www.agendaforhumanity.org/initiatives/386
This includes through large-scale initiatives, such as the selection of Bangladesh as a demonstrator country for the Grand Bargain Workstream 2, organisational partnerships and projects through platforms such as the Start Fund Bangladesh and NAHAB and research initiatives.
8 Humanitarian Response and Recovery Plan – Monsoon Floods (August 2019 – April 2020)
9 Ibid.
FLOOD IMPACT

Bangladesh is highly vulnerable to cyclones and floods. The low-lying nature of the country, high population density and socio-economic conditions compound the impacts of flooding and cyclones. More than 25% of the land is flooded every year, with severe flooding covering around 60% of the land every four to five years.

Figure 1: Overview of flood impact

7.6 million people affected
28 districts affected
583,402 houses damaged or destroyed
137,798 hectares of crops damaged
307,646 displaced
USD 27 Mn requested through Humanitarian Response and Recovery Plan

Response context

Due to the protracted Rohingya crisis, Bangladesh has a large presence of international actors with significant in-country capacity. It also has a large civil society presence, with local and national organisations involved in response across the country through various platforms such as NIRAPAD, National Alliance of Humanitarian Actors (NAHAB), Disaster Forum and Association of Development Agencies in Bangladesh (ADAB). With UN agencies and INGOs directly receiving a large majority of the aid provided for the Rohingya response (98% of 2019 funds), international actors play a significant role in the humanitarian response setting. As the flood response activities took place within this context, the in-country presence of international actors played an important role in determining how localisation was supported.

10 GFDRR Bangladesh country profile https://www.gfdrr.org/en/bangladesh
12 OCHA Financial Tracking Service data. This does not capture how much funding is passed to local and national partners from international organisations.
This baselining process adapted and contextualised the *Measuring Localisation approach and framework* and the associated tools that HAG and the Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (PIANGO) developed and used to baseline localisation in four countries in the Pacific region between October 2018 and November 2019. NIRAPAD carried out primary data collection, with support from HAG on tool development. NIRAPAD collected data from a sample of three of the six flood-affected districts where the response was ongoing.

Data collection used a mixed methods approach, including a survey, key informant interviews and focus group and consultation sessions with community representatives, local, national and international actors. A self-completed survey was answered by 28 organisations (12 international organisations and 16 local and national organisations). The survey questions (Appendix 1) captured quantitative data against key indicators in the Measuring Localisation Framework. Interviews, focus group discussions and consultation sessions were conducted with relevant groups to explore the themes emerging from the survey data and to provide context-specific examples.

Data from all sources were triangulated to determine the level of evidence of action and/or impact against the indicators in the framework. It is important to note that this is a high-level snapshot of trends; not all activities were captured in this process.

**Limitations**

**Sample size:** The quantitative dataset was analysed alongside the qualitative dataset, which strengthened the significance of the findings and provided context and nuance.

**Interpretation bias:** The data may be influenced by differing interpretation of key terms used during the survey process.

**Representation:** Most of the stakeholders involved in the research were from national NGOs and international NGOs. Some government representatives and community members also participated in the process.

**Level of evidence:** Where indicators are rated as having no or limited evidence of action, this does not mean that action is not taking place but that it did not emerge as part of the baseline process.
The Measuring Localisation Framework has seven areas of measurement: partnerships, leadership, capacity, coordination and complementarity, funding, participation, and policy influence and advocacy.

Each area presents the key findings and evidence of progress against localisation indicators. Each area has a set of qualitative and quantitative indicators, with associated means of verification.

The indicators and means of verification were drawn from the consultation process and previous work on localisation at regional and global levels, including HAG’s Measuring Localisation paper, the START Network, ALNAP and the NEAR Network. This framework can be used to measure progress in response in the future, using the data in this report as a baseline.

---

**Level of evidence**

In this paper, we assess the level of evidence of action against indicators in each of the seven areas of measurement. The four levels of evidence are no evidence, limited evidence, some evidence and strong evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PROGRESS</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>LIMITED</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

INDICATOR 1: Some-strong evidence that local and national actors lead response and dominate decision-making

The response to the 2019 floods—a medium-scale disaster—was led by the Government of Bangladesh. Existing national and local disaster management structures mobilised in the aftermath of the disaster to lead the initial response. The Government’s ability to rapidly respond to widespread disasters, such as the 2019 floods, highlights its capacity and leadership in disaster response.

Via the National Disaster Management Committee and the Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief (MODMR), national and sub-national government led the response efforts. This included coordination with the broader humanitarian community by the MODMR, which co-chairs the HCTT with the UN Resident Coordinator’s Office (UNRCO).

Government processes for leading and decision-making continue to evolve in Bangladesh. The revision of the Standing Orders on Disaster (1997, revised 2010 and 2019) has provided better clarity on the roles of government, NGOs and other actors.

Nevertheless, the decentralisation of decision-making and roles and responsibilities, with respect to both government and non-government actors, was challenging in the flood response. All stakeholders recognise that local governments struggled in leading flood response at the district level. Some of these challenges included the capacity of local government officials in coordinating responses, as well as issues of needs-based decision-making—also highlighted in the Transparency International Bangladesh report.

INTEGRITY WATCH IN FLOOD 2019 PREPAREDNESS AND RELIEF OPERATIONS

“Without the commitment of local leaders (i.e. Union Parishad Chairman and Members) no activity will take place. Some active leaders are happy to take on the responsibility to manage response work and help people in need. Others want to display their authority, but don’t want to take on any responsibility. For better results, all political leaders, traditional leaders and women leaders should be trained to understand the concepts of disaster, localisation, and beneficiary selection.”

14 Monsson Flooding Situation Update 1
15 Monsoon Flood 2019 Joint Needs Assessment: Phase 1
16 HCTT—National Disaster Management System in Bangladesh; Interview 9
17 Local NGO leader
The decision to support local and national NGOs to take increased leadership, including of international actors, through the HCTT district focal point role was welcomed. Stakeholders reported that this had positively challenged the ‘international lead – national support’ institutionalised mindset. It also positively changed the dynamic around local and national NGOs primarily playing an implementation role. National and local actors, however, perceive that there is still considerable room to strengthen local/national NGOs role in decision-making.

Decentralisation: challenges and opportunities

Much of the localisation research and evidence generation globally has emphasised the importance of considering the challenges and opportunities in decentralising response from the national to divisional and local levels. The Government of Bangladesh has been making progress towards decentralising disaster response structure and responsibility. The recent revisions to the Standing Orders on Disaster were an important step in this process, including establishing divisional-level committees and allocating local-level funding.

Figure 2: Do you think that local and national NGOs lead decision making in humanitarian emergencies in your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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However, decision-making and coordination of responses (regardless of the scale of disasters) is still managed at the national level. Decentralisation will reduce delays in decision-making and release immediate relief for ground level needs. However, capacity gaps and the role of local power and influence networks will become important considerations in a decentralised model.

Local political issues have influenced humanitarian response decision making and prioritising, based on local power dynamics. Lack of formal partnerships between local government and local, national and international actors on planning and coordination can also increase involvement of individual local politicians in determining beneficiaries and actions.

"Power influence was visible in fund allocation and relief distribution. In many cases, the lists of beneficiaries were created considering the vote bank and relationship with the local leaders."23

INDICATOR 2: *Some-strong evidence* that international actors support and strengthen national leadership

INDICATOR 3: *Some evidence* that international actors work with and respect in-country leadership structures and mechanisms

The government-led response to the floods was supported by the humanitarian community in Bangladesh, including international actors through the HCTT. The HCTT made the decision to activate international response and clusters after a series of steps including a joint needs assessment, with the participation of the MODMR, Department of Disaster Management (DDM) and National NGOs.24

Before reaching a decision to trigger an international humanitarian response, the HCTT carried out consultations with its members including the HCTT national and local NGO representatives.25 The national NGO representatives in the HCTT were also requested to consult with their local networks to confirm if an international response was required to support the government response.26

Some local and national NGOs indicated that while the international response mechanisms supported government leadership in the response, leadership for local and national NGOs needed to be further improved. Perceptions about how international actors work with and respect in-country leadership structures and mechanisms are divided. While all international actors indicated that they respected in-country leadership and mechanisms most or all of the time, just 31% of local and national actors accepted this. Local organisations have expressed that in some instances, international organisations do not always respect decision-making by local organisations and highly experienced local personnel.

Leadership within responding organisations is also an important issue. With 55% of senior managers in international organisations being national staff, there is considerable potential for improvement. As expected, local and national organisations had 99% national staff in their senior manager roles.

The definition of what constitutes a local or national organisation, and how this influences leadership, remains an ongoing concern for local actors.

---
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24 UNRCO presentation on Humanitarian Architecture in Bangladesh; Interview 9
25 UNRCO presentation on Humanitarian Architecture in Bangladesh
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“The term local is associated with the origin. The organisation that is established and originated in a particular area will be a local NGO for that area. I believe, local NGOs are more accountable to local people and sustainability of local NGOs also depend on this accountability. So, localisation will be ensured if truly local NGOs get the preference in disaster response activities.”

Elevating Local and National Civil Society Leadership in Response

The response had a strong focus on strengthening the leadership role of local/national civil society. For the first time in Bangladesh, nine national NGOs were selected to function as the district focal points in the priority districts. This area-based coordination arrangement supported the HCTT and broader cluster arrangements.

The HCTT’s decision to appoint national NGOs to act as district coordination focal points is a significant step towards increasing local and national leadership in response coordination and planning, particularly as it was previously specifically defined that the UN and INGOs would play this role.

Purpose of the District Coordination Focal Points

Maintain close cooperation with humanitarian partners involved in HCTT activities and support and complement the government’s humanitarian effort during any disaster. Key tasks include:

- Effective communication and information sharing
- Establish mechanisms to enhance accountability to the affected populations
- Support community involvement and participation.

Criteria for Selection of District Coordination Focal Points

- Proven presence and capacity at district level
- Have sufficient response program at District level
- Demonstrated capacity to contribute strategically and to provide practical support
- Established linkage and relationships with District Disaster Management Committees and District Government officials
- Accountability (capacity/willingness to dedicate time required)
- Based on their area presence, national/local organisations will get preference.

The HCTT facilitated a workshop for these organisations in September 2019, one month into the implementation of the HRP period. The meeting organised in Dhaka allowed them to share nuanced issues that are not always noticeable or considered at the central level. It also allowed the focal points to receive updates from the cluster and working groups to understand the broader recovery effort. The event was conducted in Bengali, rather than English, allowing local organisations to fully participate in the process.

This experience provided valuable learning for the RCO and HCTT. Some focal point organisations have been able to respond and coordinate more effectively than others due to a range of factors including workload, capacity and local political contexts. Supporting all focal points to respond in the future is an important next step.
**COORDINATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY**

Key finding: **SOME EVIDENCE** of application and respect for commonly agreed approaches to ‘as local as possible and as international as necessary’

**INDICATOR 1: Some—strong evidence** of national representation and engagement in coordination forums and meetings

Coordination for response in Bangladesh involves three key government-led forums.33 The National Disaster Management Council (NDMC) is the highest-level strategic decision-making body on disaster management. The two other forums are the Inter-Ministerial Disaster Management Committee (IMDMC), responsible for coordination across ministries, and the National Disaster Management Advisory Committee, responsible for policy development and advice.

The Government of Bangladesh leads and is well represented in the international and national humanitarian forums that supported this response. The national cluster system has a government ministry functioning in the lead role and a UN or international NGO functioning as the co-lead. Notably, no local or national NGOs have a co-lead role in the clusters.

---

**Figure 4: National cluster system in Bangladesh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Co-Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td>Ministry of Food/Ministry of Agriculture</td>
<td>WFP/FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Ministry of Health and Family Welfare</td>
<td>WHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief/Ministry of Housing and Public Works</td>
<td>IFRC/UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Ministry of Health and Family Welfare</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief</td>
<td>WFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Education/Ministry of Primary and Mass Education</td>
<td>UNICEF/Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Recovery</td>
<td>Ministry of Disaster Management and Relief/Ministry of Local Government, Rural Development and Co-operatives</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>Ministry of Women and Children Affairs</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
<td>Ministry of Women and Children Affairs</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

33 HCTT, National Disaster Management System in Bangladesh
34 UNRCO, Humanitarian Architecture in Bangladesh
The Terms of Engagement proposed by the agencies leading/co-leading the clusters, highlight the HCTT’s commitment to increasing coordination and complementarity between humanitarian actors and the government. These commitments include increased information sharing, joint decision-making and increased accountability.

As disaster response coordination is primarily centralised in Dhaka, international actors are perceived to have greater influence on response planning and implementation. Both national and international actors have indicated that local and national organisations have less opportunity than international actors to participate and contribute to coordination process at national and sub-national level (figure 4).

Local and national NGO engagement in the HCTT

Local and national actors have indicated the need for greater local and national representation in the HCTT and cluster system. The current HCTT structure has three national NGO representatives and three national NGO alternatives nominated by DDM – presently these are COAST, NIRAPAD, NAHAB, Disaster Forum, Bangladesh Disaster Preparedness Centre (BDPC) and Bangladesh Centre for Advanced Studies (BCAS) These six national NGOs sit make up about 19% of the 31 members in the HCTT.

The HCTT, together with the DDM, identified these six main national coordination organisations to sit in the HCTT so that they can be the conduit for the larger local and national NGO network. The HCTT national NGO representatives have an important role to play in increasing local and national participation and representation in humanitarian coordination structures. This includes identifying local NGOs who can become active members of clusters, because participation in the cluster system will benefit local NGOs in improving response coordination and efficiency.

Clusters and working groups can also benefit from the HCTT national NGO representatives by using them to amplify their reach to local and national actors. The HCTT and the UNRCO had used available networks to inform local and national organisations of coordination meetings taking place during the flood response. However, some local and national organisations indicated that they had inadequate information on the meetings taking place. International organisation indicated that while participation in coordination meetings was open for interested organisations, many local and national organisation did not participate, potentially due to language barriers.

Figure 4: To what extent are local and national civil society actors able to participate in and contribute to coordination processes at national and sub-national level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 HCTT, Proposed terms of engagement between Agencies leading/co-leading humanitarian clusters and working group with national government counterpart
36 Synthesis report on meeting with local NGOs, 19 Sep 2019
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While government-led coordination structures are in place at district and upazila level, they require further strengthening. Regular stakeholder meetings at district levels were indicated as not functioning according to the prescribed schedules without the direct patronage and participation of senior district administrators. The recently updated Standing Order on Disasters has for the first time proposed a divisional-level committee to coordinate disaster response.

While local and national actors indicated they are taking part in coordination mechanisms, international actors indicated that their ideas and suggestions are still more likely to be heard in coordination forums (figure 5).

There are opportunities to strengthen engagement, such as providing more space for local and national actors in coordination platforms to voice their opinions, as well as working around language barriers. See Figure 6.

**INDICATOR 2:** Some evidence of clearly defined parameters for international actors complementing local and national actors in humanitarian response

**INDICATOR 3:** Some evidence that humanitarian response is delivered in a way that is collaborative and complementary (i.e. based on an analysis of the specific strengths/weaknesses of different humanitarian actors)

In the early stages of the response, there was constructive discussion about how international actors are best placed to support local and national actors – that is, analysing complementary strengths. From the early stages of the response, there was a focus on defining how international actors would best add value to a government-led response.

“As recommended by the MODMR, which co-chairs the HCTT together with the UN, the clusters liaised closely with their national technical government partners in order to analyse jointly the situation and to identify possible areas where a complementary support from the humanitarian community would add-value to the government-led response.”

Research has found that the government plays a strong convening role in other responses in Bangladesh and in creating opportunity for discussions about complementarity. However, limited funding and partnership opportunities means competition among local and national organisations to secure funding for their individual organisations and projects is higher. This does not bode well for complementary delivery of work and efficiency of operations.

---

40 HPG, Capacity and complementarity in the Rohingya response in Bangladesh, 2018
**INDICATOR 4: Limited evidence** that national civil society coordination mechanisms are funded and have technical capacity to operate in humanitarian response

The six national NGO representatives in the HCTT (including NAHAB and NIRAPAD,) facilitate coordination of response of local actors and represent local viewpoints in various mechanisms, including clusters. Initiatives such NAHAB’s to strengthen national, district, upazila and union-level capacities and explore pool funding arrangements at each level will be important in improving coordination activities.\(^{41}\)

These networks do not always receive sufficient funding to continue their important roles within the coordination structures for response in Bangladesh. There is potential for these networks to secure their own internal funding by linking up with the business components of their partner national NGOs.

Beneficiary duplication and intervention overlap was noted to have taken place due to lack of coordination at different levels, especially in relief distribution.\(^{42}\) Due to data gaps or inaccuracies in government lists, NGOs implemented additional review processes for beneficiary selection, but these did not solve the problem completely. Coordination platforms for local and national organisations will have an important role to play in ensuring more open and accurate information sharing among local and national responders.

\(^{41}\) Localisation Road Map of NAHAB

\(^{42}\) Transparency International Bangladesh, Integrity Watch in Flood 2019 Preparedness and Relief Operations

District coordination focal points met with the HCTT members and cluster leads to share experiences and discuss the implementation of the HRP. Photo: UN RCO Bangladesh/ Kazi Shahidur Rahman
**Indicator 1: Limited—some evidence** that partnerships are based on equitable and ethical partnership practices

Localisation in Bangladesh over the last three years has seen more discussions about partnerships between international, and national and local actors. International organisations remain committed to localisation and recognise its value – especially in the context of the ongoing Rohingya response. Local organisations show a keen interest to further develop partnerships that support more localised response and better delivery of aid. For instance, in Kurigram, 29 NGOs had agreed to explore the possibility of forming a consortium to reduce overhead costs and improve localisation efficiency.

There is further opportunity for improvement in how equitable partnerships are set up and managed with local and national actors. During the response situation, international actors reverted to their existing processes around project-based, short-term partnerships focused on implementation, rather than seeking to explicitly strengthen localised partnerships and address power differentials. Lack of pre-planning, such as setting up longer-term partnerships based on ethical practices, is a critical factor; as also identified during the Rohingya response. Organisation that establish partnerships prior to crisis situations are able to respond more effectively and support more equitable partnership processes.

Many INGOs and UN agencies have been operating in Bangladesh for several years, and most of them have ongoing projects with local and national actors. These existing relationships were relied on to deliver flood response initiatives. For example, the World Food Program (WFP) worked with Eco-Social Development Organization, who they have worked with since 2001, to deliver emergency flood response support.

“Many international actors understand localization from an implementation partnership standpoint and as such there is limited attention and varied appreciation to issues around power, decision making and leadership.”

Further progress is needed to support more equitable partnerships between international and national actors, especially in formulating partnerships. Of the survey respondents, all international organisations noted that their ideas and views are all the time or mostly taken into account in their partnerships during the flood response. The corresponding figure for national and local organisations was only 47%.

Fifty per cent of both international and national actors responding to the survey reported they had three or more partnership agreements in place.

---
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However, 12.5% of national actors responding to the survey indicated they didn’t have any partnership agreements in place to support their response effort.

Moreover, funding provided through partnerships or projects did not allow local organisations to cover operational and overhead costs. Of the local and national agencies responding to the survey, 56% noted they could not cover overhead costs through their partnerships. This becomes restrictive for smaller local and national organisations, which rarely have substantial financial reserves.

The capacity of local organisations is regularly assessed by international actors, but reciprocal assessments are not frequent. Of the survey respondents, 92% of international organisations had assessed the capacities of their local and national counterparts, while only 47% of local or national actors were able to assess the capacity of their partners in return.

**INDICATOR 2: Limited evidence of longer-term strategic partnerships that aim to build systems and processes that mirror the ambition and goals of the local/national partner**

Although partnerships between international and national actors were operational on the ground for the flood response, long-term partnerships agreements are uncommon. Of the local and national actors responding to the survey, 27% said they had long-term agreements in place, while none of the international actors indicated they had such arrangements. Funding provided to local organisations is often prescriptive in nature. This takes away the flexibility organisations need to respond to changing situations on the ground – especially the preferences of affected communities.
Selection criteria for partnerships are skewed in favour of existing and larger national organisations.50 The risk-averse nature of international organisations and donors deters them from establishing working partnerships with local organisations. The low risk tolerance of INGOs was also noted in the Rohingya response.51

“If one international NGO partners with a local NGO then they continue that partnership. So new local NGOs don’t get the opportunity to participate and enter into partnerships. As the previously selected organisation is already trusted by the international NGO, further localisation is ignored.”52

The limited windows provided by INGOs and donors to apply for projects, complicated by their due diligence requirements, make it difficult for small or new applicants to be selected over existing partners.53 Decision-making is still largely driven by international organisations, with local and national organisations receiving insufficient opportunity to influence it. Seventy-five per cent of international organisations responding to the survey indicated they are involved in the decision making in their partnerships, while only 40% of local and national organisations indicated the same.

There were limited partnership arrangements between international or local NGOs and local governments to coordinate response activities. However, all organisations kept local government informed of their planned and ongoing activities. The full potential of partnerships with local government has not been utilised in the flood response. As the first teams on the ground during a disaster, local government structures offer a valuable opportunity for better delivery of aid.

“The fact is that the donors are only relying on NGOs and they are not relying on local government. If we get this funding support together, with proper training, I think we can act accordingly and introduce the pragmatic emergency management system.”54

50 Consultation meeting 1
51 HPG, Capacity and complementarity in the Rohingya response in Bangladesh, December 2018
52 Local NGO Representative, Consultation meeting 1
53 Charter for Change: From commitments to action (Progress Report 2018–19)
54 Local Government Representative, Interview in Kurigram
**INDICATOR 1: Limited—some evidence that local/national actors have access to direct funding with few or no barriers**

There is increasing focus on making direct funding more accessible to local and national partners. START Fund Bangladesh (SFB) and Oxfam’s Humanitarian Response Grant Facility (HRGF) under the Empowering Local and National Humanitarian Actors program are examples of direct funding for local and national actors being made available to increase national leadership and capacity.55

The SFB has been working towards opening up more of its financing for local and national organisations. Currently, among the SFB members registered and eligible to receive funding, more than half are local or national organisations.56

In response to the 2019 floods and landslides, SFB released funding for three alerts raised by members. Funding allocated for the response was split relatively evenly between national and international members, with the six national and international members each receiving funding.57

In an increasingly positive trend, international members channelled 77% of the funding they received to local partners who were non-SFB members. As a result, of the total funding released by SFB for the flood and landslide response, 88% ended up with local and national actors.58

While the SFB international members showed an increase in sharing funds with local partners, in general, local organisations face an ongoing challenge in directly accessing funding. This has been noted extensively in other analyses.59 Local and national actors still receive a considerable portion of their funding from international actors via sub-contracting modalities. Even indirect funding available through other international organisations has its own complexity as a result of the associated due diligence processes. Such limitations usually link to both internal limitations of the INGOs and UN as well as restrictions imposed by the international donors.60 Furthermore, the funding coming through to local organisations often incurs an administration cost from their international counterparts.

“Perceived barriers to accessing direct funding include a lack of capacity in proposal writing and grant management; weak English language skills; domestic competition and dominance of one or two very strong NNGOs preventing others from accessing funding; and lack of trust by international actors to manage funds.”61

---

55 Oxfam and ODI, Money Talks: A synthesis report assessing humanitarian funding flows to local actors in Bangladesh and Uganda, 2018
56 https://startnetwork.org/start-fund/bangladesh
57 Caritas Bangladesh is considered a national partner by SFB as multiple country-specific entities under Caritas are represented throughout the Start Network. If Caritas is considered an international actor, the split between direct funding to international and national actors becomes 63%–39%.
58 Data provided by START Fund Bangladesh
59 HPG, Capacity and complementarity in the Rohingya response in Bangladesh, 2018; IFRC, Mission Report: Grand Bargain Localization Workstream Mission to Bangladesh, 2018; HPG Grand Bargain annual independent report, 2019
60 Charter for Change: From commitments to action (Progress Report 2018–2019)
61 Oxfam and ODI, Money Talks: A synthesis report assessing humanitarian funding flows to local actors in Bangladesh and Uganda, March 2018
START FUND BANGLADESH (SFB) RESPONSE TO 2019 BANGLADESH MONSOON FLOODING

3 alerts raised by SFB members

£999,394 distributed under 8 awards (including 2 consortia)

12 members of SFB received funding

5 local partners (non SFB members) sub-contracted by recipient SFB members

Local and national SFB members who received funding 62

International SFB members who received funding 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding provided by member type</th>
<th>Final destination of funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£496,277 50% National members</td>
<td>88% Spent by local and national actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£503,177 50% International members</td>
<td>12% Spent by international actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How international actors used their SFB funding

77% Given to local partners

23% Spent by international actors

Modality of funding received by national actors

56% Directly provided to SFB national members

44% Sub-contracted by SFB members

Data provided by the START Fund Bangladesh.

62 Caritas Bangladesh is considered a national partner by SFB as multiple country specific entities under Caritas are represented throughout the Start Network.
Harnessing private sector to support localisation in Bangladesh

There is further potential for harnessing the corporate financing resources available in Bangladesh; major business organisations in the country want to become more involved in the response efforts as part of their corporate social responsibility. An example of such efforts is Bangalink (a major telecom provider) supporting the Bangladesh Red Cross Society (BDRCS) to provide food packages to affected families63. However, such partnerships will need to be closely managed, as private sector interventions can also be aimed at generating publicity and media coverage.

Further funding opportunities relating to the corporate arms of the larger national NGOs need to be explored.64 These larger NGOs, through their corporate financing, can play a more prominent role in supporting local NGOs and more importantly, the NGO coordination platforms in the country. To date these larger NGOs and coordination platforms have preferred to rely on donor financing.

Local administrations usually request assistance from local and national actors who closely engage with them. However, since they rarely have sufficient means to support these requests, these are channelled to international partners. Setting up local partnerships with access to pooled funding can enable increased capacity for immediate response as well as reduce dependence on international funding.65

There is no partnership among local government, NGO and the local administration. This kind of partnership could be effective. Upazila Parshad needs to be involved and introduce this form of collaboration/partnership for the sake of the affected people.66

INDICATOR 2: Limited evidence of increased humanitarian funding to local and national actors

International organisations and donors use different approaches to channel their funding, including directly to government, to other international organisations or to local and national organisations. A positive sign is that 75% of international organisations indicated they have specific targets to increase funding to local and national actors.

Of the survey respondents, 75% of international actors reported that 76–100% of their flood response funding is passed on to national and local organisations. This contrasts with the 81% of local and national actors which stated they had never or rarely received a fair proportion of the funding (Figure 11).

Figure 11: Do you feel national and local actors receive a fair proportion of funding compared to international actors in the context of the flood response?

63 IFRC Operational Update Report – Bangladesh: Monsoon Floods, 20 February 2020
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65 Synthesis report on meeting with local NGOs, 19 September 2019
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With local organisations having more understanding of the local context, better local networks and much smaller overhead costs, they question why more money is not channelled through to them for managing the response.

The Bangladesh Red Cross Society (BDRCS) requested International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) to activate their Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF) which provided financial support for BDRCS’ immediate response. Subsequently the IFRC launched an emergency appeal in coordination with BDRCS. The BDRCS response has been supported by IFRC, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and other partner national societies within the movement.

Beyond the SFB, local and national actors continued to face challenges in directly accessing funding in this response. Based on available data, INGOs, UN Agencies and IFRC/BDRCS received a majority of direct funding made available for the response (Figure 12). A review of the 2015 aid distribution in Bangladesh found that while UN agencies shared 63% of the funds they received with local and national actors, the corresponding figures for INGOs and Red Cross were quite low at 12% and 5% respectively.

Financial stability is an important indicator for the level of funding received by the organisations. Only 44% of national and local actors feel that their organisation is mostly or always financially stable, compared to 92% of international actors (Figure 13). This also alludes to potential capacity and process gaps in the local and national organisations in securing funding.

“It is not simply about getting more resources to the local organisations, but also about the increased responsibilities that come along with more resources. They need to be prepared to accept all of it together.”

Financial stability is an important indicator for the level of funding received by the organisations. Only 44% of national and local actors feel that their organisation is mostly or always financially stable, compared to 92% of international actors (Figure 13). This also alludes to potential capacity and process gaps in the local and national organisations in securing funding.

“...”

Figure 13: How often do you feel that your organisation is financially stable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Bangladesh 2019 Flooding Humanitarian Response and Recovery Plan – top funding recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
<th>% of total funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International NGO</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agency</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC / BDRCS</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International SFB members</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National SFB members</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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International organisations, as expected, also had more sources of funding for their flood response, with 42% of international actors having three or more sources of funding, compared to 25% of local and national actors. However, some national organisations such as Gana Unnayan Kendra (GUK) have diversity in their funding, with their sources including SFB, WFP and TESCO Funding Futures charity project.

INDICATOR 3: Limited evidence that local and national actors have increased decision-making power over financial matters

There is little to no evidence that local partners have increased their influence in financial decision-making. The amount of funding for the response and how it is allocated is decided at the national level or at high-level coordination meetings. Local NGOs perceive they are very rarely consulted or kept informed of these plans and decisions. It remains a challenge for local and national organisations to overcome existing dynamics and form partnerships with and among international actors and donors.

There is little evidence of transparency in funding relationships, including with respect to international organisations sharing budgets with local partners. Local NGOs submit financial documents to upazila and district administrations, as well as their partner organisations. They, in turn, receive little or no information about the international partners’ overall budget details and financial decisions.

---
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The response to the floods showed some positive examples of international actors providing appropriate and relevant capacity support to their local and national partners. Longer-term partnerships predating the flood response tended to facilitate appropriate capacity support. Only 56% of national actors indicated international support strengthens their capacity most or all of the time, indicating room to improve appropriate capacity development. National actors also indicated that capacity needs are either defined by themselves or jointly with their partners.

This response was managed primarily nationally, while some international surge deployments still took place (42% of international organisations). There is also evidence that national surge capacity was prioritised during the response by international actors, with 63% reporting deploying national surge resources.

There is a clear difference between how international and national actors perceive appropriateness of capacity-strengthening activities (Figure 15).

**INDICATOR 1:** Limited—some evidence of national and regional surge capacity and use of local/national over international expertise

**INDICATOR 2:** Some evidence that international actors do not undermine capacity of national actors in emergency response

**INDICATOR 3:** Some evidence that contextualised humanitarian standards, tools and policies are available

**INDICATOR 4:** Some evidence that legislation and plans are in place to support national response capacity

National partner capacity assessments during the response were carried out as part of subcontracting processes, which can be duplicative when national partners are partnering with multiple international partners. National partners continued to indicate there is opportunity to improve capacity-strengthening approaches. Although all international actors believed that they mostly or always focused on the flood response capacity building areas prioritised by national actors, only 50% of local and national actors agreed.

**Key finding:** SOME EVIDENCE that local and national organisations are able to respond effectively and efficiently, and have targeted and relevant support from international actors

**Figure 15:** Do you feel that the capacity of the in-country partner is strengthened by international support?
Local organisations having multiple international partners hasn’t necessarily translated into additional local capacities, especially sectoral capacities. This highlights the need to better plan and coordinate capacity development of local NGOs during the preparedness phase.

Local actors in particular often lack sufficient resources or in-house skills to upskill their staff and rely on international partners to support in this regard. Local actors found the capacity assessment process challenging because it did not provide an accurate reflection of their potential. Not customising the assessments to the local context and using the same scales for local and national organisations often put the local organisations at a disadvantage. Local organisations identified scoring low on inequitable capacity assessments as a major reason for international actors overlooking them, along with shortcomings in the district portals set up to share updated data and language barriers.

“Giving projects through assessing the capacity of the organisations alone is not always helpful. Because local-level NGOs certainly know the local context and they can work efficiently and effectively in their areas even with their limited capacity.”

The HCTT and clusters have been supporting local organisations to become more aware of the standards, as well as tools and other information available. Cluster-level policies are also available for use, but more at a national level. There is limited evidence of contextualised standards and tools accessible at the local level to support local actors. The revision of the Standing Orders on Disaster, to which international and national actors contributed, have been an important development. While this is expected to improve decentralisation, there is further opportunity to strengthen implementation of the policy.
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**POLICY INFLUENCE AND ADVOCACY**

**Key finding:** **LIMITED EVIDENCE** that humanitarian action reflects the priorities of affected communities and national actors

**INDICATOR 1:** Limited evidence that policies are informed by local and national voices, including communities

**INDICATOR 2:** Some evidence that national actors are recognised as key stakeholders in discussions regarding policies and standards that may have significant impact on them

**INDICATOR 3:** Limited evidence that local and national actors can influence donor priorities in country, including program design and implementation

The ability of local, national and international actors to influence policies and donor priorities that guide response is differentiated. International actors also report greater awareness of humanitarian policies; this suggests that there is opportunity to strengthen national actors’ awareness of national and international policies and ability to engage.

Contribution of both international and national actors on the review of the Standing Orders on Disaster was noted. International actors were also regularly involved in national-level dialogues on disaster planning and response. Local and national actors were part of the national, local, upazila and district level-discussions. They also contributed more to local-level planning and policy work than international actors.

There is more comprehensive involvement of international organisations in disaster planning and response, especially at the national level where overall disaster response decisions are made. Only 19% of local and national actors reported that their organisation is involved in influencing the development of humanitarian policies and national planning processes mostly or all the time, compared to 83% of international actors.

Local and national organisations have been successful in integrating some local priorities into disaster planning and policy. This includes integrating their widely used cash support process into the national policy. They continue to advocate on areas such as mobile banking for cash transfers (introduced in some areas) and disability-inclusive shelters.

While there are positive trends emerging from the survey regarding local and national actors meeting with donors, there is opportunity to strengthen this.

---

**Figure 17:** Are you aware of the humanitarian policies an planning processes in country?

![Graph showing awareness levels]

**Figure 18:** To what extent are you or your organisation involved in influencing / feeding ideas into the development of humanitarian policies and planning processes in your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Key finding: **LIMITED EVIDENCE** that communities lead and participate in humanitarian response decision-making

**INDICATOR 1: Limited evidence**
of development of community/
contextualised standards for all actors
working in that context

Previous major disasters and the protracted
Rohingya response has prompted development of
more cluster-specific standards and guidelines.\(^7\)
While some of these standards and guidelines
(especially for the Rohingya response) can be
context specific, they contribute to the overall
improvement in the cluster functionality. However,
their wider availability to local organisations
needs to be reviewed, including availability
in local languages. With the standards and
guidelines being managed by clusters, the limited
involvement of local actors in the cluster system
reduces their contribution to these standards – and
in turn their local adoption.

Beyond the NGO groups, corporate, micro-finance
and media organisations also played an important
role in the response work – positively and
otherwise. The lack of coherent standards around
this in response has resulted in some negative
effects to communities. Local organisations
expressed concerns over how media – although
invited to consultation meetings – do not actively
contribute to response planning but regularly share
negative reporting on the response efforts

Media still remain a crucial part of the localisation
and accountability processes, and guidelines and
procedures to facilitate better integration will be
needed.

Community participation levels in the hill tract
districts were noted to be lower than in plains
districts. This stems from a systemic process of
socio-economic challenges resulting in the people
from the hill tract districts being less vocal about
their concerns and having lower expectations of
what they should receive.

**INDICATOR 2: Limited evidence**
that communities have increased opportunities
to shape programming, including
evaluating INGO work

While all national and international organisations
felt that the opinions of affected people were
considered during design and implementation
of the interventions in some degree, only 32% of all organisations perceived that opinions of
affected people were factored in all the time. The
difference in opinion between international and
local/national organisations on how the views of
affected people factored into the flood response
design and implementation (Figure 19) shows a gap
in integration of Accountability to Affected People
(AAP) approach.

---

78 [https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/bangladesh](https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/bangladesh)
Community-level participation in supporting affected communities was noted to be high. Local community members were involved in a range of flood response activities, including rescue work and providing financial or material support. Most efforts were altruistic, but incidents of people trying to earn money or obtain other benefits were also noted.

There was evidence of community consultations for planning and design of activities at an individual organisation level, as well as during some of the needs assessments carried out in the aftermath of the flooding. For example, Plan International carried out a rapid needs assessments in some of the affected districts, while the BDRC relied on its local units to share relevant data from the ground level.

A major gap in the participation of communities included generating loss and damages lists without visiting affected households, insufficient participation when creating beneficiary lists, and ineffective complaints mechanisms. The low level of participation of local organisations in coordination meetings with international organisations and donors likely contributed to the minimal contribution of local communities to the planning and response process.

There is also some evidence of feedback mechanisms being used for evaluation of interventions. However, for the most part community engagement was limited to project-specific interventions, rather than taking a more consolidated approach. A recently completed assessment aimed at increasing Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), commissioned by SFB, has shown that, there is a notable difference among local and international organisation in practising AAP; weak communication with communities; unclear and weak involvement of communities in decision making; and that AAP is seen as a tick in the box exercise. However, the study also shows there is increased focus on AAP, with an interest to establish a common approach consistent across both national and international partners.

Figure 20: Responses from local community and local NGO members about the flood response effort and the role of local and national NGOs

The national level NGOs often have less community engagement capacity, and they are happy to use the support of the local NGOs for this work as they recognise our capacity. So, the question is WHY INTERNATIONAL NGOS ARE NOT GIVING IMPORTANCE TO THE LOCAL NGOS? Communities face disasters without any special capacity building or training because of their local knowledge and skills. Similarly, local NGOs have existing capacities and other local strengths to help manage disasters. The 4500 taka grant we received worked like one million taka during the flood. You couldn’t get any money or even a loan from anybody during that time. This is the biggest help we received, and the NGOs did a great job in providing the cash support because we were able to use that cash to meet our needs during the flood. Help us move to safe and flood free areas and then it will not be necessary to distribute relief every year. We are landless people and if we are given a piece of land, we ready to build the house on our own.

---
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USING THIS BASELINE

This baseline can act as a catalyst for change among national and international stakeholders in Bangladesh. In addition to the specific steps under the ‘Way Forward’ noted in the Executive Summary, the evidence can be used as a basis for discussion between key actors working in Bangladesh. It can also allow individual organisations and the humanitarian community in Bangladesh to set targets and continue to track change. Key possibilities for use are detailed below.

▸ **As a basis for discussion.** The baseline is intended to provide an objective basis for discussion about how localisation is progressing in context. This discussion would be useful at an organisational level, but also at an ecosystem level. Cluster meetings would be a good forum for examining some of the relevant datasets.

▸ **As a basis for planning.** The report can be used to identify areas in which progress is limited and that could be prioritised in planning processes. International, national and local organisations could work together to identify specific actions and set targets for change.

▸ **As a basis for tracking change.** The framework for measuring change and associated indicators will be publicly available in the report. Organisations can track how they are progressing against these key indicators at any time and can develop their own organisational baselines to track their progress.
APPENDIX 1 SELF-ASSESSMENT SURVEY

This self-assessment survey is intended to understand relationships between local, national, regional and international entities and what more can be done to further localise the flood response.

**Three responses per organisation are requested with the opinions from (a) senior leadership position (b) operational staff and (c) HR/finance staff. In case of single response, please ensure the opinions from (a) senior leadership position (b) operational staff and (c) HR/finance staff.**

You are requested to **circle your answer and write comments** (where necessary).

The survey will take approximately **10-15 minutes** to complete.

The deadline for survey responses is **29th December 2019**.

Local or national organisations: Please respond to the questions thinking about your partnership or relationship with one or more international organisations.

International organisations: Please respond to the questions thinking about your partnership or relationship with one or more local/national organisations.

**KEY DETAILS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National or international organisation:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of organisation (please tick):**

- Local government
- National government
- Local NGO/Community-based organisation
- National NGO Other (please specify)
- National Society of the Red Cross/Crescent
- UN organisation
- Donor government
- International NGO
- Other (please specify)

**Category of the response personnel (please tick):**

- Senior Leadership Position
- Operational Staff
- HR/Finance Staff
1. PARTNERSHIPS

1. Do you have any partnership agreements for the flood response?
   - Yes / No
   - How many?
     0 1 2 3 4 5+

2. What kind of partnership agreements does your organisation have in the context of the flood response?
   - Project grants
   - Partnership agreements
   - Cost-sharing agreements
   - Long-term MOUs
   - Other (please specify)
   - Don’t know

3. Do your response partnerships fund:
   a) project-related work
      - YES always  YES sometimes  NO never  Don’t know
   b) training for your staff not related to the project e.g. finance training
      - YES always  YES sometimes  NO never  Don’t know
   c) operational staff costs of your organisation (staff not linked to project e.g. finance staff)
      - YES always  YES sometimes  NO never  Don’t know
   d) overhead costs not linked to project (e.g. administration / office rent)
      - YES always  YES sometimes  NO never  Don’t know

4. Are your organisations’ ideas and views taken into account in your partnerships for the flood response?
   - All the time  mostly  sometimes  rarely  never

5. How often is your organisation involved in decision-making in your partnership/s e.g. decisions on changing geographic focus of a project / decisions on budget reallocations for this response? (scale)
   - All the time  mostly  sometimes  rarely  never

6. Have you ever formally assessed the capacity of your partner in your partnership e.g. undertaken an assessment of their strengths and weaknesses and provided recommendations on areas for improvement?
   - YES  NO  Don’t know

DOCUMENT ATTACHMENT: Please share copies of any partnership arrangements for confidential analysis.
## 2. LEADERSHIP

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> Do you think that local and national actors led on decision-making in the flood response?</td>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Do you think that international actors respect and work with in-country leadership structures and mechanisms during the flood response?</td>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> How many times in the last six months has your organisation met directly with an international donor?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Please provide the following information about leadership (CEO/Country Director, etc.) in your organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total number of all staff in leadership positions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of staff that are national in leadership positions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of staff that are international in leadership positions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. COORDINATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> Do you participate in international-national coordination forums and meetings such as clusters?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> To what extent are coordination mechanisms related to the flood response led by government actors?</td>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> To what extent are local and national civil society actors able to participate in and contribute to coordination processes at national and sub-national levels?</td>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong> Are cluster meetings conducted in the local language?</td>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15.</strong> Are cluster reports written in the local language?</td>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.</strong> Are your ideas and suggestions are heard in the coordination forums?</td>
<td>All the time</td>
<td>mostly</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. POLICIES

17. Are you aware of the humanitarian policies and planning processes in your country?
   - YES
   - NO
   - Partially

18. How much are you or your organisation involved in influencing / feeding ideas into the development of humanitarian policies and planning processes in your country?
   - All the time
   - mostly
   - sometimes
   - rarely
   - never

FREE TEXT BOX: Please give examples.................................

5. PARTICIPATION

19. Are the views and opinions of affected people taken into account during design and implementation of programmes for this response?
   - All the time
   - mostly
   - sometimes
   - rarely
   - never

6. FUNDING

20. Approximately how many different sources of funding does your organisation have for this response?
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5+

21. Approximately how much funding has your organisation received for activities related to the flood response? Please provide a figure in US$: .................

22. (for international actors only) Approximately what share of flood response funding is passed on to national and local organisations?
   - 0-25%
   - 26-50%
   - 51-75%
   - 76-100%

If possible, provide an estimate of breakdown:
   1. Government authorities at national and sub-national levels
   2. National and local NGOs
   3. National Societies of the Red Cross and Red Crescent
   4. Local and national private sector organizations
   5. Local and national research organisations

23. (For international actors only) Does your organisation have specific targets to increase funding to local/national actors in disaster preparedness and response?
   - Yes
   - No
   • Why is this the case? (Written answer):

24. A. (National actors) Do you feel you receive a fair proportion of funding compared to international actors in the context of the flood response?
   - Yes
   - mostly
   - Partially
   - rarely
   - No

B. OR (international actors) Do you feel national and local actors receive a fair proportion of funding compared to international actors in the context of the flood response?
   - Yes
   - mostly
   - Partially
   - rarely
   - No
25. How often do you feel that your organisation is financially stable e.g. good cash flow / operational budget in the bank for at least 3 months?
   - All the time
   - Mostly
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

26. Do you share project budgets and financial reports with your partners (local/national/international)?
   - All the time
   - Mostly
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

### 7. CAPACITY

27. Do you feel that the capacity of your organisation is strengthened by international support?
   - All the time
   - Mostly
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never

28. Did international expert staff deploy to support your organisation in this response?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know
   - If yes, How many?
     - 1-2
     - 3-4
     - 5+
   - Was this an appropriate amount?
     - Too many
     - Right number
     - Too few
     - Don't know

29. Did national expert staff deploy to support your organisation in this response?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know
   - If yes, How many?
     - 1-2
     - 3-4
     - 5+
   - Was this an appropriate amount?
     - Too many
     - Right number
     - Too few
     - Don't know

30. Did you/ your organisation get to decide on who would be deployed and when into your organisation?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - Don't know

31. Did you/ your organisation provide a performance review on the deployed staff into your organisation?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Sometimes
   - Don't know

32. (For local and national actors only) Who defines the capacity needs of your organisation?
   - International partners
   - Our own organisation
   - Combination of both
   - Is this appropriate?
     - Yes
     - No
     - Partially

33. Have international actors focused on the areas of capacity strengthening that local and national actors prioritise for flood response-related interventions?
   - All the time
   - Mostly
   - Sometimes
   - Rarely
   - Never
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## APPENDIX 3: DETAILED MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK

### IMPACT INDICATOR: PARTNERSHIPS - Equitable and complementary partnerships between local, national and international actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Means of verification (or evidence of activity)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collection tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Partnerships are based on equitable and ethical partnership practices</td>
<td>Is there a partnership agreement/MOU?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there a set of partnership principles embedded in partnership documentation?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DR - Partnership agreements/contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there opportunities for national/local partners to assess the capacity of the international partner?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII, DR - Partnership agreements/contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do the MOUs include reciprocal reporting?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DR - MOUs/Partnership agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there partnership review processes?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a perception that partnerships are equitable (partners feel respected and equally valued)?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS (Self-assessment survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a perception that partnerships are publicly recognised?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Long-term strategic partnerships that aim to build systems and processes that mirror the ambition and goals of the local/national partner organisations

3. Increased power and decision-making of local and national actors within partnerships

**Means of verification (or evidence of activity)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collection tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT INDICATOR: LEADERSHIP - National actors define and lead on humanitarian action</td>
<td><strong>Evidence of national organisations meeting with and directly engaging donors / national humanitarian leaders</strong>, <strong>Representations of national leadership in media reporting of recent responses</strong></td>
<td>KII, KII &amp; DR - org charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT INDICATOR: COORDINATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY - Application and respect for commonly agreed approaches to 'as local as possible and as international as necessary'</td>
<td><strong>Perception that local, national and international actors have understanding of complementarity of roles</strong></td>
<td>KII, KII &amp; DR - org charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT INDICATOR: PARTNERSHIP - All actors invest in and benefit from national leadership</td>
<td><strong>Representation of national and international actors in humanitarian response</strong></td>
<td>ALL, ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT INDICATOR: ACTIVITY - All actors design and deliver interventions in line with national leadership</td>
<td><strong>Evidence of national actors working with and supporting local and national actors about respecting and working with in-country leadership structures and mechanisms</strong></td>
<td>ALL, ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IMPACT INDICATOR: COORDINATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY - Application and respect for commonly agreed approaches to ‘as local as possible and as international as necessary’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Means of verification (or evidence of activity)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collection tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. National representation and engagement in coordination forums and meetings</td>
<td>% breakdown of national and international organisations leading national and subnational clusters</td>
<td>Cluster coordinators</td>
<td>KII &amp; DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% breakdown of national and international organisations participating in clusters</td>
<td>Cluster coordinators</td>
<td>KII &amp; DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of coordination meetings conducted in local language</td>
<td>Cluster coordinators</td>
<td>KII &amp; DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership of cluster administration and report writing (who writes / who sets meeting agenda)</td>
<td>Cluster coordinators</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that local and national actors can engage as equal partners and are able to participate actively in coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floor time of international and national actors in cluster meetings</td>
<td>Cluster meeting</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clearly defined parameters for international actors complementing local and national actors in humanitarian response</td>
<td>Perception that international actors support, rather than undermine, government coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that local, national and international actors have understanding of complementarity of roles</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National civil society coordination mechanisms are funded and have technical capacity to operate in humanitarian response</td>
<td>% of national civil society coordination mechanisms’ budgets funded by international donors</td>
<td>National Coordination mechanism</td>
<td>KII - national coordination bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that civil society coordination mechanisms have capacity in humanitarian response</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Humanitarian response is delivered in a way that is collaborative and complementary (i.e. based on an analysis of the specific strengths/weaknesses of different humanitarian actors)</td>
<td>Extent to which organisations felt their potential contribution to the last response was fully utilised</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS &amp; KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extent to which organisations felt their capacity was strengthened or undermined in the last response</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS &amp; KII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IMPACT INDICATOR: PARTICIPATION - Communities lead and participate in humanitarian response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Means of verification (or evidence of activity)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collection tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Development of community/ contextualised standards for all actors working in that context</td>
<td>Number of common humanitarian standards, tools and policies that have been contextualised</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII &amp; SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of key documents such as emergency response procedures that have been translated or developed by L/NA</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS &amp; DR - Response plans, standards, policies, needs assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that standards, tools and policies are appropriate to meet the needs of the affected population</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communities have increased opportunities to shape programming, including evaluating INGO work</td>
<td>Existence of formal mechanisms within L/NA and international organisations to provide information to, and ensure the participation of affected populations (including feedback mechanisms)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### POLICY INFLUENCE/ADVOCACY/VISIBILITY - Humanitarian action reflects the priorities of affected communities and national actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Means of verification (or evidence of activity)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collection tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Policies are informed by local and national voice including communities</td>
<td>Involvement of L/NA in the preparation of the Humanitarian Needs Overview and Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition of partner role, and credit for local design and implementation of programming in international partner reporting</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII &amp; DR- INGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that humanitarian policies and approaches are informed by local and national voice including communities</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National actors are recognised as key stakeholders in national debates about policies and standards that may have significant impact on them</td>
<td>Increase in the number of times that the names of national and local collaborators, including sub-contractors, appear in reports to donors and external communications, relative to those of international actors</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>DR - INGO report and public documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement of L/NA and NGO networks in humanitarian policy issues and standard-setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of national and international authorship of significant research products related to humanitarian issues in country</td>
<td>Research publications (within selected locations for specific time period)</td>
<td>DR - research publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local and national actors influence on donor priorities in country, including program design and implementation</td>
<td>Increase in L/NA access to the largest in-country donors</td>
<td>National actors</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Means of verification (or evidence of activity)</td>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>Data collection tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. National and regional surge capacity and use of local over international expertise</td>
<td>Use of national and regional surge capacity over international expertise</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII, DR - response reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-mapping of surge support in national and local organisations</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII, DR - project plans, organisational development documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Australian based staff on deployment registers / number of annual deployments</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DR - organisation reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of national and local organisations that have been facilitated to engage with international frameworks and standards such as CHS, HQAI, Sphere etc.</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII, DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that L/NA are appropriately supported by partner/international organisations in advance of and during humanitarian response</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Actors do not undermine capacity of national actors in emergency response</td>
<td>Are L/NA receiving an explicit funding line item to determine their own capacity?</td>
<td>Budget proposals</td>
<td>DR - budgets/funding agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that L/NA are able define their own organisational capacity needs</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that international actors do not undermine capacity of national actors in emergency response</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contextualised humanitarian standards, tools and policies are available</td>
<td>Number of humanitarian standards, tools and policies available in the local language</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DR - standards, tools and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that humanitarian standards, tools and policies are accessible and appropriate</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key documents such as emergency response procedures and needs assessments have been developed by L/NA (authorship of documents)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII, DR - emergency response procedures, policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Legislation and plans in place to support national response capacity</td>
<td>Disaster response legislation and plans in place with clear roles for international and national actors</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FUNDING - Increased number of national/local organisations describing financial independence that allows them to respond more efficiently to humanitarian response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Means of verification (or evidence of activity)</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data collection tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. L/NA have access to direct funding with limited or no barriers</td>
<td>Perception that L/NA have increased control over funding decisions</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that humanitarian funding is more directly allocated to L/NA</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency of financial transactions and budgets as perceived by L/NA. Do L/NA have visibility over project budgets?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS, DR - contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do L/NA actors receive over heads?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII, DR - budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanisms exist to provide funding quickly in emergency response for national actors (e.g. Emergency Response Funds)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII, DR - policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L/NA can access funding without intermediary</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the top five largest national/local organisations, how many have direct engagement with key donors (without presence of international partners)?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII, DR - annual report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase in the amount of humanitarian funding to local and national actors</td>
<td>Perception that more humanitarian funding is being allocated to local and national actors</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%/$ of funding that is directly given to L/NA</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DR - funding agreements, WHS commitment reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in the number of international actors that publish the percentage of funding passed on to local NGOs</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>DR - response reporting/annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception that L/NA receive a fair proportion of funding compared to international actors in humanitarian response</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local and national actors have increased decision making over financial matters</td>
<td>Perception that L/NA have increased control over funding decisions</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do partners see overall budgets?</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>KII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>