



VISION PAPER: Toward an equitable humanitarian knowledge and evidence landscape



GLOW
CONSULTANTS

Institute of Innovations for
Gender & Humanitarian
Transformations **insights**



PIANGO



HUMANITARIAN
ADVISORY GROUP



**Australian
Aid**

HSC **Humanitarian
Studies Centre**



Gerald J. and Dorothy R. Friedman
School of Nutrition Science and Policy
FEINSTEIN INTERNATIONAL CENTER

HPG
Humanitarian
Policy Group



Acknowledgements

Research team: Pamela Combinido, Idha Kurniasih, Eranda Wijewickrama and San May Thu (Humanitarian Advisory Group), Leaine Robinson and Iris Low (CoLAB), Zaki Ullah (GLOW Consultants), Suman Ahsanul Islam (inSights), Panji Dimas and Hendra Wijaya (Pujiono Centre), and Emeline Siale Ilolahia (PIANGO).

Editor: Josie Flint

Graphic design: Jean Watson

Cover and interior painting: Maria Shestakova / Alamy Stock Photo

Suggested citation: HAG, CoLAB, inSights, GLOW, PIANGO and Pujiono Centre (2024). *Vision Paper: Toward an Equitable Humanitarian Knowledge and Evidence Landscape*. Melbourne: HAG.

The research team would like to thank the following key learning partners for their contribution, knowledge and expertise as part of the research. They supported the development of the vision by participating in the consultation process and reviewing and providing feedback on the draft version of the report. John Bryant and Megan Daigle (Humanitarian Policy Group), Dr Merry Fitzpatrick (Feinstein International Center, Tufts University), Cordelia Lonsdale and Dr Gillian McKay (Elrha), Hana Abul Hsn (Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action), Dr Kaira Zoe Albuero Cañete (The Hague Humanitarian Studies Centre), and Stephanie Stern (Action Against Hunger).

Eleanor Davey wrote the earlier version of the literature review that was used to inform the vision paper.

This publication was funded by the Australian Government through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. The views expressed in this publication are the authors' alone and do not necessarily reflect those of the Australian Government.

Humanitarian Horizons 2021-2024

This report is part of the Power, People and Local Leadership stream of the Humanitarian Horizons 2021– 2024 research program. Humanitarian Horizons is a three-year research initiative that adds unique value to humanitarian action in the Indo-Pacific by generating evidence and creating conversations for change. It is supported by the Australian Government through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

The research program for 2021–24 builds on the achievements of the Humanitarian Horizons pilot phase (2017–18), the previous iteration of the program (2018–21) and Humanitarian Advisory Group's experience in supporting the sector for almost 10 years. The research is structured into three interlocking streams: 1) [Power, People and Local Leadership](#), 2) [Greening the System](#), and 3) [Real-Time Analysis and Influence](#). It is underpinned by a fourth stream that considers [governance, accountability, and monitoring, evaluation and learning processes](#)



Humanitarian Advisory Group is BCorp certified. This little logo means we work hard to ensure that our business is a force for good. We have chosen to hold ourselves accountable to the highest social, environmental and ethical standards, setting ourselves apart from business as usual.



About the partners

Collaborate Consulting Pty Ltd (CoLAB) is a Fiji-based development consultancy company that has delivered projects with diverse partners in the Pacific, Asia, Africa and Europe. CoLAB's vision is to achieve localised responses to development that are inclusive and sustainable, enabled through genuine collaboration amongst all partners.

GLOW Consultants, based in Pakistan, is a leading national entity providing practice solutions and field implementation support to donors, their implementing partners and research institutions. GLOW has successfully completed more than 100 third-party monitoring and evaluation assignments.

inSights (the Institute of Innovation for Gender and Humanitarian Transformation) is a Bangladesh-based social enterprise providing insights that challenge the current ways of working in humanitarian aid and gender affairs. inSights aims to transform ideas within the humanitarian, social and businesses sectors, turning them into innovations, knowledge and strategies.

The Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (PIANGO) functions as a regional secretariat to a network of umbrella organisations or platforms that are registered in 24 countries, territories and states across the Pacific region. PIANGO's primary role is as a catalyst for collective action, to facilitate and support coalitions and alliances on issues of common concern, and to strengthen the influence and impact of non-governmental organisations' efforts in the region.

The Pujiono Centre is a not-for-profit company established by disaster management practitioners in Indonesia as a new modality, institutional arrangement, and platform for obtaining, sharing and disseminating knowledge about disaster management by supporting evidence-based assessments for policymakers.

Humanitarian Advisory Group (HAG) was founded in 2012 to elevate the profile of humanitarian action in Asia and the Pacific. Set up as a social enterprise, HAG provides a unique space for thinking, research, technical advice and training that contributes to excellence in humanitarian practice.

Contents

Executive summary	6
Introduction	9
The current landscape	12
Our shared vision	15
Where to from here? Putting the vision into action	29
Endnotes	30

Executive summary

As the humanitarian sector grapples with increasingly complex challenges, the need to prioritise, value and integrate local expertise and knowledge has never been more critical. Decades of evidence have demonstrated the necessity to shift from top-down approaches to those that genuinely embrace the diversity of knowledge, skills, and insights found within communities affected by crises and amongst local actors. Whilst there have been efforts to address issues in the process of producing knowledge and evidence in the sector, leading to incremental changes such as increasing diversity in research teams, a gap remains in practical and tangible steps that can be taken at both policy and operational levels around how to better use knowledge and evidence from communities affected by crisis. Opportunities exist, but we need a clearer articulation of, and support for, the path forward to harness existing momentum.

THE VISION FOR A MORE EQUITABLE HUMANITARIAN KNOWLEDGE AND EVIDENCE LANDSCAPE

This vision paper articulates the overarching components of, and direction for, an aspirational knowledge and evidence landscape based on equity to support more effective humanitarian action. It seeks to facilitate more inclusive and equitable ways of generating knowledge by identifying practical actions for the humanitarian sector to strengthen its learning systems by valuing and integrating the knowledge and expertise of Global South and local actors.

By building on pockets of change and the decades-long advocacy efforts by different researchers, organisations and networks seeking to challenge the status quo, this vision is based on the intention that the future of humanitarian action must be shaped by, and for, those who experience its impact most directly. This includes contributing to humanitarian action that meets needs, and where decisions and actions are fair and equitable, inclusive and also driven by the knowledge and capabilities of local actors. The approach includes an overarching vision statement followed by four key focus areas, each with detailed priority actions and ideas to measure progress.



VISION:

Humanitarian sector priorities, decisions and actions are led by and value the diversity of local expertise and knowledge in order to better address needs of affected populations.



Focus area 1

How the humanitarian knowledge **agenda is set**



Objective

Local actors including crisis-affected communities shape decisions and priorities about knowledge and evidence direction and needs.



Focus area 2

How humanitarian knowledge is **generated**



Objective

Humanitarian actors consistently demonstrate the value and use of different ways of knowing and different types of knowledge.



Focus area 3

How humanitarian knowledge is **co-produced**



Objective

Humanitarian actors invest in respectful and equitable partnerships to ensure that knowledge is co-produced, co-owned and rooted in local priorities.



Focus area 4

How humanitarian knowledge is **shared and used**



Objective

Humanitarian actors utilise and make accessible the knowledge and evidence produced in ways that empower and benefit all stakeholders, particularly those most affected by crises.

WHAT THIS INVOLVES



How decisions are made about when knowledge outputs are needed, including scope of work, priorities, agendas and research questions to explore; and the factors shaping those decisions.



How diverse approaches, methodologies, types of knowledge and expertise and ways of sharing and analysing knowledge are used.



How collaborative relationships between partners are defined and created to facilitate the process of knowledge and evidence co-production including mutual agreements on roles, resources, and recognition.



How evidence and insights are communicated and shared including translation into actionable recommendations for humanitarian practice and findings for affected communities.

USING THE VISION TO ACTION

We hope this vision is not merely aspirational but serves as a practical approach for transforming current inequitable practices into ways of working that genuinely value and integrate diverse local perspectives. The vision can be used in the following ways:

- **As a basis for advocacy:** Use the vision as a tool for advocating policy and best practice changes at both organisational and international levels. This includes discussing with your team regarding potential challenges with implementing the vision, along with strategies to mitigate them. Utilise the vision to foster discussions about power dynamics and knowledge equity within humanitarian forums, conferences, and workshops. Emphasise the importance of local and indigenous expertise in all stages of knowledge and evidence generation processes and push for reforms that institutionalise these principles.
- **As a basis for planning and capacity strengthening:** Integrate the vision into strategic planning processes by ensuring that preparedness, response, and evaluation frameworks are designed with Global South and local expertise at the forefront. Incorporate the vision into training programs for humanitarian practitioners to instill the values of equity and inclusivity. Develop policies and procedures that reflect the identified action areas outlined in this vision.
- **As a basis for tracking change:** Develop monitoring and evaluation criteria based on the proposed ways to measure progress on the vision's components. Create feedback mechanisms that allow local and indigenous communities to lead the identification of what success looks like, ensuring continuous improvement based on their insights.

By embedding this vision in advocacy, planning, and tracking progress, we hope it serves as a pathway to guide meaningful and responsive action that evolves with insights and leadership from local and Global South experts and communities. This vision is moving from aspiration to action, beginning to build momentum.



INTRODUCTION

Generating and applying knowledge are critical to facilitating effective and sustainable humanitarian action. However, these processes are heavily influenced by power structures and politics. Critically reflecting on who gathers evidence and translates it into knowledge; whose knowledge is listened to and acted upon; how this plays out within humanitarian organisations; and how this reflects broader structural inequalities – have been recognised as fundamental to key localisation focus areas such as operational leadership and system reform.¹

WHAT IS THIS VISION PAPER ABOUT?

This vision paper articulates the overarching components of, and direction for, an aspirational knowledge and evidence landscape based on equity to support more effective humanitarian action. It seeks to facilitate more inclusive ways of generating knowledge by identifying practical actions for the humanitarian sector to value and integrate the knowledge and expertise of Global South and local actors. It proposes an approach that includes four focus areas, each with detailed priority actions and ideas to measure progress. The vision is informed by evidence from existing literature, including research undertaken under the Power, People and Local Leadership research stream, and through a series of consultation with key actors from Global South and North research institutions, and commissioning agencies. It was guided by the following questions:

1. What does success look like in achieving a more equitable humanitarian knowledge and evidence landscape?
2. What key components need to be included?
3. How can we measure progress in achieving the vision?

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Many researchers and practitioners are putting a spotlight on the different ways inequities manifest in the knowledge production process across the humanitarian sector and how this needs to change. These analyses point to how the production and use of knowledge within the humanitarian sector — from assessments, implementation and reporting, monitoring and evaluation, to training and research — is problematic. It is not designed or assessed with diverse values, knowledge and experience that equally reflects Global South, local actor or community expertise and priorities, and it particularly disadvantages those who are already marginalised within the sector and in global power dynamics.²

In recent years, the sector has increased its efforts to reflect these issues in the process of knowledge production, including developing new methodologies to address the negative impacts of existing power dynamics within the humanitarian research.³ These efforts have contributed to incremental changes such as (some) strengthening of participation of communities or increasing the diversity within research and evaluation teams, including by engaging more Global South and local researchers.⁴

In order to leverage these existing pockets of positive change, it is critical to understand what success looks like in achieving a more equitable landscape and to use this to galvanise support from different actors. This is important as there is a key gap in practical and tangible steps that can be taken at both policy and operational levels around how to better use knowledge and evidence from communities affected by crisis. Opportunities exist, but we need a clearer articulation of, and support for, the path forward to harness existing momentum.

VISION PAPER OUTLINE

This vision paper is divided into the following sections:

- Section 1 provides an overview of the current knowledge and evidence landscape
- Section 2 outlines the overall vision and the four focus areas
- Section 3 concludes the paper and identifies pathways to use the vision in advocacy, planning, and discussions.

About the research

This vision paper is part of the Power, People and Local Leadership (PPLL) stream of the Humanitarian Horizons 2021-2024 research program. The PPLL stream has published a series of interlinked investigations of the politics of humanitarian knowledge and what changes can help bring about more inclusive and equitable approaches to research, analysis and decision-making. This vision paper extends this collaborative work and aims to leverage stakeholder engagements for increased support from diverse actors such as donors and Global North and South research organisations.

METHODS

The vision was developed in partnership with our institutional research partners (see the Acknowledgment section), and through consultation with key actors including Global North research institutions and donor agencies. The vision development process involved:

- 1. Scoping and mapping:** This scoping process analysed and drew together common elements of success and potential components of a vision elaborated in the previous research papers, and other existing research in this area. It also draws on a literature review to support the work under the Power, People and Local Leadership (PPLL) research stream and insights from previous studies which HAG and partners led including, for example, the report, *Stories for Change*, which drew on the expertise and knowledge of Global South and local actors about the challenges to achieving a more equitable knowledge and evidence landscape.⁵ It identified key issues and questions which informed the components of the vision, and drew on some of the good practices identified as well as providing recommendations.
- 2. Vision development with partners:** An initial workshop with institutional research partners including CoLAB (Fiji), GLOW Consultants (Pakistan), inSights (Bangladesh), Pacific Island Association of Non-Government Organizations (Fiji) and Pujiono Centre (Indonesia) was carried out

to interrogate the components emerging from the mapping process to identify gaps in the vision. This process also included examining if there were any components that needed to be refined in order to capture different elements of knowledge and evidence generation processes.

- 3. Consultation with key stakeholders:** This process included engaging with Global North research institutions to explore the emerging vision components and understand how these resonated and where the gaps were. It also involved separate consultation process with key donor agencies to understand their perspectives on the proposed vision and prioritised key actions.

UNPACKING KEY TERMS

Global North and Global South: The terms 'Global North' and 'Global South' are polarising and contested. They depend on generalising labels such as 'developed' and 'developing', 'high income' and 'low income'. They do not capture the complexity and diversity within and between countries that can reinforce binaries of power, governance and dependence.

We use the terms Global North and Global South 'to distinguish between countries with high income economies (Global North) that have historically dominated the provision of development and humanitarian aid, and countries with middle- or lower-income economies (Global South) ... and have historically been recipients of aid'.⁸ We acknowledge the ongoing impact of colonialism that continue to shape power imbalances and inequities in the humanitarian sector, and this vision seeks to actively confront these legacies.

We acknowledge the flaws in using these terms, including the profound differences between countries in each category. They also imperfectly reflect our interest in how affected societies are contributing to localised decision-making through research, analysis and/or evaluation, because not all countries considered part of the Global South host humanitarian operations, and not all humanitarian operations take place in the Global South.

Additionally, we recognise that actors may not identify with these categories or may represent both Global South and North institutions.⁶ We believe, however, that these distinctions are important because of the structural inequalities and power differentials that affect knowledge production and access.

Local actor: We use the term 'local actor' where relevant to recognise that Global South partners are not always based in the research country context. By local actor, we mean institutions based and operating within the local context of reference, comprising citizens subject to local laws, and whose work is centred on local communities.⁷

Knowledge and evidence: Various definitions and understandings of knowledge have been proposed in relation to the humanitarian sector.⁸ In this vision paper, we take a broad view of defining knowledge and evidence in that it comprises of the aspects that 'allow individuals and organisations to interpret crisis situations and respond according to the local needs and global humanitarian principles and experience'.⁹ We also refer to 'knowledge and evidence outputs' as shorthand to include diverse operational and research outputs such as needs assessments, planning documents, research reports, and evaluations among others.

Power: We acknowledge the many forms and expressions of power present in humanitarian practice. Some are more visible or explicit than others, and the most useful way of conceptualising them can vary depending on the context and dynamics. For the purposes of this vision, we consider it to mean the power and control of decision-making or resources over those without.¹⁰

THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE

This section provides a brief snapshot of some key inequities in the production and use of knowledge and evidence in the humanitarian sector to set the scene for the vision, and the rationale for why a shift in approach is needed. These inequities relate to the diversity of systemic issues and barriers that affect the inclusivity, quality and accessibility of knowledge and evidence generation process. These have been explored significantly in existing literature, including in several research reports under the Power, People and Local Leadership research stream.¹¹

SITES OF INEQUITIES

Limited representation. Knowledge production is often dominated by organisations and researchers based in the Global North, leading to underrepresentation of perspectives from the Global South. This overrepresentation by Global North institutions¹² has been criticised for limiting opportunities for Global South actors to shape agendas, terms and scope of knowledge and evidence outputs – particularly in research and evaluation, but also in producing humanitarian documents such as situation reports and response plans.¹³ Evidence shows that this results in knowledge products that are not contextually relevant or do not reflect communities' voices or priorities, and fail to build ownership and support uptake by the communities they were intended to serve.¹⁴

Certain types of knowledge are not equally valued. Another site of inequity lies in the privileging of certain research methodologies and knowledge frameworks,¹⁵ overlooking indigenous knowledge and culturally specific understandings.¹⁶ Local knowledge, including indigenous knowledge as well as other ways of knowing that don't adhere to Northern knowledge frameworks or disciplines, is at risk of being treated as having little operational relevance,¹⁷ of not being fully trusted 'as 'valid and reliable' by international humanitarian actors',¹⁸ and of not being seen as transferable beyond its context of origin.¹⁹ Aside from humanitarian actors' lack of ability to systematically explore and use other methodologies, there is also a privileging of quantitative data – that is, it is considered by key decision-makers, money-holders, and leaders to be more legitimate than other forms of information.²⁰ This reliance on 'quantification' has become a way for organisations to justify and legitimise the operational choices they make, as well as core to planning, management, and evaluation in the sector, to the extent that it has been described as 'an essential component of contemporary humanitarianism.'²¹

Power dynamics and hierarchies in partnerships. Partnerships are at the core of how knowledge and evidence is produced in the sector, and are frequently an area in which unequal power dynamics are observed between Global North and Global South actors. Global North organisations largely control what kinds of knowledge and evidence outputs are produced in partnerships with Global South actors, what evidence counts and whose voices are amplified, marginalising local researchers and affected communities.²² This imbalance of power between Global North and Global South actors affect the unequal distribution of roles,²³ resources,²⁴ control of research agendas, and recognition, including intellectual property rights between Global North and South collaborators.²⁵

Extractive processes. Knowledge and evidence generation is often conducted in a way that extracts knowledge from affected communities without sharing the results in contextually appropriate ways. This relates to the 'epistemic exploitation' that occurs where members of marginalised groups are required to do the unpaid and often unacknowledged work of providing information, resources, and evidence of oppression to privileged persons who demand it – often at a great cost to their mental health and well-being.²⁶

Barriers to knowledge use and sharing. Various researchers have also been interrogating the limitations of humanitarian actors in using evidence in decision-making. Some of the persistent concerns include 1) that decisions are not sufficiently evidence-based,²⁷ 2) that more data is collected or generated than is used,²⁸ 3) that there is a lack of high-quality and rigorous evidence for decision-making despite an increased volume of research.²⁹ Others have noted that the emphasis on evidence has had the effect of leaving less space for consideration of how communities affected by crises can produce and use knowledge of their predicament.³⁰ For example, in humanitarian evaluations, despite the strong recognition of the humanitarian imperative and ethical responsibility to ensure that communities access, and benefit from, M&E knowledge, it is rarely a standard practice that humanitarian agencies, consultants, and research organisations inform communities about the results of their work and how their insights have been used.³¹

How inequities manifest in humanitarian action

Literature on humanitarian knowledge consistently identifies a hierarchical division of knowledge between 'local' knowledge and 'international' knowledge and undervaluing of local knowledge in particular.³² This hierarchical division has significant operational implications, as the underutilisation of local knowledge often leads to less effective and less contextually appropriate humanitarian responses.³³ Some of the examples include:

- 1. Lack of channels for recognising and using local knowledge in response:** A lack of channels established for sharing 'local', community or contextual information during a disaster, as seen during the 2010 Haiti earthquake response, when international agencies assumed there was no data or knowledge locally available.³⁴
- 2. Selective codification of knowledge:** For example, 'Sitreps [that] represent the "humanitarian consensus" as in the "consensus of the international humanitarian actors," not the consensus of those affected by a crisis.'³⁵
- 3. Exclusionary approaches to knowledge sharing and management:** For example, 'Cluster-based websites to share information are largely tailored to international actors, written in complex English and communicated through text-intensive reports which risks excluding national and local community non-English speakers.'³⁶
- 4. Neglect of indigenous knowledge** in approaches to knowledge management.³⁷
- 5. Unrepresentative research teams**, for example, the lack of national researchers or experts in the Joint Evaluation of the response to genocide and displacement in Rwanda.³⁸
- 6. The dominance of Global North institutions in producing key sector reform and planning documents:** For example, response plans, evaluations, Grand Bargain documents, and in the written publications they draw upon.³⁹
- 7. The lack of local and national actors' participation and data in international data initiatives** such as International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC), and Financial Tracking Service (FTS).⁴⁰

WHAT ARE THE FLOW ON EFFECTS OF THESE INEQUITIES?

The denial of expertise and knowledge represents an injustice in its own right.⁴¹ However, it also has operational consequences. Outlined below is a brief overview of some of the impacts or follow on effects of unequal or biased humanitarian knowledge production.



For communities

- The community can become fatigued – they can be interviewed by multiple actors without clear results or outputs that benefit them
- Community members, in some instance, have to rely on contextually ill-informed, poor-quality or biased analysis
- Decision-makers involved with communities (e.g. governments or implementing agencies) neglect opportunities to understand their views and fail to respond to community priorities



For researchers

- Local actors are relegated to passive, transactional enumerators or respondents
- Poor visibility in parts or all of the process can perpetuate negative assumptions about credibility
- There are few opportunities to improve skills, knowledge and network development



For research outputs

- Research outputs are not contextually relevant or do not reflect communities' voices/priorities
- Research outputs are not contextualised and risk not being utilised
- Outputs have little ownership and uptake by the communities they were intended to serve
- Poor or no translation means people who do not understand English cannot access the research
- Outputs are not returned to the local respondents and actors who provided data



For the sector

- If the research questions, frameworks and instruments are not fit for purpose, then the outputs will be irrelevant, contributing to non-evidence based decision-making
- There are few opportunities for good practice and innovation; research outputs become "dead documents" that are not used
- Responses do not reach some sub-groups of the population, particularly those that are most vulnerable

Source: [Stories for Change: Elevating Global South Experiences in Humanitarian Knowledge Production](#)



OUR SHARED VISION

As the humanitarian sector grapples with increasingly complex challenges, the need to prioritise, value and integrate local expertise and knowledge has never been more critical. As discussed in the previous section, decades of evidence have demonstrated the necessity to shift from top-down approaches to those that genuinely embrace the diversity of perspectives, skills, and insights found within communities affected by crises and amongst local actors.

The vision below articulates the direction for, and components of, a more equitable knowledge and evidence landscape. It seeks to build on pockets of change and the decades-long advocacy efforts by different researchers, organisations and networks seeking to challenge the status quo. This vision is based on the intention that the future of humanitarian action must be shaped by, and for, those who experience its impact most directly. This includes contributing to humanitarian action that meets needs, and where decisions and actions are fair, equitable, inclusive and driven by the knowledge and capabilities of local actors.

OUR PROPOSED VISION FOR A MORE EQUITABLE KNOWLEDGE AND EVIDENCE LANDSCAPE:



Our vision

Humanitarian sector priorities, decisions and actions are led by and value the diversity of local expertise and knowledge in order to better address the needs of affected populations.



The vision is underpinned by the following foundations:



ADDRESSING UNEQUAL POWER DYNAMICS. We recognise that a critical starting point to achieving the vision is putting a spotlight on and tackling unequal power dynamics. Power imbalances in humanitarian knowledge and evidence production between Global North and Global South actors need to be addressed in order to strengthen equity and inclusivity in producing knowledge and evidence that is relevant, and effectively influences decision-making and implementation.



ENABLING LOCAL LEADERSHIP. Knowledge generation processes should be primarily driven by individuals and organisations within the affected communities. Recognising the diversity of local expertise and knowledge means valuing the rich array of skills, experiences, and insights that exist within affected communities. This includes traditional knowledge, local practices, and innovative approaches developed in response to unique challenges.



SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE HUMANITARIAN ACTION. We recognise that the production, recognition, and use of multiple types of knowledge and evidence are vital issues for supporting effective humanitarian action. These activities need to be critically interrogated as they help to determine and justify choices made in humanitarian settings in all phases of a humanitarian response.⁴²

ABOUT THE FOCUS AREAS

The vision is broken into four focus areas. The four focus areas are intended to capture the interlinked and overlapping stages of the knowledge generation process, and can be used to inform the production of outputs to support humanitarian action including research, evaluation, needs assessments, response plans and reviews among others.



Focus area 1

How the humanitarian knowledge **agenda is set**



Focus area 2

How humanitarian knowledge is **generated**



Focus area 3

How humanitarian knowledge is **co-produced**



Focus area 4

How humanitarian knowledge is **shared and used**

The vision also includes strategies for tracking progress and ensuring accountability under each of the focus areas. It also provides a range of resources and tools tailored to support these efforts. Together, these components of the vision are designed to be practical and actionable, offering concrete steps to implement changes in real-time and adapt approaches whilst setting ambitious goals.



VISION:

Humanitarian sector priorities, decisions and actions are led by and value the diversity of local expertise and knowledge in order to better address needs of affected populations.



Focus area 1

How the humanitarian knowledge **agenda is set**



Objective

Local actors including crisis-affected communities shape decisions and priorities about knowledge and evidence direction and needs.



Focus area 2

How humanitarian knowledge is **generated**



Objective

Humanitarian actors consistently demonstrate the value and use of different ways of knowing and different types of knowledge.



Focus area 3

How humanitarian knowledge is **co-produced**



Objective

Humanitarian actors invest in respectful and equitable partnerships to ensure that knowledge is co-produced, co-owned and rooted in local priorities.



Focus area 4

How humanitarian knowledge is **shared and used**



Objective

Humanitarian actors utilise and make accessible the knowledge and evidence produced in ways that empower and benefit all stakeholders, particularly those most affected by crises.

WHAT THIS INVOLVES



How decisions are made about when knowledge outputs are needed, including scope of work, priorities, agendas and research questions to explore; and the factors shaping those decisions.



How diverse approaches, methodologies, types of knowledge and expertise and ways of sharing and analysing knowledge are used.



How collaborative relationships between partners are defined and created to facilitate the process of knowledge and evidence co-production including mutual agreements on roles, resources, and recognition.



How evidence and insights are communicated and shared including translation into actionable recommendations for humanitarian practice and findings for affected communities.

FOCUS AREAS



Focus area 1: How the humanitarian knowledge agenda is set

KEY OBJECTIVE: Local actors including crisis-affected communities shape decisions and priorities about knowledge and evidence direction and needs to inform humanitarian responses.

WHAT THIS INVOLVES: This focus area encompasses the decision-making processes about when knowledge and evidence outputs are needed, including the scope of work and research questions to explore; and interrogates the factors shaping those decisions including the impacts of how agenda setting processes work in practice. This is particularly relevant during the initial design and planning phase and during the development of proposals, terms of reference (ToRs), and application approval criteria.⁴³

WHAT SHIFTS NEED TO HAPPEN? Global North donors, operational agencies and research institutions currently dominate decision-making and planning about the needs for, and types of, knowledge and evidence, dictating what questions to answer, which topics to prioritise, and how to proceed. This needs to shift to a collaborative process where local experiences and co-identified knowledge gaps inform and guide priorities from the outset.

1. Key action: Prioritise locally identified knowledge and evidence needs and priorities.

Commissioning agencies and Global North

- ✓ Create default processes, such as standard consultation frameworks and participatory design sessions in planning and design for meaningful collaboration with Global South and local actors, ensuring that knowledge and evidence outputs reflect affected community priorities and needs.
- ✓ Invest in funding modalities like earmarking funds for local knowledge and evidence outputs, creating exclusive grant schemes, and implementing flexible, adaptive funding mechanisms to swiftly address emerging local priorities.

Global South

- ✓ Support and enable connections with affected communities or end users to ensure that knowledge agendas and proposed outputs are relevant to community and accurately portray their views.
- ✓ Include processes or accountability requirements in partnerships with Global North or international partners to demonstrate how these outputs consider and meet these priorities (also see Focus Area 3 on knowledge co-production).

All

- ✓ Promote the importance of locally identified needs and knowledge systems within international and national forums and donor platforms.

2. Key action: Strengthen access for community representatives and Global South actors to engage with and participate in knowledge and evidence decision making platforms (e.g. steering committees etc.).

Commissioning agencies and Global North

- ✓ Ensure that governance structures and decision-making bodies overseeing knowledge and evidence outputs always include significant representation from local communities and Global South or local actors, and ensure their voices are heard within those structures.
- ✓ Commit to co-creating knowledge and learning agendas, strategies, and policies with Global South or local actors.
- ✓ Share resources, information, and opportunities with Global South and local partners to enhance their ability to participate and influence decisions on knowledge and evidence generation direction and process.

Global North

- ✓ Advocate for and support commissioning agencies to contract and fund Global South or local actors directly as project leads.⁴⁴
- ✓ Ensure that Global South experts and practitioners are compensated for the time commitments they provide to support the knowledge and evidence agenda setting process.

Global South

- ✓ Build communication and partnership review processes that enable concerns to be raised when the knowledge agenda does not adequately reflect Global South stakeholder leadership or joint consultation.⁴⁵
- ✓ Strengthen networks of Global South actors to collectively advocate for greater representation in decision-making spaces.

All

- ✓ Ensure community representation in ways that are appropriate for communities in mechanisms such as consultative groups or advisory boards to enable contribution by different voices.⁴⁶

3. Key action: Address institutional biases that preference knowledge produced by Global North actors, systems and processes.

Commissioning agencies and Global North

- ✓ Build in default processes for always including Global South or local experts in knowledge and evidence work, including reviewing organisational processes to identify and address barriers such project design processes.
- ✓ Assess recruitment biases and examine procurement frameworks for direct engagement with Global South researchers. Identify feasible changes and develop action plans to address them.
- ✓ Share positive emerging practices in partnership with Global South actors in relevant forums to build momentum and provide evidence of change.

Global South

- ✓ Support open discussions with Global North actors and in partnerships about how these biases manifest in practice, and build examples of emerging positive practice that can be shared.⁴⁷

Ideas for measuring progress:

- Track the proportion of knowledge and evidence outputs (e.g. research, needs assessments, response plans, evaluations) that are initiated by, led by or meaningfully co-led with Global South and local actors.
- Track the diversity and inclusivity of Global South and local stakeholders involved in setting research and evaluation agendas.
- Assess the alignment of knowledge and evidence outputs with the identified needs and priorities of local communities.



Learning from others

Linda Tuhiwai Smith [describes](#) how Maori communities in New Zealand have sought to reclaim research by training their own researchers and implementing a community-based vetting process which allows the community to have control over what research is conducted, how it is conducted, and how the findings will be used. This ensures that research is not exploitative and that it benefits the community rather than just external researchers.

Additional tools and resources:

- Power in Knowledge and Evidence Framework is designed as a tool to help organisations assess their evidence use and citation practices and subsequently start conversations around challenges and opportunities in amplifying Global South knowledge.
- Read examples of research that show the impact of externally-driven agenda setting:
 - ▶ 'Analysing famine: The politics of information and analysis in food security crises,' by D Maxwell and P Hailey. (2021). *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs* 3 (1): 16–27;
 - ▶ 'How humanitarian assistance practices exacerbate vulnerability: Knowledges, authority and legitimacy in disaster interventions in Baltistan, Pakistan' by A Arifeen and I Nyborg. (2021). *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*;
 - ▶ 'Knowledge and power: A critique of an international relief operation' by B Hendrie. (1997). *Disasters* 21 (1): 57–76.
- Explore various resources that examine how Global South leadership in humanitarian research and evaluation can be achieved:
 - ▶ [The Bukavu Series](#), hosted by the Governance in Conflict Network, featured a series of blogs authored by researchers sharing their experiences in producing research as well as navigating and challenging power dynamics in the process;
 - ▶ ALNAP's scoping study outlines strategies for supporting locally-led monitoring and evaluation in humanitarian contexts by: 1) shaping evaluation culture and policy, 2) building know-how, and 3) fostering key relationships. It also provides actionable steps for planning, implementing, and using evaluations effectively.



Focus area 2: How humanitarian knowledge is generated

KEY OBJECTIVE: Humanitarian actors consistently demonstrate the value and use of different ways of knowing and different types of knowledge.

WHAT THIS INVOLVES: This focus area encompasses how diverse approaches, methodologies, types of knowledge and expertise and ways of knowing and analysis are used. This is particularly relevant when designing methodologies, data collection process, and analysis that supports the welfare of affected communities and draws on cross-sectoral expertise in order to have a comprehensive understanding of complex humanitarian situations.

WHAT SHIFTS NEED TO HAPPEN: A shift across the humanitarian system away from the dominance and privileging of particular types of knowledge that conform to Global North standards towards inclusive and equitable approaches that value different forms of expertise and knowledge.

1. Key action: Address the bias towards knowledge and methodologies from the Global North, leading to the devaluation of local knowledge and practices.

Commissioning agencies and Global North

- ✓ Consistently co-design methodologies with Global South actors and community representatives. (also see Focus Area 3 below) to ensure a diversity of approaches and types of knowledge are used.
- ✓ Recognise the validity and importance of qualitative, experiential, and indigenous knowledge.
- ✓ Identify any 'methodology dependencies' within your organisation and explore ways to disrupt this by including other less widely documented, creative and flexible methods of knowledge collection.⁴⁸

Global South

- ✓ Work with Global North partners to discuss and demonstrate the importance of indigenous knowledge use in research program or project design.⁴⁹
- ✓ Work with communities to draw on and highlight the role of indigenous knowledge in how they participate and lead in responses.⁵⁰

All

- ✓ Actively seek out, learn about and incorporate local methodologies and ways of knowing into knowledge and evidence output design and implementation.

2. Key action: Engage local populations meaningfully by gathering only the most essential data, thus avoiding consultation fatigue.

Commissioning agencies and Global North

- ✓ Work closely with Global South and local actors to identify if, and in what ways community engagement or data collection processes are needed and will benefit communities, and the most appropriate way to approach this.
- ✓ Establish and enforce strict ethical guidelines that prioritise the welfare and autonomy of local communities. Include mechanisms for monitoring and enforcing these standards.
- ✓ Thoroughly review existing data to determine if it can meet your needs before initiating new data collection. This can help reduce the frequency of consultations.

Global South

- ✓ Provide guidance to Global North actors about appropriate ways to engage with communities in the development of knowledge and evidence outputs.
- ✓ Work with other local researchers and institutions to create data-sharing agreements, or joint processes that reduce the need for repeated consultations.

All

- ✓ Ensure communities have a say in when and how data collection occurs. This can include setting limits on the number of consultations or requiring that certain conditions be met before data is collected.

3. Key action: Foster cross-disciplinary collaboration among humanitarian actors to integrate diverse knowledge types, rather than working in isolated silos focused on specific sectors.

All

- ✓ Support cross-sectoral studies that explore complex humanitarian issues from multiple perspectives.
- ✓ Build partnerships with organisations and experts from different sectors and highlight the benefits and necessity of such approaches for addressing complex humanitarian challenges.

Ideas for measuring progress:

- ✓ Track the diversity of methodologies and approaches co-developed with communities and Global South actors
- ✓ Look for evidence of critical analysis and use of indigenous and other cultural forms of knowledge in humanitarian papers, assessments and evaluations including critical reflection
- ✓ Document and promote examples of humanitarian actors drawing on cross-disciplinary expertise and knowledge in policy, programming and partnerships, and the practical benefits that result

Learning from others

Indigenous Knowledge and Disaster Risk Reduction International Network, including researchers/faculty/ Indigenous persons in New Zealand, Brazil, South Africa, Nigeria, the US and China. Their website says it was 'created to facilitate and guide disaster risk planning and development processes of communities by encouraging collaboration within and between Indigenous communities.'

Talanoa is a traditional Fijian process that involves bringing people together to talk. It is

“ ‘a personal encounter where people story their issues, their realities and aspirations,’⁵¹ ‘allows more mo’oni (pure, real, authentic) information to be available for Pacific research than data derived from other research methods.’⁵²

Talanoa has been used by the Pacific Island Association of NGOs (PIANGO) in their work exploring traditional coping mechanisms in Tropical Cyclone (TC) Gita and several humanitarian localisation baselines in the Pacific. It has also been used in the development of contextually and culturally appropriate monitoring, evaluation, research and learning in the Pacific.

Additional tools and resources:

- Read: 'Indigenous Knowledge: Learning and Sharing for the Humanitarian Industry,' by Kirby-Reynolds, Alex, and Paul Gunaratnam
- Read various resources on quantification of humanitarian needs: *Humanitarianism and the Quantification of Human Needs: Minimal Humanity* by Glasman, Joël. 2020; 'The Power to Count and the Stakes of Counting: An Inquiry into the Quantified Production of Humanitarian Insecurity,' by Beerli, Monique J. 2017.
- Read various resources on participatory methodologies employed in humanitarian research: 'Interactive Research and the Construction of Knowledge in Conflict-Affected Settings,' by Haar, Gemma van der, Annelies Heijmans, and Dorothea Hilhorst. 2013; PhotoKwento: co-constructing women's narratives of disaster recovery by K Zoe Alburo-Cañete.





Focus area 3: How humanitarian knowledge is co-produced

KEY OBJECTIVE: Humanitarian actors invest in respectful and equitable partnerships to ensure that knowledge generation processes are enabling and do not perpetuate power imbalances.

WHAT THIS INVOLVES: This focus area puts a spotlight on how collaborative relationships between two or more parties are defined and created to facilitate the process of knowledge and evidence generation including mutual agreements on roles, resources, and recognition.

WHAT SHIFTS NEED TO HAPPEN: From 'paternalistic' or 'hierarchical' partnerships where decisions, resources, and control are dominated by one party, typically the one with more resources or authority, to *co-production* which emphasises mutual learning, shared decision-making, and joint ownership of the knowledge and evidence process and outcomes.

1. Key action: Promote equitable partnerships by involving Global South partners throughout all phases of knowledge and evidence generation process

Commissioning agencies

- ✓ Require or prioritise applications that show meaningful, equitable collaboration between Global North and Global South research partners.
- ✓ Set parameters for equitable and ethical research partnerships and include partnership quality metrics as part of project design and reporting to ensure accountability.

Global North

- ✓ Share decision-making power, resources, and credit equitably in all stages of the knowledge and evidence generation process.
- ✓ Establish and support relationships beyond specific tasks or projects to allow diverse actors to build trust.⁵³

Global South

- ✓ Document successful models of equitable partnerships and collaborative work in producing humanitarian knowledge and evidence and share best practices with other organisations and partners.
- ✓ Actively press for meaningful roles within partnerships with Global North actors, making a clearly articulated case that it would enhance the validity and utility of the outputs.

2. Key action: Ensure Global South actors receive quality funding and resources to participate fully and effectively in co-production efforts.

Commissioning agencies

- ✓ Ensure funding is distributed equitably, prioritising Global South partners' leadership to enable their effective participation.⁵⁴
- ✓ Implement feedback mechanisms that allow Global South partners to provide input on funding processes and project outcomes.
- ✓ Consider 'staggered' or flexible due diligence approaches as appropriate for size of organisation, or pre-selected partner pools.
- ✓ Develop shared due diligence processes with other funders to reduce the burden on Global South partners in particular.

Global North

- ✓ Incorporate mutual/bidirectional learning and training opportunities to allow partners to value each other's expertise.
- ✓ Ensure risks don't fall disproportionately on Global South partners, whilst sharing more donor-facing responsibilities in relation to project and finance reporting.

Global South

- ✓ Develop long-term strategic plans to guide participation in international research collaborations, including taking the lead where appropriate. By setting clear goals, Global South partners can evaluate the partnership and the extent to which it aligns with their own priorities and values.
- ✓ Identify the stakeholders and spaces that it would be helpful to have access to, and which partners could support you.⁵⁵

3. Key action: Respect and integrate cultural norms and practices in knowledge and evidence generation processes, rather than impose external standards.

Commissioning agencies and Global North

- ✓ Base partnerships on complimentary skillsets and explicit establishment of shared objectives and values.
- ✓ Recognise and address biases in expectations about the roles of different actors i.e., instead of assuming that Global South actors should fill any gaps (such as lack of language skills), ask how Global North actors can improve their skill sets relevant to knowledge and learning processes in humanitarian settings.
- ✓ Invest in cultural competency training for staff to better understand and respect local contexts, cultures, and practices.

Global South

- ✓ Consider how local prejudices related to practices amongst more vulnerable sections of the population may mirror Global North/Global South inequalities at the local level.⁵⁶

4. Key action: Ensure that local actors are given due credit and profile for their work - according to their own assessment of where this is safe/appropriate

Commissioning agencies and Global North

- ✓ Consider who represents and showcases the knowledge or evidence produced, and enable representation by all actors that showcases their complementary contributions to the product or process.
- ✓ Provide support for the publishing and dissemination process (e.g. travel costs) to raise the visibility of Global South actors among international audiences.⁵⁷

Global South

- ✓ Identify effective and appropriate ways how to share your work including branding and visibility for events, outputs, publications, etc.

All

- ✓ Evaluate the impact of inclusion of different types of partners and their unique value add and reflect their value in impact reports.

Ways to measure progress:

- Documentation of changes in knowledge and evidence outputs based on insights from local partners.
- Feedback from Global South actors to Global North actors on the impact of public recognition on their work and visibility.
- Track the number of platforms/initiatives created to showcase the work of Global South actors.
- Assess the satisfaction level of local partners with the co-production process including tracking perceptions of equity through surveys and interviews with local partners to assess their perceptions of respect and equity in partnerships.



Learning from others

Recognising the inequities identified in previous [research partnerships](#), the Humanitarian Policy Group of ODI, a UK-based global affairs research organisation, piloted an alternative model of co-production with partner organisation Neem Foundation in Nigeria. Unlike standard practice, this approach began with a 'blank slate,' with researchers from both organisations co-designing the research from the beginning. The partnership, though longer than a standard HPG research project, yielded positive improvements for the research's quality and relevance for a Nigerian audience.

Additional tools and resources:

- Draw on guidance on ways to establish and build equitable research partnerships: M Lokot and C Wake (2021). [The co-production of research between academics, NGOs and communities in humanitarian response: A practical guide](#); HAG, CoLAB, GLOW Consultants, inSights, PIANGO and Pujiono Centre (2024). [Equitable research partnerships between Global North and Global South research collaborators: Making it happen; Four principles to strengthen international research-practice partnerships](#). UKCDR and Essence on Health Research (2022). [Four approaches to supporting equitable research partnerships](#).



Focus area 4: How humanitarian knowledge is shared and used

KEY OBJECTIVE: Humanitarian actors utilise and make accessible the knowledge and evidence produced in ways that empower and benefit all stakeholders, particularly those most affected by crises.

WHAT THIS INVOLVES: This encompasses how evidence and insights are communicated and shared including translation into actionable recommendations for humanitarian practice. This covers two practices: 1) ensuring that knowledge and evidence outputs are adapted to fit the specific cultural, social, and linguistic contexts of affected communities, and 2) engaging decision-makers to ensure evidence informs practice.

WHAT SHIFTS NEED TO HAPPEN: There needs to be a greater emphasis on making evidence accessible and actionable for relevant stakeholders, most especially those most affected by crises.

1. Key action: Ensure that all partners have adequate resources to identify information needs, develop, translate, and distribute knowledge and evidence effectively.

Commissioning agencies

- ✓ Fund knowledge translation and sharing of findings to communities as standard component of grants.
- ✓ Require all partners to demonstrate how findings and data has been shared with communities or local actors in appropriate ways.

Global North

- ✓ Build in default practices and processes to ensure Global South and local partners can access and prioritise resources needed for these activities (e.g. translation), and articulate how they can be supported by capacities and networks often housed in Global North actors.
- ✓ Understand and respect sensitivities of sharing knowledge by local actors in difficult contexts and accommodate to their specific needs.

Global South

- ✓ Advocate during funding bids for time/resource/training required to engage equitably in dissemination.

All

- ✓ Consult communities to pinpoint any cultural sensitivities and determine the most effective method for making knowledge and evidence outputs accessible.
- ✓ Establish mechanisms to receive feedback from affected communities to ensure that the information and evidence provided are meeting their needs and to make necessary adjustments.

2. Key action: Engage decision-makers to ensure evidence informs practice

Commissioning agencies

- ✓ Seek out and create opportunities for dialogue with knowledge producers and local operational actors and partners who may use the knowledge and evidence product.

Global North and Global South

- ✓ Maximise opportunities for researchers to establish relationships with operational actors whereby they can better understand decision-making processes.
- ✓ Help decision-makers understand and appraise what evidence is already available.
- ✓ Provide evidence and data to support advocates who can influence decision-makers and political debate.

All

- ✓ Develop agreed advocacy key messages for different groups of targeted audience and agree on how these will be shared to leverage partner networks and relationships.⁵⁸

Ways to measure progress:

- Document case studies where Global South-led or affected population-informed knowledge and evidence have directly influenced decision-making processes or improved program outcomes.⁵⁹
- Track the number of knowledge products tailored to specific needs and contexts of affected populations.
- Measure the extent to which the knowledge and evidence outputs produced address the specific needs of different target demographic and social groups.
- Map the number of learning opportunities (e.g., workshops, seminars) created for affected communities and humanitarian practitioners to enhance their use of knowledge and evidence.
- Assess long-term outcomes and impacts on communities resulting from the use of knowledge and evidence.



Learning from others

Canada's International Development Research Centre (IDRC) has 'position for use' criteria in their assessments which 'considers whether research is designed, implemented, and disseminated in a way that enhances its potential for use in countries in the Global South'.⁶⁰

Elrha's [R2HC Ethics Framework 2.0](#), intended to support their role as a funder of research in humanitarian settings, affirms that 'The community in which research is conducted should be actively consulted with and listened to at all stages'.⁶¹ The accompanying [Research Ethics Tool](#) proposes questions that researchers can use to reflect on and plan their communication of findings to participants. Also see Elrha's resources to support research uptake including: '[The Research Impact Framework](#), and '[5 things we learned from evaluating the impact of research](#)'.




The [guidelines on making research inclusive of people with disabilities](#) stress that sharing research with people with disabilities should involve accessible formats and inclusive practices, ensuring everyone is represented and informed.⁶² Inclusive presentation of findings includes producing materials of different formats and lengths; using an [accessible font](#) and colour contrasts in printed publications; offering large-print, audio, or braille versions; and including alt-text to accompany visual images.

WHERE TO FROM HERE?

PUTTING THE VISION INTO ACTION

In envisioning a more equitable approach to knowledge and evidence generation in the humanitarian sector, our goal is to support a paradigm shift where Global South knowledge and expertise is not only acknowledged but is the cornerstone of all knowledge and learning as well as evidence-based decision-making processes. By decentralising power and elevating the voices of those most affected by crises, we strive for a humanitarian landscape that reflects true inclusivity and justice. We hope this vision is not merely aspirational but serves as a practical framework for transforming current practices into ones that genuinely value and integrate diverse local perspectives.

Use the vision to change practice:

-  **A BASIS FOR ADVOCACY:** Use the vision as a tool for advocating policy and best practice changes at both organisational and international levels. This includes discussing with your team regarding potential challenges with implementing the vision, along with strategies to mitigate them. Utilise the vision to foster discussions about power dynamics and knowledge equity within humanitarian forums, conferences, and workshops. Emphasise the importance of local and indigenous expertise in all stages of knowledge and evidence generation processes and push for reforms that institutionalise these principles.
-  **A BASIS FOR PLANNING AND CAPACITY STRENGTHENING:** Integrate the vision into strategic planning processes by ensuring that preparedness, response, and evaluation frameworks are designed with Global South and local expertise at the forefront. Incorporate the vision into training programs for humanitarian practitioners to instill the values of equity and inclusivity. Develop policies and procedures that reflect the identified action areas outlined in this vision.
-  **A BASIS FOR TRACKING CHANGE:** Develop monitoring and evaluation criteria based on the proposed ways to measure progress on the vision's components. Create feedback mechanisms that allow local and indigenous communities to lead the identification of what success looks like, ensuring continuous improvement based on their insights.

Endnotes

- 1 M Shuayb. (2022). '[Localisation Only Pays Lip Service to Fixing Aid's Colonial Legacy.](#)' The New Humanitarian (blog). February 8, 2022; O U Rutazibwa. (2019). '[What's There to Mourn? Decolonial Reflections on \(the End of\) Liberal Humanitarianism.](#)' *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs* 1 (1): 65–67; A Swaine. (2016). '[Enabling or Disabling Paternalism: \(In\)Attention to Gender and Women's Knowledge, Capacity and Authority in Humanitarian Contexts.](#)' KB Sandvik and J Lemaitre (2013). '[Internally Displaced Women as Knowledge Producers and Users in Humanitarian Action: The View from Colombia.](#)' *Disasters* 37 (July): S36–50.
- 2 Shuayb. (2022). '[Localisation Only Pays Lip Service to Fixing Aid's Colonial Legacy.](#)' The New Humanitarian (blog). February 8, 2022; O U Rutazibwa. (2019). '[What's There to Mourn? Decolonial Reflections on \(the End of\) Liberal Humanitarianism.](#)' *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs* 1 (1): 65–67; A Swaine. (2016). '[Enabling or Disabling Paternalism: \(In\)Attention to Gender and Women's Knowledge, Capacity and Authority in Humanitarian Contexts.](#)' KB Sandvik and J Lemaitre (2013). '[Internally Displaced Women as Knowledge Producers and Users in Humanitarian Action: The View from Colombia.](#)' *Disasters* 37 (July): S36–50.
- 3 F Carden, T Hanley and A Paterson (2021). *From Knowing to Doing: Evidence Use in the Humanitarian Sector*, Elrha, 2021; M Lokot and C Wake, '[Research as Usual in Humanitarian Settings?](#)' Humanitarian Advisory Group (2017). [Localising the Research Process: Walking the Talk Insight Series](#); L Fast. (2019). [Researching Local Humanitarian Action Through Partnerships with Local Actors](#). Overseas Development Institute; J Smith and K Blanchet (2019). [Research Methodologies in Humanitarian Crises: Review](#). Elrha; I Ormel et al (2020). '[Key Issues for Participatory Research in the Design and Implementation of Humanitarian Assistance: A Scoping Review.](#)' *Global Health Action* 13(1).
- 4 See for example efforts described by Global North researchers to make sure that local researchers were acknowledged as co-authors in the evaluation report they published: Humanitarian Advisory Group, CoLAB , GLOW and inSights, (2022). '[Needles in a Haystack: An Analysis of Global South Roles in Humanitarian Knowledge Production.](#)'
- 5 HAG, GLOW Consultants, CoLAB, inSights, PIANGO & Pujiono Centre. (2022). [Stories for Change: Elevating Global South Experiences in Humanitarian Knowledge Production.](#) Melbourne: HAG
- 6 It is also important to note that we focused on institutional affiliations. This limited our understanding of how Global South voices and representation influence processes within Global North institutions (or vice versa).
- 7 ECD (2023). [Framing DAC member approaches to locally led development](#), p. 3.
- 8 For [Piquard \(2021\)](#), 'Knowledge' refers to 'an internalisation and transfer of these lessons and meanings [accessed as data is analysed to become information] interpreted with a specific frame of references and useful in different contexts'. This is quite an open-ended definition, which can be contrasted with those that draw on the field of organisational studies. For example, [Caballero-Anthony, Cook and Chen \(2021\)](#) adopted a definition of knowledge as the 'justified belief that increases an entity's capacity for effective action' (Nabaka, 1994) which has been influential in organisational knowledge management studies. Literature in this area also distinguishes information from data. 'Data' refer to collected facts usually organised in a particular format and gathered for a particular purpose; while 'information' refers to analysed and systematised data revealing the lessons learned and the underlying meanings' ([Piquard 2021](#)). Róisín Read, Bertrand Taithe and Roger Mac Ginty identified two types of data that humanitarian organisations routinely collect, based on intended uses. The first, 'real-time situational data', includes needs assessments, early warning systems, and security data. The second, 'evaluative data', includes monitoring and evaluation (M&E) data, accountability data, audits, and exit reports ([Read, Taithe and Mac Ginty 2016](#))
- 9 L Tanner. (2016). '[Annex 1: Draft Landscape Report.](#)' Humanitarian Leadership Academy.
- 10 There are five key ways power can be conceptualised including: 1) productive power (the power to shape concepts and categories), 2) power over (control of decision-making or resources over those without), 3) power with (build collective strength through finding common ground), 4) power to (shape one's life and world), and 5) power within (capacity to have hope and imagine). See HAG, CoLAB, GLOW, InSights, PIANGO & Pujiono Centre (2022). '[Achieving a More Equitable and Impactful Humanitarian Sector: Platform paper.](#)' *Humanitarian Horizons*. Melbourne: HAG.
- 11 Such as HAG, CoLAB , GLOW and inSights, (2022). '[Needles in a Haystack: An Analysis of Global South Roles in Humanitarian Knowledge Production.](#)' Melbourne: HAG. HAG, CoLAB, GLOW, InSights, PIANGO and Pujiono Centre (2022). '[Stories for Change: Elevating Global South Experiences in Humanitarian Knowledge Production.](#)' Melbourne: HAG; HAG, CoLAB, GLOW, InSights, PIANGO & Pujiono Centre (2023), [Equitable Research Partnerships Between Global North and Global South Research Collaborators: Making it Happen](#), Melbourne: HAG; Humanitarian Advisory Group, GLOW Consultants and Collaborate Consulting. (2024). [Making Evaluation Results Accessible to Communities: Why it Frequently Fails and What to do About it.](#)
- 12 Humanitarian Advisory Group, CoLAB , GLOW and inSights, (2022). '[Needles in a Haystack: An Analysis of Global South Roles in Humanitarian Knowledge Production.](#)' Melbourne: HAG; Development Initiatives (2021). [Improving the Visibility of Local and National Actors in Humanitarian Aid Data](#); M Demeter (2021). [Development Studies in the World System of Global Knowledge Production: A Critical Empirical Analysis.](#) *Progressive Development Studies* 1-18 (2021).
- 13 M Finn and E Oreglia (2016). '[A Fundamentally Confused Document: Situation Reports and the Work of Producing Humanitarian Information.](#)' Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing: 1349-1362.
- 14 HAG, GLOW Consultants, CoLAB, inSights, PIANGO and Pujiono Centre. (2022). '[Stories for Change: Elevating Global South Experiences in Humanitarian Knowledge production.](#)' Melbourne: HAG
- 15 G Mckay, M Baggio, CA Camara, E Eralach, L Dios, F Checchi & H Rohan. (2021). '[The Response is Like a Big ship': Community Feedback as a Case Study of Evidence Uptake and Use in the 2018-2020 Ebola Epidemic in the Democratic Republic of Congo.](#)' *BMJ Global Health*.
- 16 A Kirby-Reynolds and Paul G. (2021). '[Indigenous Knowledge: Learning and Sharing for the Humanitarian Industry.](#)' HLA Case Study. Humanitarian Leadership Academy.
- 17 J Allouche and C Maubert. (2021) '[How to Co-produce Transdisciplinary and Plural Knowledge to Solve Complex Humanitarian Problems? An illustration in the Democratic Republic of Congo.](#)' *Alternatives Humanitaires / Humanitarian Alternatives.*

- 18 B Piquard (2021). 'What Knowledge Counts? Local Humanitarian Knowledge Production in Protracted Conflicts. A Central African Republic Case Study.' *Peacebuilding* 0 (0): 1–16
- 19 M Lokot and C Wake (2021). 'Research as Usual in Humanitarian Settings? Equalising Power in Academic-NGO Research Partnerships through Co-Production.'
- 20 One reason for this is rooted in the practical nature of humanitarian work and the need for fast actionable information, see K Allouche and C Maubert. (2021) 'How to Co-Produce Transdisciplinary and Plural'. Also see B Lawson (2021). 'Quantification and Humanitarianism.' *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs* 3(1): 53–60 and J Glasman (2020), Humanitarianism and the Quantification of Human Needs. Routledge.
- 21 B Lawson (2021). 'Quantification and Humanitarianism.'
- 22 HAG, CoLAB, GLOW, InSights, PIANGO and Pujiono Centre (2022). Stories for Change: Elevating Global South Experiences in Humanitarian Knowledge Production; M Fitzpatrick, I Cordua, T Atim, A Kattazukhy and K Conciatori (2023). 'Co-investigators but with Different Power: Local Voices on the Localization of Humanitarian Research.' Feinstein International Center; F Carden, T Hanley and A Paterson (2021). From Knowing to Doing: Evidence Use in the Humanitarian Sector, Elrha; M Lokot and C Wake, (2021). 'Research as Usual.'
- 23 For example, a dominant form of collaboration that has emerged especially in the multi-institutional Syrian refugee research complex, has been one where institutions in high-income countries are incentivised to be the conceptualizers and producers, while Middle East partners become facilitators and executors, see A M Sibau, A Rizk, A P Coutts, G Monzer, A Daoud, R Sullivan, B Roberts, L I Meho, and F Fouad. (2019). 'North-South Inequities in Research Collaboration in Humanitarian and Conflict contexts.' *The Lancet*, 394: 1597-1599. And because of the tendency to limit local actors to data collection rather than analysis, important elements of interpretation can be overlooked, see B Piquard (2021). 'What Knowledge Counts? Local Humanitarian Knowledge Production in Protracted Conflicts. A Central African Republic Case Study.' *Peacebuilding* 0 (0): 1–16.
- 24 Some highlighted the importance of equitable contracting where some Global South researchers experience undertaking time-consuming tasks, such as engaging in-country stakeholders, that were not budgeted probably because due to poor understanding of country contexts and dynamics, see HAG, CoLAB, GLOW, InSights, PIANGO and Pujiono Centre (2022). 'Stories for Change: Elevating Global South Experiences in Humanitarian Knowledge Production.' Melbourne: HAG.
- 25 Visibility matters and is seen an indication of fair and equitable partnerships. However, the visibility of Global South actors is often insufficient, inconsistent, or even completely absent.
- 26 N Berenstain (2016). 'Epistemic Exploitation.' *Ergo: An Open Access Journal of Philosophy* 3(22).
- 27 ALNAP (2013), Evidence and knowledge in Humanitarian Action: Discussion Framers.
- 28 R Read, B Taithe and RM Ginty. (2016). 'Data Hubris? Humanitarian Information Systems and the Mirage of Technology.' *Third World Quarterly* 37 (8): 1314–31.; M Finn and E Oreglia. (2016). 'A Fundamentally Confused Document: Situation Reports and the Work of Producing Humanitarian Information.' In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*, 1349–62. San Francisco California USA: ACM.
- 29 F Carden, T Hanley and A Paterson. (2021). From Knowing to Doing: Evidence Use in the Humanitarian Sector. Elrha.
- 30 KB Sandvik and J Lemaitre (2013). 'Internally Displaced Women as Knowledge Producers and Users in Humanitarian Action: The View from Colombia.' *Disasters* 37 (July): S36–50.
- 31 Humanitarian Advisory Group, GLOW Consultants and Collaborate Consulting. (2024). Making Evaluation Results Accessible to Communities: Why it Frequently Fails and What to do About it.
- 32 R Lund, S Khasalamwa, and S Y.A. Tete. (2011). 'Beyond the Knowledge-Action Gap: Challenges of Implementing Humanitarian Policies in Ghana and Uganda.' Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography 65 (2): 63–74; L Tanner (2016). 'Annex 1: Draft Landscape Report.' Humanitarian Leadership Academy; M Barnett, A Vandermoss-Peeler, and S Patel. (2021). 'Power & Solidarity in Humanitarian Governance – What Aid Workers Really Think.' CHS Alliance (blog); G Daoust and S Dyvik. (2020). 'Knowing Safeguarding: The Geopolitics of Knowledge Production in the Humanitarian and Development Sector.' *Geoforum* 112 (June): 96–99; M Lokot and C Wake. (2021). 'Research as Usual in Humanitarian Settings? Equalising Power in Academic-NGO Research Partnerships through Co-Production.' *Conflict and Health* 15 (1): 64; B Piquard. (2021). 'What Knowledge Counts? Local Humanitarian Knowledge Production in Protracted Conflicts. A Central African Republic Case Study.' *Peacebuilding* 0 (0): 1–16.
- 33 A Swaine. (2016). 'Enabling or Disabling Paternalism: (In)Attention to Gender and Women's Knowledge, Capacity and Authority in Humanitarian Contexts.' SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 2978113. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network; HAG, CoLAB, GLOW, InSights, PIANGO & Pujiono Centre (2023), Equitable Research Partnerships Between Global North and Global South Research Collaborators: Making it Happen. Melbourne: HAG.
- 34 L Tanner. (2016). 'Annex 1: Draft Landscape Report.' Humanitarian Leadership Academy.
- 35 M Finn and E Oreglia (2016). 'A Fundamentally Confused Document: Situation Reports and the Work of Producing Humanitarian Information.' *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*: 1349-1362.
- 36 L Tanner. (2016). 'Annex 1: Draft Landscape Report.' Humanitarian Leadership Academy
- 37 L Tanner. (2016). 'Annex 1: Draft Landscape Report.' Humanitarian Leadership Academy
- 38 M Buchanan-Smith. (2003). 'How the Sphere Project Came into Being: A Case Study of Policy-Making in the Humanitarian Aid Sector and the Relative Influence of Research.' ODI Working Paper. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- 39 HAG, CoLAB, GLOW and InSights, (2022). 'Needles in a Haystack: An Analysis of Global South Roles in Humanitarian Knowledge Production.' Melbourne: HAG
- 40 Development Initiatives (2021). Improving the Visibility of Local and National Actors in Humanitarian Aid Data

- 41 M Fricker. (2007). Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing. Oxford University Press.
- 42 For example, some argue that the politics of knowledge are at the roots of paternalism in international interventions, with two main elements: 'The first is the claim that host populations lack the capacity to resolve their own predicaments, and the second is the belief that international interveners possess this capacity', see S Autesserre. (2016). 'Paternalism and Peacebuilding: Capacity, Knowledge, and Resistance in International Interventions,' 161–84. Practitioner-researcher Aisling Swaine, who applied Autesserre's insights to humanitarian settings, unpacks this further, arguing that paternalistic attitudes see a series of 'lacking' characteristics in people affected by emergencies: 'lack of knowledge or information, a lack of freedom to act autonomously, and a lack of cognitive ability and capacity (of variant forms). Arising out of this preponderance of "lacking" qualities is a resulting lack of ability to know what is best for themselves, see A Swaine. (2016). 'Enabling or Disabling Paternalism: (In)Attention to Gender and Women's Knowledge, Capacity and Authority in Humanitarian Contexts,' SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 2978113. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.
- 43 HAG, CoLAB, GLOW, InSights, PIANGO & Pujiono Centre (2023), Equitable Research Partnerships Between Global North and Global South Research Collaborators: Making it Happen, Melbourne: HAG.
- 44 HAG, CoLAB, GLOW, InSights, PIANGO & Pujiono Centre (2023), Equitable Research Partnerships Between Global North and Global South Research Collaborators: Making it Happen, Melbourne: HAG.
- 45 Peace Direct (2024). Transforming Partnerships in International Cooperation: A Practical Resource for Civil Society, Donors, INGOs and Intermediaries.
- 46 Advisory groups have been described as a way to formalise partnerships between researchers and communities and as providing 'a mechanism for communities to assume a leadership role in research activities.' See RA Afifi et al. (2020). 'Implementing Community-Based participatory Research with Communities Affected by Humanitarian Crises: The Potential to Recalibrate Equity and Power in Vulnerable Contexts,' *American Journal of Community Psychology*, p. 388.
- 47 Peace Direct (2024). Transforming Partnerships in International Cooperation: A Practical Resource for Civil Society, Donors, INGOs and Intermediaries.
- 48 W Hoffman (2021). Indigenous Data in Effective Humanitarian Response. Center for Humanitarian Leadership.
- 49 Peace Direct (2024). Transforming Partnerships in International Cooperation: A Practical Resource for Civil Society, Donors, INGOs and Intermediaries.
- 50 Peace Direct (2024). Transforming Partnerships in International Cooperation: A Practical Resource for Civil Society, Donors, INGOs and Intermediaries.
- 51 S L Vaioleti. (1999–2003). Series of Talanoa. Palo Alto, Oakland, San Francisco, California.
- 52 T M Vaioleti. (2006). 'Talanoa Research Methodology: A Developing Position on Pacific Research.' *Waikato Journal of Education* 12: 21–34.
- 53 HAG, GLOW Consultants, CoLAB, inSights, PIANGO & Pujiono Centre (2022). Stories for Change: Elevating Global South Experiences in Humanitarian Knowledge Production. Melbourne: HAG
- 54 M Fitzpatrick, I Cordua, T Atim, A Kattazukhy and K Conciatori (2023). 'Co-Investigators but with Different Power: Local Voices on the Localization of Humanitarian Research.' Feinstein International Center;
- 55 Peace Direct (2024). Transforming Partnerships in International Cooperation: A Practical Resource for Civil Society, Donors, INGOs and Intermediaries.
- 56 Peace Direct (2024). Transforming Partnerships in International Cooperation: A Practical Resource for Civil Society, Donors, INGOs and Intermediaries.
- 57 M Fitzpatrick, I Cordua, T Atim, A Kattazukhy and K Conciatori (2023). 'Co-Investigators But With Different Power: Local Voices on the Localization of Humanitarian Research.' Feinstein International Center;
- 58 HAG, GLOW Consultants, CoLAB, inSights, PIANGO & Pujiono Centre. (2022). Stories for Change: Elevating Global South Experiences in Humanitarian Knowledge Production. Melbourne: HAG
- 59 See for example Elrha's research impact case studies
- 60 Paterson, A., Carden, F., & Hanley, T. (2021). From knowing to doing: Evidence use in the humanitarian sector. Elrha.
- 61 Siriwardhana, S., Lignou, S., Doherty, S. and O'Mathúna, D. (2017). R2HC Ethics Framework 2.0, Elrha.
- 62 RDI Network (2020). Research for All: Making Development Research Inclusive of People with Disabilities, authored by CBM-Nossal Partnership for Disability-inclusive Development and Research for Development Impact Network, p. 102.

