"You think you are the solution, but the solution comes from the community"[1]

On the importance of community engagement for principled humanitarian action

Inez Kipfer-Didavi, with contributions from Liliane Bitong

Local actors can implement the humanitarian principles, but in certain contexts this poses challenges for them. In order to meet these challenges, local actors need greater institutional and financial power. This should be based on a broad localisation approach that actively involves and strengthens people affected by crises and their informal networks and official institutions, and also strengthens their ability to apply the humanitarian principles.

The humanitarian principles – international norms with local roots

In 1991, the UN General Assembly defined the "humanitarian principles" as humanity, neutrality and impartiality.[2] This was expanded to include the principle of independence by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in its 1994 Code of Conduct.[3] It is interesting to note that the Red Cross had already formulated additional principles back then, among them respect for the local culture, the use of local capacities, participation, accountability towards donors and affected people, and also respecting human dignity in humanitarian communications. These additional principles, which will also be addressed here, have gained far less international acceptance and therefore had to be reinforced by new initiatives – for example by means of the SPHERE Standards, the Core Humanitarian Standard and the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS).

Humanity, which is defined in the humanitarian principles is also a central pillar of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as is human dignity. Moreover, humanity and human dignity were central ideas in the freedom, liberalisation and democratisation movements of western Enlightenment. The notion of humanitarianism can also be found in all world religions, from Christianity and Islam to Hinduism, Confucianism and Judaism.[4] It is reflected in many philosophical world views[5] and in numerous local cultural concepts and forms of expression.[6]

"Help me during the floods, I will help you during the drought":[7] Who are 'local humanitarian actors'?

There is no standard definition for 'local humanitarian actors', a fact which makes analysis and discussion more complicated. Relatives, neighbours, friends, local networks and relief organisations, local religious or political institutions and local government agencies are usually the first to provide assistance in the event of a humanitarian crisis – long before international organisations (NGOs or the UN) arrive on the scene and before donors release the necessary funds. This has been demonstrated after natural disasters such as the earthquake in Nepal in 2015, or Typhoon Haiyan, which struck the Philippines in 2013, and after violent conflicts such as the 2014 crisis in Ukraine.

In many crises it is local actors who take in the largest number of internally displaced people (and to some extent refugees as well[8]) and provide them with emergency care, be it in Jordan, Lebanon, Pakistan,[9] Iraq,[10] Sudan[11] or in the DR Congo and Uganda.[12]

There are frequently delays before foreign relief organisations arrive on the ground, and they often only remain in an area temporarily – for as long as their funding allows and they can ensure the safety of their staff. Local actors, however, do not leave the area where they are giving help, except if they are forced to flee themselves. They are the ones who have to deal with the long-term consequences of a crisis, whether they want to or not. Furthermore, they are often the only protagonists in a conflict region with access to the affected people - and thus the only ones who can meet the humanitarian imperative at all (principle of humanity).[13] We can currently see this in Yemen, parts of Somalia, Darfur, the Central African Republic, South Sudan, northern Nigeria, Syria, Myanmar, Ukraine and increasingly in Pakistan and Nepal. For this reason, international organisations are increasingly cooperating with local actors, especially with local NGOs and above all in such dangerous contexts.

There are frequently delays before foreign relief organisations arrive on the ground, and they often only remain in an area temporarily

Is it harder for local actors to uphold the humanitarian principles than for international actors?

Most people affected by crises are neither aware of international humanitarian law nor of the humanitarian principles as such. For many people around the world it is normal that the initial relief efforts benefit 'their people', such as neighbours, and only benefit 'the others', or their adversaries, to a limited extent. Often, the issues of impartiality and neutrality first become contentious when substantial

relief resources – in terms of value or duration – are at stake in larger-scale conflicts and those providing assistance have to select which beneficiaries to help. This applies equally to local actors and international relief organisations.

Local organisations generally have a much better understanding of local conflicts and the relevant local actors than outsiders.[14] This means that they are better able to judge what impartial and neutral help means in concrete terms. In addition, local actors usually strive to avoid getting caught 'between the fronts' and to remain non-political and neutral in their actions (principle of neutrality). However, being a service provider of basic provisions in a conflict region is one way of gaining public legitimacy. For this reason, conflicting parties often view such services as a threat to their power, and thus obstruct them (sometimes violently) – or, conversely, they support them and exploit them to consolidate their own power.[15] This explains how humanitarian relief can rapidly become polarised in a conflict.

There are situations, such as in Myanmar or northern Nigeria at present, in which the affected society is so deeply divided that the conflicting parties cannot tolerate local organisations assisting people on both sides of the conflict. Local relief workers who find themselves on the 'wrong side' risk their lives in such cases. External organisations such as the ICRC are then required to provide neutral assistance and to avoid exacerbating the conflict. As Schenkenberg has noted, impartiality may be achieved in such a tense situation – at least on a higher level

– when external organisations work together with non-impartial actors on both (or various) sides to ensure that those in need are given help. This may in any case be necessary for security reasons at certain times.[16] Schenkenberg is therefore correct in his assertion that local NGOs are, per se, no better at upholding the humanitarian principles than international NGOs. However, the reverse is also true.

International relief organisations can only gain acceptance among all conflicting parties and the local population if they are able to credibly demonstrate that their help is neutral and impartial. Parties to the conflict watch closely to see whether relief is neutral or if it is caught up along ethnic, religious or political conflict lines; whether it is needs-based or provided according to social categories (such as ethnicity, age, gender, social class, religion etc.); whether individuals are discriminated against and whether their human dignity is respected in the process of providing and receiving assistance.[17] For example, it has been reported from northern Nigeria[18] that an international NGO specialising in healthcare has been criticised by the local population for showing bias and lacking neutrality, as it mainly treats people associated with Boko Haram – presumably because they are not given treatment by any other service provider. Local people similarly have little understanding for re-integration programmes for ex-combatants, since these are perceived as a kind of 'reward for the murderers'. Although such programmes are not strictly part of 'humanitarian relief', this makes no difference to the local population.

These examples show that while factual impartiality is important, how it is perceived also plays a role. This is why it is so important to explain the humanitarian principles to affected people, conflict parties and other local actors and, crucially, to discuss with them how these principles can be implemented.

The call for humanitarian principles within the international political discourse concerning compliance with international law has considerable significance and urgency. Unfortunately, up to now many international NGOs have merely proclaimed their adherence to the humanitarian principles to public and private

While factual impartiality is important, how it is perceived also plays a role.

donors – yet they have failed to train their national and international staff in the implementation of the principles as an important orientation tool in daily humanitarian work. At the same time, they rarely allow themselves to be drawn into difficult discussions about local dilemmas with the affected people in order to find collaborative solutions.

The localisation debate at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul

The starting point for the WHS was the declaration that the current humanitarian system and its limited financial resources, which are heavily bound up with the United Nations and with international NGOs, can no longer meet the constantly growing global need for humanitarian relief. Therefore, in Istanbul there were calls from many sides to strengthen the role of governments as well as local and national civil society organisations as first responders in crises and conflicts. These protagonists need to be empowered to take effective preventive action against conflicts and natural disasters in their own countries; to deal with humanitarian crises without outside help, and to rebuild social and economic infrastructure quickly in order to maintain long-term social stability and encourage development.

This was accompanied by the appeal to shift the focus of humanitarian relief and crisis prevention to the affected people themselves and to recognise their right to a life of dignity, security and self determination. Numerous consultations with affected people prior to the actual summit led to the conclusion that – from their perspective – relief has so far often failed to address their actual needs, and that international relief organisations have generally not involved them in assessing requirements and planning the relief programmes. Moreover, affected people felt that external relief workers often did not understand their local capacities and structures. As a consequence of this, they felt ignored or even that their structures were weakened by the aimless zeal of external protagonists. This lack of local affiliation and local control was also said to

facilitate the misuse of relief funds and to increase the risk of making the affected people dependent on international relief.[19]

Consequently, people affected by crises made vehement demands at the WHS for greater inclusion by relief organisations, both in terms of planning their operations and in decision-making. Furthermore, they demanded that all relief efforts be linked with local strategies and capacities and support rather than weaken them.

Civil society conferences, the regional WHS steering committees[20] and the 2015 WHS Global Consultation[21] have given their full support to these demands, and the UN General Secretary incorporated them in his report on the WHS, including the Agenda for Humanity.[22]

Localisation in the Grand Bargain

The above considerations pertaining to the localisation of humanitarian relief have also been incorporated in the Grand Bargain[23] – an agreement drawn up between several governments and UN organisations at the WHS. It contains diverse workstreams which were agreed upon, some of which should be mentioned here:

- Funding should go as directly as possible to institutional local and national actors and should be increased, as Ed Schenkenberg stated. At the same time, the global humanitarian cash flow from the original donors to local actors should be measured and made transparent (Grand Bargain Transparency Workstream).

- Assistance in the form of relief goods should be reduced in favour of cash transfers, and local markets should be increasingly used – in those places where the situation and the markets allow it. This should give affected people more choice and freedom to decide and thus help preserve their sense of dignity (Grand Bargain Cash Workstream).[24]

- People and communities affected by, or at risk of, crises should be informed[25] and actively included in humanitarian decision-making processes[26]– and this applies to local relief actors as well. This is to be tantamount to a 'participation revolution' and should be realised by means of collective standards for reporting and continual dialogue. Of prime importance is that the most vulnerable people have a voice in how humanitarian services should be implemented and evaluated. This dialogue should also be accompanied with funding modes that help local actors to work participatively and to respond flexibly to the views, needs and priorities of affected people (Grand Bargain Participation Workstream).[27]

- Relief funds should be less determined by regions and sectors, and country based pooled funds should be increased. Such funds should

facilitate decisions concerning the allocation to people and regions in greatest need according to coordinated assessments – with greater inclusion of local actors on governmental and non-governmental levels (Grand Bargain Less Earmarking Workstream).

Not everything that is labelled 'local' is actually local

Localisation in the sense of political and economic empowerment for people affected by crises, their self-help groups, and local aid organisations is an important step towards achieving greater human dignity and adherence to the humanitarian principles. This should not be considered equivalent to a localisation that solely aims to support the NGOs registered in the respective country without checking whether they are rooted in the local society, work along lines of participation, and are able to take decisions independently (without state intervention).

As Ed Schenkenberg also writes, not everything that is labelled 'local' is actually local. Local NGOs that function like consultancy firms but are not actually rooted in the local society might well be accomplished and well-versed in the repertoire of the international humanitarian system. But they may ultimately only differ from international NGOs due to their greater local knowledge and lower travel costs. Indeed such NGOs run the same risk of planning relief operations without involving the affected people or considering their needs. In such cases, they would equally fail to respect the dignity of vulnerable people and thus violate the principle of humanity. And they might equally fail to clearly communicate their neutrality and impartiality to the affected people, as described above, and to live out those principles in ways that are acceptable to them.

It is a welcome development that there are already a few pioneering, well-positioned locally-registered NGOs that act as professional role models. Such NGOs are to be found among those involved in the newly-founded NEAR network[28] and also among the long-term partners of faith based international NGOs, many of which have signed up to the commitments in the Charter4Change.[29]

However, it should again be emphasised that we are not only concerned with locally registered NGOs. Rather, the often less organised and less vocal informal structures and institutions that act as first responders should be supported. The task ahead requires us to strengthen these groups in accordance with their own priorities, to link them up with national and international actors, and to enable them to provide larger-scale humanitarian relief as described further below. The relief they provide has to be guided by the humanitarian principles and they should be capable of conveying these principles to conflicting parties and affected people in a credible way. It is ultimately these informal structures and institutions that can and must implement the link between humanitarian relief, development, and peace-building that is currently

being discussed (the so-called humanitarian-development-peace-nexus).

Since the 2016 WHS, the civil society debate about localisation has been restricted to the demand for an increase in direct funding for 'local' NGOs while questioning who exactly qualifies as 'local'. This limited discourse is on the one hand attributable to the general increase in competition among international NGOs for funds which, though higher than before, are still insufficient. Some of these NGOs have so far provided a portion of their relief themselves, using many of their own (international and local) staff – in other words, largely without local partners. These organisations now fear the potential loss of their existing or future

'market share' to local NGOs. Others see it as an opportunity to expand their own operations (e.g. the NEAR Network[30]) or those of their local partners (the Charter-4Change[31] signatories).

On the other hand, the demand that funding is directed straight to registered local NGOs reflects the determination of many international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) and some donor countries (e.g. the German government) to put into action the commitments made during the WHS concerning an adjustment of funding mechanisms. For some donors, at least, this form of localisation probably seems more feasible and easier to control than strengthening the informal community levels.

How can local first responders be given concrete support?

As we have seen, it is crucial to support local first and last responders and to facilitate their capacity to act. This applies regardless of whether they are institutional, registered NGOs that are recognised by their own government, or structured along less formal social relationships – including for example relatives, neighbours, community groups, youth clubs, grass roots organisations, self-help groups for people with disabilities etc.

With respect to the informal level, this kind of empowerment needs to begin with a participative dialogue between relief organisations and representatives of the various social groups in an affected community.[32] This would give affected people an opportunity to express their

concerns and needs, while offering their views on the causes of these problems. They can list the steps they have already taken themselves and, where applicable, identify capacities and competences that might require external support.

Experiences with this sort of community engagement have shown that affected people often ask for advocacy training which will help them to better understand and claim their rights – in accordance with both national laws and international humanitarian law. The latter also implies engagement with the humanitarian principles. Moreover, affected people want to be informed in a transparent way about the access routes to state/non-state and international relief funds and financing mechanisms. It is important for

The localisation debate in Germany

In 2014, during the lead-up to the World Humanitarian Summit, German humanitarian actors compiled a series of recommendations for strengthening local NGOs. The recommendations were based on the evaluation of 22 reports from German NGOs and the findings were incorporated into the summit process.[35] The driving force behind this undertaking were VENRO member organisations, many of which have already been implementing their humanitarian relief projects partly or exclusively with local partner organisations for many years. Consequently, they consider respect for and knowledge of the humanitarian principles by local actors an essential prerequisite for the successful expansion of the latter's role in the humanitarian system.

Since the WHS in 2016, German NGOs have been working intensively on this issue in collaboration with the German Federal Foreign Office. In January 2018 they compiled a joint paper[36] to provide orientation for German humanitarian actors when operationalising the localisation agenda. In it, they adhere to the definition set down in the Inter Agency Standing Committee's humanitarian financing task team, according to which national and local NGOs and civil society organisations – as well as the Red Cross / Red Crescent societies and national government offices – are to be considered 'local actors'. The less organised, lower levels are also mentioned:

"On its own, humanitarian relief cannot promote the creation of independent civil society, though it can, preventively in the medium term, strengthen the organisational structures and humanitarian capacities of local actors from the national level to affected populations on a community level in humanitarian crisis situations. By this means it can contribute to the resilience and local co-determination of affected people."

The paper demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of localisation: It defines as core elements a broad range of capacity building measures and improved access to funding for local actors, and also the reassignment of coordination responsibilities – moving away from international actors to more involvement of local actors. The latter has already been successfully put into practice in a number of crisis-hit countries (Afghanistan, Kenya, Somalia etc.).

The paper describes to what extent the various existing partnership and cooperation models between international and local NGOs in different humanitarian contexts serve the implementation of the humanitarian principles – and where this poses specific challenges, especially in complex crises and violent conflicts, where potential partnerships and cooperation with local NGOs have to be carefully weighed up. In sudden on-set disasters there needs to be early investment in long-term partnerships combined with adequate capacity development. Concrete action plans and proposals as well as good-practice examples complete these analyses.

However, what is so far lacking in the German debate are precise ideas about how to achieve participation and co-determination for the affected population. For this, it would be advisable to evaluate the previous international debates.[37] The "new understanding of the role of INGOs (...), e.g. as capacity developers, moderators/advisors for local actors", developed in the benchmark paper, should be concretised. The experiences of VENRO member NGOs with the People First Impact Method (P-FIM) as well as the ideas of the ReflACTION think tank can contribute to this process.

them to understand how money is used by relief organisations and how, at least in rough terms, the accounting has to be carried out. This allows them to exert a certain degree of control over relief organisations (or their staff) and thus minimise the risk that money is misappropriated or misused for political purposes. In addition, affected people would often like access to small loans or professional training. Stronger financial independence also gives communities a degree of protection against government exploitation or manipulation.[33]

In other words, capacities are not strengthened by abstract donor plans and principles, but rather by approaches that accommodate the cultural circumstances, consider local actors and their values as resources, and include affected people in the dialogue.

In the case of institutionalised local NGOs, financial support should also be accompanied by institutional capacity building. This could, for example, take the form of increasing legal knowledge (see above) as well as skills in fundraising and in conflict analysis and resolution. In conflict contexts, international partners have so far paid too little attention to training local NGOs in security management in particular. They have also ignored the fact that this involves specific costs. This has led to prohibitive risks for local NGOs.[34] In addition, trainings in community engagement competences are important to put local NGOs in a position where they can conduct a participative dialogue with affected people in their own society and include them in an empowering way.

Here too, the requirements and priorities for training need to be defined by the local NGOs themselves. The localisation debate should not repeat the past mistake in which 'we' discuss whether 'they' will be supported – or whether 'they' are the first responders, and what 'they' need to learn in 'our' opinion. Instead, 'we' should start to listen and engage in a dialogue on equal terms.

In conclusion: The reform of the humanitarian sector must combine localisation and empowerment

In view of the crises and conflicts around the world, a radical reform of the humanitarian sector is unavoidable. This reform must work towards the political and economic empowerment of local actors. This does not only include providing them with comprehensive, direct financial and institutional support. Rather, local and international NGOs (and also local governments) must promote the participation of people affected by crises on an informal, local level.

This approach requires that international and local actors strengthen their community engagement competences. Moreover, the INGOs must change their perception of their role – indeed such changes must go beyond Schenkenberg's demand for an updated language in the ICRC Code

of Conduct. There will be fewer cases in which INGOs implement projects themselves, be it alone or in a subsidiary or complementary role to local NGOs. Instead, they will in future have a greater role in supporting local (formal and informal) actors in their own processes and considerations. This can contribute to a situation whereby in the medium term, local and international NGOs work together in partnerships on a truly equal basis which could also include the affected people. In this way, all parties can learn from each other and provide mutual support.

A broad localisation approach such as this can strengthen the independence and impartiality of local NGOs. It can also lead to more respect for human dignity. This is absolutely essential, especially for the principle of humanity.

Translated from German by Alexander Zuckrow[38]

Endnotes

1   Quote from a local NGO staff member at the end of a People First Impact Method exercise in Kakuma, northern Kenya, 2017.

2   See UN General Assembly resolution 46/182.

3   See Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief, 31/12/1994, Publication Ref. 1067. Online at: www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/publications/icrc-002-1067.pdf [06.03.2018].

4   See Küng, Hans. (1990). Projekt Weltethos.

5   Such as by John Rawls, Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen, Jürgen Habermas or the Dalai Lama.

6   Thus, in the Philippines we find the terms damayan (help among equals in times of crisis) and pagtutulungan (mutual self-help). Both imply an equal status between those giving and recieving help. However, the western concept of Kawanggawa (one-sided charity) was probably introduced by Catholic missionaries (Athena Banza, oral statement 2018). The meaning of mutual help in times of need can also be found in the following African sayings: Help those who cannot help themselves (Congo), Not to aid one in distress is to kill her in your heart (Yoruba), The help you give others will soon be your own help (Ewe/Togo), The woman who kills the snake for you is your neighbour; see Ibekwe, Patrick. (1998). Wit & Wisdom of Africa. In: Proverbs from Africa and the Caribbean. Caribbean (Sukuma/Tanzania): New Internationalist Publ, pp. 88-89.

7   Saying of the Haya people from Tanzania, see Ibekwe, Patrick. (1998). lc.

8   www.icvanetwork.org/system/files/versions/London_Side_Event_10May2017_Notes.pdf [06.03.2018].

9   www.irinnews.org/report/85045/pakistan-idp-hosts-under-pressure [06.03.2018]; www.aerzte-ohne-grenzen.at/article/pakistan-die-belastung-der-gastfamilien-ist-enorm--interview-zur-situation-der-vertriebenen-aus-dem-swat-tal [06.03.2018].

10 www.heks.ch/sites/default/files/documents/2017-01/Factsheet16_Projekt_640315.pdf [06.03.2018]; www.caritas-international.de/cms/contents/caritas-internationa/medien/dokumente/oeffentlich-gefoerde/zentralirak-unterstu/oeffentliche_foerderer_aa_irak_p308-012-2016.pdf [06.03.2018].

11 www.kath.ch/medienspiegel/soforthilfe-fuer-intern-vertriebene-im-sudan/ [06.03.2018].

12 www.refworld.org/pdfid/4fe8732c2.pdf; www.icvanetwork.org/system/files/versions/IDPs%20outside%20camps.pdf [06.03.2018].

13 Zyck, Steven A. and Krebs, Hanna B. (2015). Localising Humanitarianism: Improving Effectiveness Through Inclusive Action. Humanitarian Policy Group, ODI, pp. 4-5.

14 Cf. i.a. Stephen, Monica. (2017). Partnerships in Conflict. How Violent Conflict Impacts on Local Civil Society and How International Partners Respond. International Alert & Oxfam, p. 2. Online at: https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/partnerships-in-conflict-how-violent-conflict-impacts-local-civil-society-and-h-620359 [06.03.2018].

15 Stephen, Monica, lc., pp. 10, 16.

16 Stephen, Monica, lc., p. 10.

17 Cf. also the Sphere Project Humanitarian Charter.

18 Liliane Bitong, email dated 05/02/2018 to the author.

19 Putting People at the Centre of the World Humanitarian Summit. A consultation with people affected by conflict and natural disasters in Colombia led by Plan International Germany, with the support of the German Federal Foreign Office, Hamburg (2015); McCarthy, Gerry, Kipfer-Didavi, Inez. (2016). Putting People First – Community Engagement in Humanitarian Practice. Summary Report and Evaluation of P-FIM Exercises in Germany and DR Congo 2016. Johanniter International Assistance, with the support of the German Federal Foreign Office, pp. 15, 23; Restoring Humanity: Global Voices Calling for Action. Synthesis of the Consultation Process for the World Humanitarian Summit, (2015), pp. 12 -27.

20 Correspondingly, the WHS steering committee for eastern and southern Africa demanded "radical change to improve engagement with affected communities", cf. Eastern and Southern Africa RSG Presentations – WHS Istanbul, presented by Gerry McCarthy on 24/05/2016; Eastern Africa NGOs Brief for the WHS Announcement Plenary, presented by Eunice Ndonga-Githingi of the Refugee Consortium, Kenya; Our Voices at Istanbul: Outcomes of a civil society conference, HLA, KRC and START Network 2016.

21 Final Report of the WHS Global Consultation, Geneva 14-16/10/2015, p. 10.

22 One Humanity: Shared Responsibility, Report of the UN Secretary General for the World Humanitarian Summit, United Nations A/70/709, 02/02/2016, pp. 3, 27-28, 35, 53.

23 The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need, Istanbul, Turkey, 23/05/2016.

24 The large-scale shift from humanitarian relief to nationwide cash transfer payments, which is notably practiced in Syria, supports a few very large, international actors on a grand scale (among them the WFP, IFRC, private multinational banks and mobile communications providers). This carries the risk that the private market and the power relations between relief actors (UN, international and national NGOs) is distorted to the detriment of local and international civil society. To what extent these private companies will subordinate their profit motive to the humanitarian principles in the long term remains to be seen.

25 Austin, Lois. (2017). The Role of Collective Platforms, Services and Tools to Support Communication and Community Engagement in Humanitarian Action. CDAC Network Policy Brief.

26   The Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS) is pioneering here. Potential tools for its application include the Ground Truth's Constituent Voice method (Nik Rilkoff for Save the Children, Danish Church Aid and Ground Truth Solutions 2016, online at www.danchurchaid.org/about-us/quality-assurance/the-listen-learn-act-project [06.03.2018]) and the People First Impact Method by Gerry McCarthy and Paul O'Hagan (cf. Inez Kipfer-Didavi for Johanniter 2017, online at: https://reliefweb.int/report/world/people-first-impact-method-p-fim-community-engagement-tool-enhance-relevance [06.03.2018]).

27   Cf. Recommendations that promote effective participation of people affected by crisis in humanitarian decisions and incentivise participation as a way of working for GB signatories, Grand Bargain workstream 2, July 2017, pp. 1-4.

28   http://near.ngo/our-reach [06.03.2018].

29   https://charter4change.org/signatories [06.03.2018].

30   Founded in 2016, the NEAR Network is a network of local and national NGOs from the global south. Its common goal is to "transform the humanitarian and development policy system from its top-down approach to a locally planned and managed system with equitable, dignified and accountable partnerships". See www.near.ngo [06.03.2018].

31   In the Charter4Change – Localisation of Humanitarian Aid, 29 INGOs (among them four from Germany) made a commitment following the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit to pass on 20 percent of their humanitarian funds to local NGOs by May 2018. They aim to account for this share in a transparent way, and clarify the role of the local actors in their communication. 150 local and national NGOs have endorsed the charter in writing. Online at: https://charter4change.org [06.03.2018].

32   Examples of such participatory and empowering approaches on the community level ares the People First Impact Method by McCarthy and O'Hagen (http://www.p-fim.org [06.03.2018]), and the Resiliency Framework developed by CORDAID.

33   McCarthy and Kipfer-Didavi. (2016). Ic., p. 7.

34   Stephen, Monica, lc., pp. 10-11.

35   Contribution to the World Humanitarian Summit by the German Coordination Committee for Humanitarian Assistance, 2014, (inc. appendix by Inez Kipfer-Didavi). Online at: https://ngovoice.org/search?q=whs+german [06.03.2018].

36   „So lokal wie möglich, so international wie nötig" – die Lokalisierung des humanitären Systems, Eckpunkte zur Umsetzung durch deutsche humanitäre Akteure, draft (as of November 2017).

37   Particularly those of the Grand Bargain Workstreams on "participation revolution" sketched out above, the IASC Task Teams on Accountability to Affected People and the broad ranging experiences within the CHS Alliance and the CDAC network.

38   The original version of this article is published in the German edition of this volume: Quack, Martin (ed.). (2018). Allein nach dem Maß der Not? Unparteilichkeit in der Humanitären Hilfe.