LOCALISATION BASELINE REPORT

Cover Photo: Women during a tailoring class at Ajloun Oasis Centre. UN Women/Bashar Al-Ja'bari

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The localisation of humanitarian work in Jordan is an ongoing process that requires collaboration and co-operation among local and international actors. The survey results highlight both progress and challenges in the efforts to promote the implementation of the localisation agenda.

This baseline report provides an overview of the current status of localisation efforts in Jordan in-line with the Jordan Localisation Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning Framework1 and the global Grand Bargain commitments.2 Importantly, this baseline provides an important evidence base to inform the way forward for advancing localisation efforts in Jordan, notably in a gender-responsive and inclusive manner.

In summary, the analysis of the various outcome areas reveals both positive developments and areas requiring further attention in the International Actors-Local and National Actors (IA-LNA) localisation relationship dynamics. While progress has been made in implementing accountability systems and supporting community-led projects, power differentials persist and need more mitigation, and efforts should be focused on contextualizing agreements, integrating, and empowering LNAs, and involving them in decision-making processes.

In terms of funding, there is a need for increased direct funding opportunities for LNAs and policy changes to facilitate equitable resource distribution. Strengthening LNAs' sustainability and capacity, including addressing their specific needs and enhancing financial management systems, is crucial. Furthermore, efforts should be made to manage risks effectively and adopt comprehensive risk management practices within LNAs.

Capacity assessments should consider the needs and capacities of both LNAs and IAs, and capacity strengthening plans should be incorporated into partnership agreements. Collaborative initiatives between LNAs and IAs, particularly during the preparedness phase, are important for effective capacity strengthening.

While there are ongoing efforts to enhance LNAs' engagement in coordination mechanisms, barriers to participation and the need for greater inclusion of local voices persist. Language barriers, technical jargon, and limited representation of LNAs should be addressed to ensure meaningful engagement.

Acknowledging and crediting the roles and achievements of LNAs in public communications is important in order to positively shape perceptions of LNAs within the community and among funders. This recognition can contribute to strengthening support for LNAs role and strategic positioning.

Lastly, IAs must support the advocacy capacity of LNAs, and efforts should go beyond training including measures such as information-sharing, administrative support, technical assistance, and facilitating connections. Engaging government, funders, and communities in strategic dialogues is essential to address mutual areas of interest and to drive change. Overall, by addressing the identified areas for improvement, enhancing partnership dynamics, and promoting inclusive practices, the IA-LNA collaboration can become more equitable, effective, and locally-led, ultimately leading to more efficient, effective and better quality humanitarian action in Jordan.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

In Jordan, the Jordan Strategic Humanitarian Committee (JoSH) – formerly Humanitarian Partners Forum (HPF) - mobilized a Localisation Task Team (LTT), co-chaired by the Jordan National NGO Forum (JONAF), the Jordan INGO Forum (JIF) and UN Women, to translate the Grand Bargain commitments into concrete actions.

This baseline report was commissioned by UN Women on behalf of the Localization Task Team (LTT) with support from a Localisation MEAL Specialist funded by the Government of Australia. The report builds on, and further assesses the baseline status of the seven dimensions of the Localisation Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL) Framework which was developed and officially endorsed by Jordan Humanitarian Partners Forum (HPF) – now renamed the Jordan Strategic Humanitarian Committee (JoSH) - in June 2021.

The aim of this report is to provide a comprehensive baseline assessment for the 7 outcome areas of the Localisation MEAL framework (areas include Partnership Quality, Participation, Funding, Capacity, Coordination, Perceptions, and Enabling Environment) which are to be achieved through 15 actions and measures through 37 indicators. This will serve to draw a picture of the current status of and any progress made in the implementation of the localisation agenda in Jordan, notably in a gender-responsive and inclusive manner.

This report is intended to be useful for, and used by, all humanitarian actors in Jordan. It recognizes that while localisation definitions and priorities should be set by local and national actors, progressing localisation in Jordan is the shared responsibility of all. It also recognizes that all actors have both capacities and capacity gaps. The Localization MEAL Framework that forms a basis of the report, pays particular attention to the activities and practices required to be undertaken by international actors (donors, INGOs, UN) in order to reform their current practices and systems to become more locally led. But is intended as a tool for, and to be utilized by, any actor that is engaged in humanitarian action at any level.

In recent years, and particularly following the Grand Bargain in 2016, a range of practice notes, tools and frameworks have been developed to measure localisation progress at the global, national and response levels. There is less evidence, however, of the extent to which these frameworks have been effectively utilised and adapted by actors, though more evidence is emerging.

Global Mentoring Initiative's (GMI) original 'Seven Dimensions of Localisation' has been well utilised, adapted and built upon by others (see box inset) and offers a relevant and helpful starting point for Jordan. For this Framework, the 'dimensions' and corresponding actions and indicators have been tailored to reflect the national and operational context.

The ultimate goal of this MEAL process is to facilitate more effective, inclusive and sustainable humanitarian preparedness, response, recovery and stabilisation efforts in Jordan. Genuine localisation progress is an important pathway to achieving this goal.

METHODOLOGY

The process for collecting the baseline data was multi-faceted and required multi-stakeholder engagement, namely through collecting relevant information across the 7 outcome areas from all actors that have committed to the Localisation MEAL Framework, as per below:

For the Partnership Quality outcome indicators, data was collected from IAs and LNAs who committed to share information about their current practices of the different aspects of the Principles of Partnerships.

For the Participation outcome indicators, data was collected from IAs and LNAs who committed to share information about their current practices of promoted accountability to affected populations.

For the Funding outcome indicators, data was collected from OCHA (JHF), as well as from donors and IAs who committed to share information about their current practices of promoting increasing financing for local organisations, as well as from LNAs who commit to strengthening their risk mitigation plans.

For the Capacity outcome indicators, data was collected from IAs and LNAs who commit to share information about their current practices of promoting shared capacity strengthening initiatives as a part of their partnerships.

For the Coordination outcome indicators, data was collected from the refugee sectors/sub-sectors/working groups about their current practices of promoting the localisation agenda in their coordination structures, as well as from LNAs about their perception of their participation in these structures.

For the Perceptions of Local Actors outcome indicators, data was collected from the IAs who committed to share information about their current practices of accrediting LNA partners in public communications, as well as LNAs perceptions of this.

For the Enabling Environment outcome indicators, data was collected from IAs and LNAs who committed to share information about their current practices of jointly advocating for issues of mutual importance.

DATA COLLECTION

Data was collected through two online surveys developed for: 1) those that directly implement humanitarian action (primarily local, national and international humanitarian actors); and 2) those that fund humanitarian action (donors). The survey for those that implement humanitarian action was translated and made available in Arabic and English, on Kobo Toolbox. The survey for those that fund humanitarian action was made available in English only on Kobo Toolbox.

The Localisation Baseline Survey was shared with all members of the JoSH (former HPF) in June 2022, and confidentiality was guaranteed.

Before launching the survey, all actors were invited to attend a Workshop for Roll-out of the Jordan Humanitarian Partners Forum (HPF) Localization Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) Framework and baseline data collection on 12 June 2022. The overall purpose of this workshop was to bring together key stakeholders from local and international organizations representing donors, UN agencies, INGOs, L/NNGOs, CSOs, and Sector/Sub-sector/Working Group leads working in the humanitarian response in Jordan to encourage collective and stakeholder-specific sign-up and commitment to implementing the Localisation MEAL framework through their respective organizations. The concrete objective of the workshop was to brief participants on the scope and purpose of the Localization MEAL Framework and the requirements and expectations associated with signing-up and committing to the framework, including baseline, monitoring, reporting and accountability requirement in addition to introducing them on how the tools of the data collection (survey) and type of data and info need to be filled within this survey. The workshop included both plenary presentations, keynote, and guest speaker remarks, and used a participatory and facilitated approach to promote peer learning and reflection between stakeholders to enable people to people exchange and agree on the next steps for rolling out the framework and its baseline.

The workshop introduced the 70 participants (representing 24 IAs and 20 LNAs) to the localization MEAL framework, its seven outcomes and indicators, as well as the importance of all stakeholder's contribution to the localisation baseline report.

Following the workshop, a series of group and individual online follow-up sessions were conducted to answer the participants' further questions in relation to the baseline data reporting process.

LIMITATIONS

The main limitation facing the data collection for this baseline report is the lower-than-expected number of LNAs/IAs that contributed to the survey, despite being circulated with all members of the JoSH and organizing the dedicated launch workshop for 70 participants.

Key issues shared by organisations who apologized for not being able to contribute to the data collection were: 1) data sharing concerns, 2) lengthiness and complexity of the baseline survey (requiring inputs from multiple departments within each organization, e.g.HR, finance, communications) and related staff capacity gaps. For the LNAs specifically, a major obstacle highlighted was the absence of institutional memory and records, as well as staff shortage, preventing them from being able to respond to several the survey questions.

In relation to the outcome area related to funding, it was difficult to obtain accurate figures from actors, particularly when asking about funding allocated to a specific task such as capacity building as not all organisations had such budget breakdown.

Furthermore, it should be noted that in order to ease the baseline data collection process, a new set of SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) data collection indicators were developed to match the original indicators in the Localisation MEAL framework.

In relation to the questions related to LNAs participation in humanitarian coordination mechanisms, it should be noted that there was some limitation in the understanding and awareness of what these groups are, hence impacting the clarity of their responses.

BASELINE FINDINGS ON OUTCOME AREAS (1-7)

The baseline survey reflects the data submissions of 41 actors (16 LNAs, 19 IAs and 6 donors). The overall findings and results per outcome as per related indicators are presented below.

I. Outcome Area 1: Partnership Quality [3 Actions; 9 Indicators]

This outcome recognizes that **quality partnerships are at the heart of the localization agenda**. Actions and indicators for this outcome area focus on the need for actors to jointly articulate and adhere to agreed principles of engagement, strengthening the role of local and national actors in the development and implementation of programs, and taking steps where possible to reduce differentials between international and local actors.

Overall, the baseline analysis indicated that significant efforts have been made to ensure partnerships between local, national, and international actors (including women's rights and women-led organizations) are genuine, equitable and complementary. Nonetheless differential positions of power are still embedded within many of the IA-LNA partnership arrangements.

Under action number one "Embed, and actively practice, the Principles of Partnership (PoP) in humanitarian partnerships and programming," the baseline analysis shows that both IAs and LNAs are adhering to the PoP and confirming their commitment to them. This is a positive indication of the recognition and understanding of the importance of equitable and collaborative partnerships in humanitarian efforts. However, there is a need to further contextualize the partnership agreements to ensure they are inclusive and responsive to the needs and preferences of LNAs. This includes incorporating Arabic as the local language in Jordan in partnership documents, which can facilitate a better understanding and engagement among all partners.

This outcome area also highlights the **importance of enhancing the integration and roles of LNAs in different stages of the project**. This implies creating opportunities for LNAs to have a more active and meaningful involvement in decision-making, planning, and implementation processes, thereby strengthening their ownership and leadership in humanitarian programming. Under action number two "LNA and IA collaborate throughout the program cycle (incl. design, planning, proposal development, MEAL), and with crisis-affected people, share decision-making while performing complementary roles," the baseline analysis suggests that there is a good level of collaboration between IAs and LNAs when it comes to conducting needs assessments. This indicates a recognition of the importance of involving LNAs in the understanding the needs and priorities of crisis-affected populations. However, **according to inputs from LNAs, their involvement in the partnership is still limited and their contributions often revolve around field data collection and coordination, rather than actively participating in decision-making processes and program design and planning**. In line with this, the baseline analysis also indicates that IAs are not fully collaborating with LNAs throughout all stages of the program cycle.

As further stressed under this outcome area, to strengthen collaboration, it is **important for IAs to recognize and value the expertise and perspectives of LNAs**. This includes involving them in **decision-making processes, sharing complementary roles, and actively engaging them in program design, planning, proposal development, and monitoring and evaluation (MEAL) activities.** In relation to action number three of "Within their partnerships, LNA and IA promote and adhere to ethical recruitment practices and more equitable employment conditions," the baseline analysis indicates that both LNAs and IAs report full adherence to ethical recruitment practices and employment conditions. However, it is important to note that self-reporting can be subjective, and there may be variations in how actors define and interpret ethical recruitment practices.

Partnership Quality		
Actions	**Indicators**	**Baseline findings**
1.1 Embed, and actively practice, the Principles of Partnership (PoP) in humanitarian partnerships and programming.	**1.1a** A set of contextualized partnership principles are embedded in partnership documentation (e.g. MOUs or partnership agreements, partnership plans and reporting). **Definition:** IAs were asked to answer if their partnership agreements are aligned with POP in order to determine the % of the partnership agreements that follow all the POP (Equality Transparency Result-oriented approach Responsibility Complementarity).	**Result: 100% (19/19)** Analysis indicates that all of the IAs (100%) reported that their partnership agreements followed the POP.
	1.1b % of IA that have partnership agreements with LNA that have clear, mutually agreed roles and responsibilities, reciprocal reporting, and a means to raise concerns and challenges. **Definition:** IAs were asked to respond if their partnership agreements have clear, mutually agreed roles and responsibilities, reciprocal reporting, and a means to raise concerns and challenges.	**Result: 94% (18/19)** The analysis shows that that 94% of IAs were able to confirm positively in response to this question, and only one of them was not able to confirm about having reciprocal project progress reporting.
	1.1c % of LNA that self-report that strategic partnerships with IAs increasingly reflect the goals and ambitions of the LNA partner. **Definition:** LNAs were asked if their strategic partnership with IAs increasingly reflects their goals and ambitions.	**Result: 93% (14/15 3)** Analysis reveals that 93% of LNAs believe their partnerships with IAs reflect their goals and ambitions. A follow-up question was also asked to understand the extent to which LNA goals and ambitions are reflected within the IA strategic partnership,

		with 64% of LNAs believing that more than 70% is reflected, 22% believing that this reflects between 50-70%, and the remaining 14% believing that it is less than 50%.
		More than 70% of those who reported that this strategic partnership reflected their goals and ambitions stated that those partnerships helped them to get new opportunities working with IAs, new knowledge in the field, and the opportunity to implement projects in their local community based on their needs.
		Those who believe that the strategic partnerships with IAs only reflect their LNA goals less than 50% of the time point to the fact that their thoughts and perspectives on working in the field based on their local experience were not considered.
	1.1d Where possible, partnership documentation is accepted in Arabic. **Definition:** % of IAs who accept submission of partnership documents in Arabic.	**Result: 58% (11/19)** Analysis shows that 58% of the IAs accept Arabic partnership documentation.
1.2 LNA and IA collaborate throughout the programme cycle (incl. design, planning, proposal development, MEAL), and with crisis-affected people, share decision-making while performing complementary roles.	**1.2a** % of needs assessments that are genuinely collaborative needs assessments and consultations carried out and used to inform proposal and program design. **Definition:** LNA and IA were asked about processes for conducting the needed assessment and whether they use those needed assessments in proposal and programs design .	**Result: 58% (15/26)** Analysis indicates that 63% (12 out of 19) of IAs reported that they conducted a total of 26 needs assessment during 2021, out of which 15 were done in collaboration with LNAs. 62.5% of LNA (10 /16) reported that they were part of a joint needs assessment, however, they mentioned that their role was limited to field data collection including surveys and conducting FGDs.

	1.2b Number of programmes co-designed (where possible), implemented, monitored and evaluated with LNA and crisis-affected people.	**Result: 36% (7/19)** For this indicator, 59% (11 /19) of IA reported that they have a program co-designed with LNA. Once asked about the project implementation, the percentage increased to 89,4% (17 /19) of IA who reported that they implement programs with LNA. However, when asked if those programs are co-monitored and evaluated with LNAs and crisis-affected people, only 52% of IA (10/19) mentioned that they monitor and evaluate those programs together with LNAs.
	1.2c LNA self-report that partnerships are genuine and equitable (partners feel respected and equally valued). **Definition:** % LNAs that self-report that partnerships are genuine and equitable (partners feel respected and equally valued).	**Result: 56% (9/16)** While 56% of LNAs self-reported that they feel their partnerships with IAs assure that they are respected and equally valued, the remaining 43% of LNAs were less assure of this as they self-reported that they feel respected and equally valued to some extent. A follow up question was asked for LNAs to explain their answer further to which the 56% of LNAs who reported they were happy with the partnership, explained that they feel the partnerships give them the space to address their needs and build their capacity, and that they feel that they are listened to and respected. However, the remaining 43% explained that they believe that the partnership agreement is only in place because it is mandatory for IAs to partner with LNAs and that there is no real collaboration in the field nor focus on strengthening the capacity and involvement of the LNA.

1.3 Within their partnerships, LNA and IA promote and adhere to ethical recruitment practices and more equitable employment conditions.	**1.3a** All actors have ethical recruitment guidelines that are available and adhered to. **Definition:** % of IAs/LNAs who have ethical recruitment guidelines that are available and adhered to.	**Result: 100% (35/35)** Analysis shows that all IAs/LNAs report that they have ethical recruitment guidelines and that they adhered to.
	1.3b % of IA and LNA that have taken steps to reduce differences in conditions between their national and international staff, where relevant. This can include examples that relate to well-being, remuneration, safety and security conditions, career development etc.	**Result: 100% (35/35)** All IAs and LNAs responded positively to this indicator as they confirm that they take steps to reduce differences in conditions between their national and international staff- if these exist.

II. Outcome Area 2: Participation [2 Actions; 5 Indicators]

This outcome recognizes the importance of ensuring that crisis-affected women, men, boys, and girls are meaningfully involved in determining what assistance is provided to them, and how humanitarian assistance is delivered to enhance the lives and livelihoods. This includes ensuring they have influence over the decisions and activities that affect them.

While locally-led programming is seen as a way to be better engaged with local communities and more in tune their needs, localisation does not naturally lead to better accountability to affected people. Hence, actions to actively improve participation are important to be included in localization planning.

This outcome seeks to strengthen opportunities for crisis-affected communities to shape the development of interventions and participate in their evaluation. Enhancing meaningful participation is especially important in the Jordanian context, given the diversity of capacities and needs of refugee and host communities in the country.

Under action number one of this outcome "IAs and LNAs strengthen opportunities for crisis-affected women, men, boys, and girls to understand and shape humanitarian programming, including evaluating those programs," the results indicate a mixed progress as around **70% of actors have implemented an accountability system for the affected population**, which shows a commitment to engaging and involving them in humanitarian programming. However, only **40% of IAs and LNAs reported having inclusive tools that consider gender, age, and diversity** when communicating and engaging with the affected population. This suggests a need for improvement in ensuring that the voices and perspectives of all individuals, regardless of gender, age, or diversity, are included and considered in programming efforts. Furthermore, only **46% of actors reported using Arabic and inclusive communication tools that address gender, age, and diversity** when interacting with the affected population. This highlights a gap in effectively reaching and engaging with the local communities using culturally appropriate and accessible means.

Regarding action number two "Donors fund, and IAs or LNAs pilot, community-led projects where conditions allow," the results indicate a positive trend in which **45% of the actors reported offering CBOs/CSOs the opportunity to pilot community-led projects**. This demonstrates a recognition of the value and importance of empowering local communities and allowing them to take the lead in addressing their own needs and priorities.

Participation		
Actions	**Indicators**	**Baseline findings**
2.1 IA and LNA strengthen opportunities for crisis-affected women, men, boys and girls to understand and shape humanitarian programming, including evaluating those programmes.	**2.1a** Existence of formal mechanisms within IA and LNA that provide quality information to, and ensure the participation of and two-way communication with, crisis-affected people (safe and inclusive accountability and community feedback mechanisms, MEAL processes). **Definition:** % of IA/LNA that have formal accountability and community feedback mechanisms for crisis-affected people.	**Result: 69% (24/35)** 69% (24/35) indicate that they have feedback mechanisms. Among the IAs, 95% of them report having feedback mechanisms in place, however only 38% of LNAs report this. As follow up question, most of those actors who confirm having feedback mechanisms in place reported using hotlines and WhatsApp as the main channels of feedback.
	2.1b Mechanisms designed to strengthen participation reflect the gender, age and diversity of crisis-affected people and are inclusive of – and accessible to – these different groups. **Definition:** % of IA/LNA that have formal inclusive (gender, age and diversity) accountability and community feedback mechanisms for crisis-affected people.	**Result: 40% (14/35)** 53% of IAs (10/19) report positively on the 3 aspects of inclusivity while only 25% of LNAs (4/16) reported this. Gender: If we only focus on gender inclusion, 74% (26/35) of all actors reported that their feedback mechanism is inclusive from a gender perspective – this includes 94% of IAs and 50% of LNAs. Age: Regarding the age inclusion, 71% (25/35) of all actors confirm this, including 95% of IAs and 45% of LNAs. Disability: For the Disability inclusion, the result was similar to the one for age with 71% (25/35) of all actors – including 95% of IAs and 45% of LNAs.

	2.1c % of IA and LNA that use contextualized communication examples (e.g. Arabic or another local language, visual and audio, door-to-door, radio/TV and other information dissemination modes) employed to reach crisis-affected people according to their gender, age and diversity, while ensuring not to reinforce gender stereotypes and harmful gender norms and roles through images and messaging.	**Result: 46% (16/35)** Among all actors 46% reported that they use Arabic, gender, age and diversity inclusive communication tools – this includes 42% of IAs and 50% of LNAs. For this indicator, both actors were asked about the language used for the communication tools, in addition to whether their tools are inclusive in term of gender, age and disability. Arabic Language: 60% (21/35) of all actors confirm that they use Arabic language all the time, followed by 34% (12/35) who sometimes use Arabic and only 6% (2/35) not using Arabic at all. This includes 75% of LNAs reporting using Arabic compared with 47% of IAs who report using Arabic all the time. Gender: 89% (31/35) of all actors report considering gender in their tools - 89% of IAs and 87% of LNAs. Age: 83% (29/35) of actors confirm this, 87% of IAs and 78% of LNAs. Disability: 71% (25/35) of all actors confirm this, 74% of IAs and 69% of LNAs.

2.2 Donors fund, and IA or LNA pilot, community-led projects where conditions allow.	2.2a Examples of community and CSO-led funds piloted (including women-led, women's CSO-led and DPO-led). **Definition:** % of the actors providing funds/ grants to be led from CSO/CBO.	**Result: 45%** 45% of all actors (16/ 35) indicate that they have fund grants led by CSO/CBO, including 58% of IAs and 31% of LNAs. The total budget of funds/grants led by CSO/CBO reported by all actors adds up to 61,364,881 USD.

III. Outcome Area 3: Funding [3 Actions; 10 Indicators]

This outcome area recognizes the importance that local and national humanitarian actors, including women's rights and women-led organizations, have **increased access to quality funding (international and national)**. This outcome area seeks to **increase the quantity of overall funding to local and national actors and to diversify the types of local and national actors that receive funding**. Pooled funds are an important component of funding for localization but the localization MEAL Framework recognizes that pooled funds represent only a fragment of overall humanitarian funding. For this reason, indicators require reporting of both pooled and non-pooled funds as a proportion of all funding. The outcome area aims to promote **quality funding through the increased provision of multi-year and core funds by donors, and through reducing barriers for local and national actors to access quality funding, for example through capacity support for proposals, budgeting and overall financial governance**.

In relation to action number one under this outcome "Donors make direct funding (more) available and accessible to local and national actors, including through the Jordan Humanitarian Fund (JHF), Women Peace and Humanitarian Fund (WPHF)4, and the Jordan Response Plan (JRP), the analysis of data for 2021 reveals that there is **limited direct funding available to local and national actors (LNAs) compared to international actors (IAs)**. This discrepancy in funding allocation raises questions about the equitable distribution of resources and the ability of LNAs to access direct funding to support their humanitarian activities. Furthermore, the analysis highlights that none of the donors reported making any changes in their policies to allow for more direct funding to LNAs. This lack of policy changes suggests a need for greater recognition and support for LNAs, including enabling them to access funding directly. Direct funding can empower LNAs by providing them with greater control over resources and decision-making processes, ultimately leading to more effective and locally-led humanitarian interventions.

For action two under this outcome "IAs support LNAs to build their sustainability by providing multi-year funds and allowing core funds in project budgets", the analysis reveals that IAs are willing to provide multi-year funds to LNAs, which is a positive step towards enhancing their sustainability and localisation efforts. By offering multi-year funding, LNAs can have more predictable and stable resources to plan and implement their programs and projects. However, it is noted that IAs have mainly focused on budgeting for the implementation phase without adequately considering the different needs of LNAs in order to implement effectively. This suggests that there may be a gap in understanding and addressing the specific capacity and resource requirements of LNAs beyond the implementation phase.

For action three under this outcome "IAs support LNAs to enhance their capacity to access quality funding and strengthen their financial management systems, with a focus on risk mitigation", the analysis indicates that there is a discrepancy between the presence of LNAs in different fund allocation rounds and the level of funding-related support provided by international actors (IAs) to LNAs. While LNAs were present in 90% of the fund allocation rounds run by the Jordan Humanitarian Fund (JHF), only 1% of IAs' funds were reported as allocated to funding-related support or capacity-strengthening activities to LNAs. This suggests that there is a need for greater attention and investment in supporting LNAs in accessing quality funding and strengthening their financial management systems. Furthermore, while 43% of LNAs confirmed having a risk plan, only 37% of them reported adopting risk mitigation measures and addressing fiduciary, institutional, and programmatic risks. This suggests that there is room for improvement in terms of fully integrating risk management practices and addressing various types of risks within LNAs. .

Funding		
Actions	**Indicators**	**Baseline findings**
3.1. Donors make direct funding (more) available and accessible to local and national actors, including through the JHF, WPHF, JRP and other CBPFs and ERFs.	**3.1a** Number of humanitarian funding mechanisms available in Jordan for LNA.	1[5]
	3.1b % of pooled humanitarian funds, including the Jordan Humanitarian Fund, that is allocated to LNAs.	**Result: 12%** (source: Humanitarian Partnerships and Capacity Exchange Analysis 2021 report).
	3.1c % (and total $ value) of LNA receiving direct funding – not through pooled funds.	**Result: 10%** and 727,097 USD.
	3.1d Year-on-year increases in the proportion of total humanitarian funding awarded to LNA, including through the JHF; proportion of these that are small-medium sized actors (i.e. not Jordan's largest national/ royal NGOs).	**Result:** 2021- 7 Million USD (Baseline). 75% to a small budget range of less than 25K. Bilateral donor grants are largely concentrated in the smallest budgets range: six of eight <25k each.
	3.1e % of donors who have instituted policy changes to enable/ease funding to LNA **Definition:** Using the donor survey, donors were asked to answer the questions if they have any statement in their corporate policies which facilitate the allocation of funding to LNAs.	**Result: 0%** (0/6) Out of the 6 donors, none of them answered positively on this, however, all of them mentioned that internally they have policies and SoPs in place to help enable LNA funding however, this is not publicly available.
3.2 IA support LNA to build their sustainability by providing multi-year funds and allowing core funds in project budgets.	**3.2a** Number of project budgets for LNA that provide multi-year funds (as % of all project budgets).	**Result:** 45 Projects. This question was directed to IAs, 42% of IA (8/19) confirmed that their organization provide multi-year funding to LNA. In the year of reporting, it was indicated that 45 of the funded LNA projects were funded with a multi-year fund amounting to a total of 64,262,159 USD out of 65,568,374 USD (98%).

	3.2b Proportion of total partnership funding per the contract that is allocated to anything other than project implementation (overheads, core costs). **Definition:** Average % cost of total partnership funding that is allocated to anything other than project implementation (overheads, core costs).	**Result: 5%** (3,345,354 USD out of 67,800,439 USD). 53% of IAs (10/ 19) confirmed that they fund LNAs to support with other costs than project implementation.
3.3 IA support LNA to enhance their capacity to access quality funding and strengthen their financial management systems, with a focus on risk mitigation.	**3.3a** Number of funding-related support examples or capacity strengthening activities provided by IA to LNA (e.g. training in resource mobilisation, proposal development, budgeting). **Definition:** percentage and amount of funding-related support examples or capacity-strengthening activities provided by IAs to LNAs (e.g. training in resource mobilization, proposal development, and budgeting).	**Result: 1%** (897,337 USD out of 67,800,439 USD) 32% of international actors (IAs) reported allocating a budget for capacity- strengthening activities for LNAs. These activities were related to humanitarian capacity strengthening efforts. Additionally, it is noted that a total amount of 897,337 USD was allocated by six IAs for these activities.
	3.3b Consultations held with LNA, including local CSOs and CBOs, for the prioritisation of the allocation strategy ahead of each Jordan Humanitarian Funding Round. **Definition:** % of the Jordan Humanitarian Funding allocation rounds which include consultations with LNAs.	**Result: 83%** (5/6). In 2021, the JHF launched one Standard allocation, NNGOs were represented in the JHF's Advisory Board, Sector prioritization committees, and technical reviewing committees (A total of 4 consultative meetings that included members from LNAs). In addition, the JHF and members of JONAF held a roundtable consultative meeting to discuss the restrictions, conditions and hardships that the newly introduced government regulations were creating to LNAs, and the expectations from the Nexus approach moving forward.

	3.3c % of LNA that adopt risk mitigation plans to identify and address fiduciary, institutional and programmatic risks.	**Result: 38%** (6/16) Although 43% (7/16) of LNAs confirm that they have a risk plan, only 6 of them (37%) confirm that their risk plan adopts risk mitigation and address fiduciary, institutional and programmatic risks.

IV. Outcome Area 4: Capacity [2 Actions; 4 Indicators]

This outcome area acknowledges that **local and national actors' capacity is recognized and respected; capacity gaps for all actors are mutually identified and supported**. This outcome area recognizes that all actors have both capacities and capacity gaps. It seeks to ensure that the capacity of local and national actors to design, lead and deliver humanitarian assistance – from needs assessments, planning and design through to monitoring and evaluation is recognized and respected. Hence, it calls for **capacity-strengthening or capacity sharing activities to be mutually identified, more strategic, better coordinated and reported on**. Whilst this outcome area acknowledges the mutual responsibilities of all actors, a priority will be to collectively build the capacities of international actors to engage with and support local actors. Historically, capacity-strengthening initiatives have tended to have an end goal, albeit largely implied, of making local and national actors more international. This framework seeks to challenge that approach.

Regarding action one under this outcome 'LNA and IA assess capacity strengthening needs for each other and/or capacity strengthening is incorporated into partnership agreement", the analysis indicate that there is a tendency for IAs to conduct shared capacity assessments with LNAs. However, the assessment process often **focuses more on the capacity needs of LNAs** rather than considering the capacities of IAs. It does not view the lack of local language skills of staff (Arabic), or any limitations relation to understanding the local context. This unbalanced approach may limit the effectiveness of capacity strengthening initiatives. Additionally, it is noted that not all **capacity assessments are accompanied by appropriate capacity strengthening plans that address the needs of both actors**.

For action two under this outcome, "LNAs and IAs jointly develop and deliver targeted, innovative capacity-strengthening projects and programs, particularly in the preparedness phase, including a specific focus on capacity strengthening for WROs/WLOs", the analysis indicates that although almost half of the IAs allocate specific budget lines for capacity strengthening for LNAs, only 21% confirm that they have implemented joint capacity strengthening initiatives. This suggests that there is still room for improvement in terms of collaborative efforts between IAs and LNAs to jointly develop and deliver capacity-strengthening interventions.

Capacity		
Actions	**Indicators**	**Baseline findings**
4.1. LNA and IA assess capacity strengthening needs for each other and/or capacity strengthening is incorporated into partnership agreements.	**4.1a** Shared capacity assessments are available and/or partnership agreements reflect the same. **Definition:** Number of shared capacity assessments between IAs and LNAs. IAs were asked whether their organization conducts shared capacity assessments with LNAs.	**Result: 196** 84% of IAs (16/19) mentioned that they conduct shared capacity assessments with LNAs which amount to a total number of 196 assessments. According to IAs, the capacity assessment usually is based on the partnership agreement to develop the partner's capacity.
	4.1b Number of capacity-strengthening plans highlighting gaps and contributions of both partners, recognizing complementarity, including disaggregation of those targeting WROs/WLOs/DPOs. Capacity-strengthening approaches and plans can be informed by this Guidance Note. Definition: % of partners who shared capacity-strengthening plans with IA/LNA partners focusing on both partners.	**Result: 43% (15/35)** Both IA and LNA were asked about this, in which both actors share almost the same level of confirmation on this with 42% of IAs (8/19) and 43% of LNAs (7/16). Comparing this to the 4.1 indicator, it is noted that when it comes to shared capacity strengthening, the percentage was almost half of those IAs reporting they conduct shared capacity assessments which shows gap between assessing the capacity and developing the capacity.
4.2. LNA and IA jointly develop and deliver targeted, innovative capacity-strengthening projects and programmes, particularly in the preparedness phase, including a specific focus on capacity strengthening for WROs/WLOs.	**4.2a** Number of funded humanitarian project budgets which include a specific budget line for capacity strengthening of LNA (and proportion of these that are WROs/WLOs and DPOs). **Definition:** IAs were asked if their organization's projects allocate specific budget lines for the capacity strengthening of LNAs.	**Result: 42 projects.** 58% (11/19) indicate that they fund humanitarian projects, and those 11 IAs confirm that among their humanitarian projects, 42 projects allocate specific budget lines for capacity strengthening of LNAs (including 23 WROs, 26 WLOs, 6 DPOs).

| 4.1. LNA and IA assess capacity strengthening needs for each other and/or capacity strengthening is incorporated into partnership agreements. | 4.2b Examples of jointly designed and delivered capacity-strengthening projects.

Definition: Number of joint capacities strengthening initiatives (workshops, training, webinar). | **Result: 31**

21% (4/19) of IAs indicate that they did joint capacity strengthening initiatives with a total of 31 initiatives.

Those 4 IAs reporting conducting different types of training either based on the partners' feedback or as per their internal needs and policy. |

V. Outcome Area 5: Coordination [2 Actions; 4 Indicators]

This outcome area acknowledges the need for local and national actors, including women's rights and women-led organizations, to have greater presence, influence, and leadership in humanitarian coordination mechanisms. It seeks to both increase local and national actors' participation in and leadership of humanitarian coordination mechanisms (e.g. clusters and working groups, commonly led by international actors) and also encourage international actors to participate in nationally or locally-led coordination mechanisms, where appropriate.

With regards to action one under this outcome "LNA increasingly participate in and influence humanitarian coordination mechanisms (e.g. sectors, working groups, high-level meetings, Jordan HPF), the analysis shows there **are efforts being made by IAs and coordination groups to enhance the engagement of local and national actors in humanitarian coordination mechanisms**. However, **the participation of LNAs in these mechanisms is still limited**. LNAs have expressed a desire for increased engagement and leadership opportunities within the coordination structures.

To address this, it is important to continue working towards breaking down barriers that hinder the meaningful participation of LNAs. Some of these barriers include the **prevailing use of English and sector-specific technical language**, the predominance of international actors in decision-making processes, and limited representation of local voices. Efforts should be made to ensure that language and communication barriers are overcome, and that the perspectives and expertise of LNAs are valued and incorporated in coordination mechanisms.

For the action two under this outcome area "IAs and LNAs jointly identify duplicated coordination mechanisms, with effective nationally-led mechanisms and approaches given primacy over time", the analysis demonstrates some level of IAs engagement in the nationally-led coordination efforts and mechanisms, however, IAs have expressed interest in working more closely with LNAs in this regard. This collaboration can foster stronger partnerships, ensure locally-driven approaches, and enhance the effectiveness of humanitarian coordination in Jordan.

Coordination		
Actions	**Indicators**	**Baseline findings**
5.1 LNA increasingly participate in and influence humanitarian coordination mechanisms (e.g. sectors, working groups, high-level meetings, Jordan HPF).	**5.1a** Percentage of humanitarian actors that are LNAs and engaged in humanitarian coordination mechanisms at all levels (and proportion of these that are WROs/WLOs and DPOs).	**Result:** 30.6% of organizations are national, of which 21.7% are women's (according to Protection Sector and CP and GBV sub-sectors) and 4.3% are disability organizations (according to Disability and Age taskforce).
	5.1b % of LNA engaged in humanitarian coordination mechanisms that self-report they are meaningfully included and able to influence decision-making.	**Result: 43% (6/14)6** Analysis shows that 43% of LNAs feel that are meaningfully included and able to influence decision-making.

For this indicator, 88% (14/16) of LNAs report that they are part of humanitarian coordination groups.7 When asking LNAs if they believe that their organization is meaningfully included or not in humanitarian coordination, 35% responded they feel they are included partially and the rest feel they are completely included.

For those who believe that they are partially involved, **they mentioned that usually they attend the calls and the meeting discussions only are led by the IA, while the LNA only attend as a listener and not as decision makers. In addition they highlighted feeling that their voice is not heard well and not considered.**

For those who reported feeling that they are completely involved, they mentioned that they are always consulted by IAs and their contributions during the COVID-19 response especially gave them the feeling of power as they were responsible of implementing by themselves. |

		When asking LNA about whether they believe they able to influence decision-making within the humanitarian coordination groups, 19% responded negatively as they think that they don't have any influence, while the remaining 81% gave varied responses (25% partially agreed to this and 56% completely agreed that they have influence). For those who believe that they are partially included, they believe that as a local NGO, their mandate is more focused on the implementation side, rather than the strategic orientation of the humanitarian response.
	5.1c % of LNA engaged in humanitarian coordination mechanisms that self-report they are meaningfully included and able to influence decision-making.	**Result:** a) The sectors' co-chairing is managed through regular rotation. The organisations keen to co-chair a sector/working group submit their interest to the respective sector, and nomination of a co-chair takes place due to the results of the sector's voting. The national organizations are encouraged to apply for co-chairing. b) Normally, the sector events/meetings are conducted in English, however translation can be provided upon need. On the other hand, the JRP planning consultations, for example, are largely conducted in Arabic, and translation into English is organised by the sector members accordingly.

		c) Exposure to the inter-agency coordination context introduces national organizations to the best practices thus enhancing their coordination capacities. Through the JRP planning consultations, as well during the 3RP cycle, organizations are provided with a set of trainings enabling them to successfully contribute to the coordinated sector's planning, monitoring and reporting. As well, the targeted trainings on utilizing the inter-agency coordination information management platforms, i.e., ActivityInfo, Jordan Financial Tracking (JFT), Services Advisor are conducted in both languages.
	5.1d Evidence that IA and LNA promote gender-responsive localisation in coordination, including the promotion and utilisation of the GB Localisation Workstream's related Guidance Note on gender-responsive localisation (e.g. develop standards and guidance on enhanced representation of WLOs/WROs in coordination mechanisms to foster an enabling environment for women's leadership and decision-making, ensure that relevant inter-cluster coordination and sub-groups integrate a gender perspective, invest in alliance-building to increase WLO and WRO influence).	**Result:** The Protection sector and its sub-sectors (CP and GBV) successfully implement the '16 Days of Activism against GBV' where women organizations are among the core actors.

5.2 IA and LNA jointly identify duplicated coordination mechanisms, with effective nationally-led mechanisms and approaches given primacy over time.	**5.2a** Examples of IAs' increased engagement in nationally-led coordination mechanisms and approaches. **Definition:** Number of IAs self-reporting increment in their engagement in JRP IAs requested to self-report about their engagement in the national-led coordination group.	**Result:** 63% (12/19) of IAs report that they are a part of national lead coordination efforts. When asked about describing their engagement within those groups during the year 2021, 58% (7) reported that more engagement happened in the year of reporting, followed by 33 % (4) who believe that no change in the trend of engagement happened, while only 8% (1) believe that the engagement had decreased compared to previous years.

VI. Outcome Area 6: Perception of Local and National Actors [1 Action; 2 Indicators]

This outcome area recognises that the roles and results of local and national actors, including women's rights and women-led organizations, are increasingly promoted within and outside of Jordan. Recognizing that not all actors have the same objectives regarding the visibility of their activities, local and national actors should decide the extent to which their activities are promoted. Where greater visibility is encouraged, the Framework calls for international actors to take steps to promote the role that local and national actors (often their partners) play in designing and delivering humanitarian assistance in Jordan.

In relation to action under this outcome area "IA credit the roles, risks taken, innovations and results of their LNA partners in public communications, so that LNA are perceived more positively by the community and funders", the analysis shows that there is willingness from IAs to accredit and acknowledge effort and achievements done by LNAs , however, this done only through social media.

Perception of Local and National Actors		
Actions	**Indicators**	**Baseline findings**
6.1 IA credit the roles, risks taken, innovations and results of their LNA partners in public communications, so that LNA are perceived more positively by the community and funders.	**6.1a** Examples of IA highlighting LNA-led humanitarian action, including the roles and results of LNA, in public communications (incl. traditional and social media). **Definition:** This indicator was replaced by number of instances of IAs highlighting LNA-led humanitarian action, including the roles and results of LNA, in public communications (incl. traditional and social media), this was directed to IAs asking them whether their organization share any updates on LNA-led humanitarian action and if so, asking about the number of times they do.	**Result: 89 Times** 63% (12 of 19) of IAs reported that they share updates about their LNA partners, those IA who positively report this, they indicate that they shared LNA updates 89 times during the year of 2021 with an average of 12 shares per IA, its noted that all of them mainly used social media for such sharing.
	6.1b Number of instances that innovative ideas and practices developed by LNA are publicly reported or acknowledged. **Definition:** This indicator refers to the number of times which IAs publicly (Publish on traditional or social media) reported on or acknowledged LNA innovative ideas and practices developed by LNA.	**Result: 75 times** Among the participating IAs, 42% (8 out of 19) reported that they publish reports acknowledging LNA innovate ideas. Out of those who report positively on this, they mentioned that they these 75 times during 2021 with an average of 9 times per organization.

VII. Outcome Area 7: The Enabling Environment [2 Actions; 3 Indicators]

This outcome area acknowledges that humanitarian actors in Jordan collaborate on and advocate for issues of mutual importance. In reimagining the future role of international actors in a more localized humanitarian system, they may be well-placed to drive and support advocacy on issues of agreed mutual importance.

This outcome area recognizes the leadership and capacity-strengthening role that international actors can play and calls for international, national, and local actors to increasingly collaborate on joint advocacy initiatives.

Regarding the first action under this outcome "Create space for and support LNA to do collective advocacy through information-sharing, administrative and technical support, and facilitation of bilateral connections (INGO/L/NNGO, UN/L/NNGO, donor/L/NNGO)", the analysis shows that international actors are willing to provide support to strengthen the advocacy capacity of local actors. However, the current support is limited to providing training. It suggests that **more measures may be needed to create an enabling environment for LNAs to engage in collective advocacy, such as information-sharing, administrative and technical support, and facilitating connections between INGOs/L/NNGOs, UN/L/NNGOs, and donors/L/NNGOs**.

For action two under this outcome area "LNAs and IAs identify mutual areas of interest and lead a strategic dialogue with government, funders, and communities (national, regional and international)", the analysis indicates that some progress has been made in identifying mutual areas of interest between LNAs and IAs in terms of advocacy. However, it seems that the current indicators do not consider the strategic dialogues with the government, donors, and other stakeholders at the national, regional, and international levels. This suggests that there may be a need to further enhance engagement with these stakeholders to shape and drive the strategic dialogue on issues of mutual importance.

The Enabling Environment		
Actions	**Indicators**	**Baseline findings**
7.1 Create space for and support LNA to do collective advocacy through information-sharing, administrative and technical support, and facilitation of bilateral connections (INGO/ NNGO, UN/NNGO, Donor/ NNGO).	**7.1a** Examples of support measures taken (those identified in Action 7.1.) to strengthen LNA advocacy capacity. **Definition:** Number of support measures taken by IAs to strengthen LNA advocacy capacity (training, staffing, funding, etc.).	**Result: 63 Activities from 8 IAs.** 42% of IAs (8 /19) reported that their organization supported LNAs to strengthen their advocacy capacity, those 8 IA reported as well that they supported the advocacy capacity of 63 activities during 2021 with an average of 8 activities per IA. None of the IAs mentioned allocating a specific budget for this or allocating specific staffing, most of them referred to training initiatives.
7.2 LNA and IA identify mutual areas of interest and lead strategic dialogue with government, funders, and communities (national, regional and international).	**7.2a** Number of finalized (collective or joint) advocacy documents. **Definition:** This indicator refers to the number of examples of joint advocacy documents like posters, position paper or leaflet. This question was referred to both IA and LNA asking whether their organization developed joint advocacy documents.	**Result: 75 advocacy documents from 12 actors.** 34% (12/ 35) of actors (5 IAs and 7 LNAs) positively indicated that they developed joint advocacy documents with LNAs/IAs. For those who report positively on this, they indicated that the number of joint materials is 75 with an average of 6 per actor.

| | **7.2b** Examples of joint dialogue and advocacy (private and public) carried out by LNA and IA; identification of advocacy results where relevant.

Definition: Number of joint advocacy events carried out by LNA and IA, the joint event can be a Webinar, workshop, or consultation dialogue. | **Result: 58**
34% (12/35) of actors report that they conducted joint advocacy activities with other actors, among both IAs and LNAs the percentage is quite similar with 31% (5 /16) of LNAs and 36% (7/19) of IAs.
IAs reported a higher number of joint activities with 46 compared to 12 events reported by LNAs. |

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Overall, the localisation of humanitarian work in Jordan is recognized as an ongoing process that requires collaboration and cooperation between local and international actors. The baseline survey analysis indicates that the status of implementing the localisation agenda in Jordan in line with the Localisation MEAL framework is in a medium stage – significant progress has been made but further efforts and collaboration among stakeholders is needed to accelerate action.

Importantly, the analysis highlighted that the process of localisation also presents its challenges. Hence, it is essential to ensure that LNAs have the necessary resources, including funding and staffing, to effectively carry these responsibilities. Furthermore, there is a need for continued collaboration and coordination among all stakeholders to address the barriers and constraints that may impede the localisation process.

Notably, in recent years there have been new contextual changes in Jordan introducing new challenges for local and national organisations and preventing the acceleration of progress around localisation. The closure or the Jordan Humanitarian Fund in 2022 represented a significant backdrop for direct humanitarian funding opportunities for local organisations. Furthermore, there has been a deterioration in the CSO and civic space including with the introduction by the Government of new bureaucratic impediments for project approvals and proposed changes to the legislation governing registered NGOs and preventing CSOs to operate and grow. Notably this has also posed risks of further limiting the role of CSOs to focusing more addressing problems linked to poverty and marginalization through charity and service delivery only, and less on policy advocacy on human rights and being able to shape the future in Jordan.

Based on the baseline analysis, further action on localisation in Jordan should prioritize addressing the following areas where gaps were indicated:

Partnership quality

- Address differential positions of power between IAs and LNAs by using power-sharing matrixes when setting up programming with partners to ensure decision-making and collaboration is shared and made visible.

- Enhance the leadership roles of LNAs through the programme cycle including in programme design in joint projects with IAs. Adopt a strengths-based approach which recognizes and leverages the unique strengths and capacities of local and national actors throughout the project lifecycle, from initial concept to activities and empowerment.

- Tailor, and contextualise partnership agreements addressing the concerns and interests raised by LNAs ensuring ability to carry out partnership relationships in Arabic language.

- Ensure mutually carried out needs-assessments. LNAs should not be only seen as data collectors, but should be involved in design and analysis as well as learning, planning and decision-making based on outcomes.

Participation

- Currently accountability mechanisms are more in place with IAs than with LNAs. **Community based feedback mechanisms that are inclusive and accessible to people with different diversities and abilities such as women and girls, people with disabilities and illiterate people, should be made available for LNAs** that in many parts are widely engaged with the people affected by crisis. Developing a **common accountability mechanism** among all organisations should be considered to reduce costs and ensure good quality feedback mechanisms are available to all. Ensure accountability mechanisms uphold to standards of two-way communication.

- Develop targeted strategies and mechanisms to facilitate **active community involvement, considering inclusion of gender, age and other diversity, in the planning, execution, and monitoring phases of humanitarian projects**, ensuring their voices and preferences shape outcomes.

Funding

- **Enhance financial allocation and direct funding to LNAs**. This includes facilitating the process of obtaining direct funds for LNAs and encouraging donors and IAs to revise their policies to support and prioritize local and national actors in humanitarian initiatives. By aligning with donor requirements and fostering a favourable funding environment, the localisation efforts can have a higher chance of success and sustainability.

- **Barriers for LNAs to access quality funding should be addressed** for example through capacity support for proposals, budgeting and overall financial governance.

- **IAs should be seen as intermediaries** with responsibilities of allocating quality funding to LNAs similar to those of donors. They should allow flexible funding, multi-year funding and overheads to partner organisations, equally to what they advocate from donors for themselves.

- **Outline long-term sustainability strategies** for localisation efforts, emphasising the development of local leadership and resource mobilization capacities. Consider a detailed strategy for addressing the funding gap caused by the closure of the Jordan Humanitarian Fund by including alternative funding models, such as pooled funds or local fundraising initiatives.

Capacities

- Capacity building plans should be carried out in a **comprehensive and collaborative manner acknowledging the needs of capacity strengthening and sharing by both IAs and LNAs**.

Coordination

- Further efforts can be made to **address the barriers to LNA participation and promote their increased engagement and leadership in humanitarian coordination mechanisms**. This includes sharing information on coordination mechanisms, allowing participation in Arabic language, ensuring technical language is understandable and ensuring leadership positions are also held by LNA actors. By actively involving LNAs and valuing their perspectives and expertise, the coordination mechanisms can become more inclusive, effective, and responsive to the needs of the affected populations.

- Continued efforts from both IAs and LNAs are needed to **strengthen and engage in nationally-led coordination** and ensure a more comprehensive and locally-driven humanitarian response in Jordan.

Perception of local and national actors

- IAs should promote the role that LNAs play in designing and delivering humanitarian assistance and utilize **more diverse media and information channels to promote outreach to more varied stakeholders** - such as community meetings, radio broadcasts, or print media.

- Explore opportunities to **enhance the support provided to LNAs to engage in strategic dialogue initiatives** in relation to shaping a more coordinated and impactful humanitarian response.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE DATA GATHERING

1. During the reporting process, it was observed that there are **data gaps among various actors** at all levels involved in humanitarian work in Jordan. This suggests that comprehensive and consistent data collection and reporting mechanisms need to be established to ensure a more accurate representation of the humanitarian landscape.

2. The reporting process should be reviewed to ensure that the results can be effectively tracked and monitored. This may involve further refining the reporting format for the Localisation MEAL framework, clarifying data requirements, and establishing clear guidelines for reporting.

3. There is a need to determine the frequency of reporting and monitoring against the Localisation MEAL framework and align it with a localisation roadmap in Jordan.

4. There is a need to find new ways to engage more actors, both IAs and LNAs, in the reporting process. This will enable more representative data. Efforts should be made to encourage and support the participation of a diverse range of actors in reporting, including capacity building initiatives and providing technical assistance if needed before and during the reporting process.

5. There is a need to further revise the Localisation MEAL framework indicators used in reporting to allow for more accurate data and to ease the reporting process. The number of indicators was also seen as a challenge.

6. Suggest conducting further evidence-based advocacy efforts to enhance diverse actors engagement in and ownership of the implementation of the localisation agenda in Jordan and to enhance understanding of their role and responsibilities in the process.

UN WOMEN