Localisation and Optimization of Response Mechanisms Initiative in Yemen (LORMIY)

Localisation Strategy Performance Measurement

Methodology

Prepared by: Abdulqawi Hajeb
Email: abdulqawi.hajeb@gmail.com

July 2024

Contents

1. Introduction

Contextual Background

Yemen has been facing one of the world's most severe humanitarian crises, exacerbated by ongoing conflict, economic collapse, and widespread displacement. The localization agenda, which emphasizes the leadership and participation of local and national actors in humanitarian response, has become a critical component in addressing these challenges.
In this context, the localization performance measurement methodology is developed to evaluate and enhance the effectiveness of localization strategies in Yemen. The methodology is particularly relevant given the complex operational environment, where local actors often have the most immediate access to affected populations and are better positioned to deliver culturally and contextually appropriate assistance.
This methodology is also aligned with global commitments and its performance measurement indicators under the Grand Bargain (GB 3.0), IASC guidelines, NEAR LPMF, C4C initiative, OECD partnership principles, ICVA's principles of partnership, Core Humanitarian Standards, and SDG 17 methodological note which advocates application of localisation agenda, increased funding and decision-making power to local actors. By grounding the study in the realities of Yemen's response landscape, this methodology aims to ensure that localization efforts are not only monitored but also optimized to respond effectively to the needs of the most vulnerable populations.

Purpose of this Methodology:

The **Localisation Performance Measurement Methodology** is designed to track and monitor the implementation of localisation indicators as outlined in the localisation strategy and its executive mechanism in Yemen. This methodology provides a structured approach to evaluating the performance of localisation efforts by measuring key performance indicators that reflect the progress, challenges, and impact of localisation progress in the country.

Key Objectives:

1. **Tracking Localisation Progress:** The methodology systematically monitors the achievement of response localisation progress, focusing on 7 main performance areas and cross cutting issues that include equitable partnerships, local leadership, and capacity building and funding. It measures how well international and national actors align with the Grand Bargain commitments, IASC guidelines and other relevant localisation frameworks.
2. **Assessing the Effectiveness of Partnerships:** By evaluating the performance of partnerships between donors, intermediaries, and local/national actors, the methodology highlights areas of success and identifies gaps where improvements are needed. This assessment fosters stronger, more principled partnerships based on mutual respect and shared objectives.
3. **Supporting Thematic Groups and Stakeholders:** The methodology guides the activities of the localisation initiatives and its thematic groups, ensuring their work aligns with the overall localisation strategy. Thematic groups rely on this methodology to assess their contributions to localisation and adjust their strategies based on the findings.
4. **Informing Policy and Decision-Making:** The data and insights generated through this methodology are critical for informing policy decisions at both the national and international levels. It provides evidence-based recommendations to improve

localisation practices, enhance accountability, and promote greater inclusivity in humanitarian and development responses in Yemen.

5. **Enhancing Transparency and Accountability:** By providing a clear and consistent framework for measuring localisation performance, the methodology enhances transparency among all stakeholders involved in the localisation process. This contributes to greater accountability and ensures that all actors are held responsible for their commitments.

Additional Uses:

Beyond its primary objectives, this methodology offers significant utility for local and national actors by enabling them to examine and evaluate their partnerships with donors and intermediaries, identify gaps in localisation efforts, and advocate for necessary changes. The following examples illustrate how different areas of the methodology can be applied:

1. **Identifying Gaps and Advocacy Needs:** By understanding and using this methodology, local and national actors can identify gaps in response localisation and determine what they need to advocate for at both the national and organizational levels. The methodology serves as a tool for analyzing these gaps and guiding advocacy efforts, ensuring that localisation is effectively implemented and responsive to the needs of local actors.
2. **Coordination Structures, and Consortium Projects – Analyzing Local actors' Participation and Leadership Indicators:** Local and national actors involved in consortium projects can use **Area 2** and **Area 3** to analyze leadership indicators and determine what exactly to advocate for. By evaluating the level of local leadership in decision-making and the inclusivity of these processes, they can push for more equitable leadership structures within the coordination structures and consortium projects.
3. **Cross-Cutting Issues – Common Indicators:** The methodology also addresses cross-cutting issues that are relevant to all actors. These common indicators should be considered whether at the national performance level or when advocating individually by local/national actors. This ensures that key issues, such as WLOs/WROs and gender equality, risk sharing, and disaster risk reduction, environment sustainability and climate change integration in Yemen, are advocated by all actors.
4. **Reference for International Actors:** International actors can also use this methodology as a reference to understand what local and national actors are looking for when debating localisation efforts in Yemen. Since this framework is based on the localisation strategy, which was developed through intensive consultations with local/national actors, it reflects the perspectives and priorities of these actors regarding localisation indicators in Yemen. By referring to this methodology, international actors can better align their efforts with the expectations and needs of their local partners.

Ongoing Development and Future Enhancements:

It is important to note that this methodology is currently under development and does not fully cover all performance areas under the localisation strategy. Key areas such as **community participation**, **advocacy**, and **capacity building** still require further development and refinement. These areas will be more fully developed in consultation with relevant stakeholders in the coming year.

As the localisation landscape in Yemen continues to evolve, additional indicators may be required to capture the full scope of localisation efforts. Therefore, this methodology is subject to revision through a participatory process involving all relevant actors. Any suggestions and recommendations from stakeholders are actively encouraged and will be carefully considered to create a more comprehensive and effective framework for Yemen.
In summary, the Localisation Performance Measurement Methodology is a versatile tool that not only tracks and assesses the progress of localisation efforts but also empowers local and national actors to advocate for necessary changes and improvements. It provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing gaps, guiding advocacy, and ensuring that localisation is effectively implemented at both the national and organizational levels. Additionally, it serves as a valuable reference for international actors, helping them to align their efforts with the perspectives and priorities of local/national actors in Yemen. The ongoing development of this methodology, with input from all stakeholders, will ensure that it remains relevant and comprehensive, adapting to the evolving needs of the localisation agenda in Yemen.

The Evaluation Approach

This **localisation performance measurement methodology for Yemen** is designed to bring together local, national, and international stakeholders committed to enhancing the performance of localisation efforts in Yemen. The initiative is driven by the shared goal of ensuring that localisation commitments are effectively implemented, leading to more equitable, inclusive, and locally led humanitarian and development outcomes. LORMIY's assessments will be used to meet standards of accountability and commitment, inform strategic dialogue with stakeholders, and contribute to broader learning and advocacy to improve response localisation practices in Yemen.

The performance measurements

The methodology assessments will be collaborative and designed to ensure that findings suitable with all stakeholders involved in localisation response in Yemen. This assessment will draw upon multiple streams of evidence, including documents, surveys, and interviews, from both external and internal sources to validate and triangulate findings against a standard indicator framework developed based on international good practices and adaption to the Yemeni context. There are a lot of localisation performance methodologies, but Yemen context needed to contextualize this methodology.

The methodology operates under the assumption that if localisation efforts in Yemen are supported by effective systems, practices, and behaviors, they can efficiently deliver relevant, inclusive, and sustainable results. Organisational commitments is assessed across partnerships framework cycle since the start to exist and commitments by the management domains. This is complemented by an assessment of the leadership and capacity empowerment of the local actors as well enabling environment and funding quantity and quality to the local/national actors to provide a complete picture of localisation performance.

Process of Localization Performance Measurement in Yemen

The process of localization performance measurement in Yemen involves a systematic and participatory approach to assess the effectiveness of localization efforts within the humanitarian and development sectors. This process is designed to ensure that all aspects of the localization strategy are thoroughly evaluated and that the findings are actionable and relevant to stakeholders at all levels. The process is represented by the following key steps, forming a continuous cycle aimed at enhancing and refining localization efforts:

1. **Initiation and Scoping**: This initial phase involves setting the scope of the performance measurement, defining the key objectives, and determining the specific aspects of the localization strategy to be evaluated. Stakeholders, including local NGOs, international agencies, and donors, are engaged early in this process to ensure that the scope aligns with the needs and priorities of all parties involved.
2. **Data Collection Design**: In this step, the methodology for data collection is developed. This includes selecting the appropriate tools and techniques for gathering both qualitative and quantitative data, such as surveys, interviews, and focus group discussions. The design phase also involves identifying the key performance indicators (KPIs) that will be used to measure progress.
3. **Data Collection**: With the methodology in place, data is collected from a variety of sources, document review, local and national actors across Yemen, and international actors. This phase is critical for obtaining a comprehensive view of the localization efforts across different regions and actors in Yemen.
4. **Data Analysis and Interpretation**: Once the data is collected, it is analyzed to evaluate the performance against the established KPIs. This analysis helps to identify trends, challenges, and areas of success within the localization strategy and efforts in Yemen. Interpretation of the data is done in collaboration with stakeholders to ensure that the findings are contextually relevant and actionable.
5. **Validation of Results**: The preliminary findings are shared with stakeholders for validation. This step allows for the verification of results and the inclusion of additional insights or corrections. It also helps to build consensus around the key findings and recommendations.
6. **Reporting and Dissemination**: The validated results are compiled into a comprehensive report that details the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. This report is disseminated to all relevant stakeholders, providing them with actionable information to guide future localization efforts.
7. **Implementation of Recommendations**: Based on the report’s findings, stakeholders take action to implement the recommendations. This may involve adjusting strategies, enhancing partnerships, or reallocating resources to better support localization objectives.
8. **Continuous Monitoring and Review**: The process is cyclical, with continuous monitoring and periodic reviews to assess the impact of changes and ensure that the localization strategy remains effective. Feedback from these reviews is used to refine the methodology and improve future performance measurement cycles.

This structured process ensures that the localization performance measurement in Yemen is comprehensive, inclusive, and focused on driving sustainable improvements in the localization agenda.

Design of the Localization Performance Measurement Framework in Yemen

The design of the Localization Performance Measurement Framework in Yemen is tailored to address the unique challenges and opportunities within the country's response system in Yemen. The framework is structured to provide a rigorous, evidence-based approach to evaluating the effectiveness of localization efforts.

1. **Framework Objectives**: The primary objective of this framework is to assess how well localization strategies are being implemented in Yemen, focusing on key areas such as local leadership, equitable partnerships, resource allocation, capacity building, and community engagement. The design ensures that the evaluation is aligned with the overarching goals of enhancing local ownership and sustainability in humanitarian responses.
2. **Comprehensive Indicators**: The framework includes a set of comprehensive indicators that are specifically tailored to the context of Yemen. These indicators are designed to measure various dimensions of localization, such as the degree of participation by local actors in decision-making processes, the effectiveness of capacity-building initiatives, and the fairness of resource distribution.
3. **Participatory Approach**: A key feature of the framework's design is its participatory approach. Stakeholders, including local and national NGOs, international agencies, donors, and community representatives, are actively involved in the design, data collection, analysis, and validation processes. This ensures that the framework reflects the realities on the ground and is sensitive to the needs and perspectives of those directly affected by localization efforts.
4. **Flexibility and Adaptability**: The design of the framework is flexible, allowing it to be adapted to changing circumstances in Yemen. This adaptability is crucial given the dynamic nature of the humanitarian landscape in the country. The framework is designed to be responsive to new challenges and opportunities, ensuring that it remains relevant and effective over time.
5. **Data Collection and Analysis**: The framework incorporates robust data collection and analysis methods, combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This mixed-methods design allows for a comprehensive understanding of localization performance, capturing both the measurable outcomes and the nuanced, context-specific factors that influence these outcomes.
6. **Validation and Feedback Mechanisms**: The framework includes mechanisms for validating the findings with stakeholders, ensuring that the results are accurate, credible, and actionable. Regular feedback loops are built into the design, allowing for continuous improvement and refinement of the framework based on stakeholder input and evolving needs.
7. **Alignment with Global Standards**: The design of the framework aligns with global standards and best practices in localization and humanitarian evaluation. It draws on lessons learned from other contexts while being specifically adapted to the Yemen context, ensuring that it meets both local and international expectations for rigorous and meaningful assessment.

The design of this Localization Performance Measurement Framework in Yemen is intended to provide a comprehensive, participatory, and adaptable tool that supports the effective implementation and continuous improvement of localization strategies in the country.
Same to this chapter "theory of change"

Theory of Change for Localization Performance Measurement in Yemen

The Theory of Change for the Localization Performance Measurement in Yemen outlines the logical framework that connects the inputs, activities, and outputs of localization strategy to the desired long-term outcomes and impacts. This framework serves as the foundation for understanding how various elements of the localization strategy contribute to empowering local actors and enhancing the effectiveness of humanitarian and development interventions in Yemen.

1. **Context and Rationale**: The Theory of Change begins with a clear articulation of the context in which localization efforts are being implemented in Yemen. This includes the challenges faced by local and national NGOs, such as limited access to resources, capacity gaps, and marginalization in decision-making processes. The rationale for localization is rooted in the belief that empowering local actors leads to more sustainable and culturally appropriate responses to humanitarian crises.
2. **Inputs**: The inputs refer to the resources, partnerships, and capacities that are mobilized to support localization in Yemen. This includes financial resources from donors, technical support from international agencies, and the existing capacities of local actors. These inputs are essential for initiating and sustaining localization efforts.
3. **Activities**: The activities outlined in the Theory of Change include a range of interventions designed to enhance localization. These activities may include capacity-building workshops for local NGOs, establishing equitable partnerships between local and international actors, advocating for increased funding to local organizations, and promoting community participation in decision-making processes. These activities are aimed at strengthening the role of local actors in humanitarian and development work.
4. **Outputs**: The immediate outputs of these activities are tangible results that can be measured and observed. For example, increased leadership role of local/national actors in coordination mechanisms, increased percentage of direct funds to local/national actors, the existence of transition plan for local leadership, and more equitable resource distribution. These outputs are the direct results of the activities and are crucial for achieving the broader objectives of localization.
5. **Outcomes**: The short- to medium-term outcomes of the Theory of Change focus on the changes in behavior, practices, and relationships among stakeholders. This includes greater leadership and influence of local/national actors in partnerships decision-making processes, gradual transitioning of power to local actors accompanied by capacity improvement and enabling environment, more effective and responsive humanitarian interventions, and stronger partnerships between local and international actors. These outcomes are indicative of the progress being made towards localization.
6. **Impact**: The long-term impact envisioned by the Theory of Change is a more resilient and self-reliant local humanitarian and development sector in Yemen. This includes enhanced local ownership of response efforts, engagement of the private sector, diversity of fund resources for local actors, sustained capacity within local organizations, and improved overall effectiveness of humanitarian interventions. The ultimate impact is a humanitarian system in Yemen that is driven by local needs,

expertise, and leadership, leading to more sustainable and culturally appropriate outcomes.

7. **Assumptions and Risks**: The Theory of Change also acknowledges the assumptions and risks that underlie the localization efforts. Assumptions may include the commitment of international actors to genuinely support localization, the availability of adequate resources, and the political stability necessary for local actors to operate effectively. Risks might include potential resistance from international agencies, funding shortfalls, or worsening security conditions that could undermine localization efforts.
8. **Monitoring and Evaluation**: The Theory of Change includes a robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) component to track progress and assess the effectiveness of the localization strategy. This involves the regular collection and analysis of data related to the defined outputs, outcomes, and impacts. The M&E framework is designed to provide feedback that can be used to adjust activities and strategies as needed, ensuring that the Theory of Change remains relevant and effective in achieving its goals.

The Theory of Change for Localization Performance Measurement in Yemen provides a clear and structured roadmap for understanding how localization efforts contribute to empowering local actors and improving the overall humanitarian and development response in the country. It serves as a guide for stakeholders to align their efforts and resources towards achieving a more localized and sustainable humanitarian and development response system in Yemen.

Data Collection

Information is collected and analyzed systematically using structured frameworks tailored to each evidence stream. The primary streams include:

- **Document Review:** A thorough examination of relevant documentation, including grand bargain report, donor/intermediaries' partnership's framework published and used with local actors, policy papers, OCHA data platforms including FTS, UNDP reports, multilateral organizations reports, Cluster reports, CBPFs reporting, UN agencies reports, International NGOs performance and audit reports published, International Transparency Initiative, Partnership agreements, and national government published reports and statements etc.
- **Stakeholders Survey:** If needed and possible, surveys conducted with key partners, including local NGOs, international organizations, and government entities, to gather insights on their experiences and perspectives.
- **Individual and Group Interviews:** Interviews conducted with stakeholders at various levels to gather qualitative data and context-specific insights whenever necessary.

The structured analysis involves integrating these different evidence streams into a composite analytical framework. This framework includes specific techniques for validating and triangulating the data, ensuring that the analysis is robust and reliable.

Document Review Process

The document review is a critical part of evaluating the application of grand bargain commitments signatories in the country whether they have established key systems, practices, and behaviors that function effectively for application of the localisation agenda in Yemen or not. This review lays the foundation for assessing the localization efforts effectiveness and contributions to the application of localisation agenda in the country level. It serves as the initial block of evidence, guiding subsequent evidence streams like surveys and interviews. The document review is particularly vital for the results performance area, where it acts as the primary source of evidence.

Approach and Process

The document review focuses on gathering evidence related to individual elements and micro-indicators within the assessment framework, which then informs scoring alongside other evidence streams (refer to Annex A for the Indicator Framework). This process involves review of independent evidence to create a narrative that aligns with Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The document review process is more iterative than sequential, with the following key steps:

1. **Document Selection and Collation**
    - **Purpose:** To efficiently select a representative sample of documents for review across various donors and intermediaries.
    - **Principles:** Localisation Performance Measurement's operating principles emphasize minimizing the burden on international actors in supplying documents while ensuring fairness through the consistent analysis of official and similar documentation types across all actors.

- **Process:** A broad set of documents is screened, and key documents are selected, including evaluations where available. The goal is to obtain key documents that provide broad and deep insights, rather than simply amassing a large volume of documents. The document selection follows a purposive approach, ensuring coverage of all relevant indicators, guided by a clear typology.

Typology for Document Review

- *External Assessments:* Includes country specific relevant reports and published data, partnership frameworks, Call for proposals documents, Financial tracking system, audits reports published, reports from UN, previous localisation performance assessments in Yemen, and other independent reviews and key documents published,.
- *Evaluations:* Covers independent, internal, and external evaluations.
- *Management Information:* internal document provided from partners such as partnership agreements, MoUs up on approval and request if needed.

Document Parameters

- *Accessibility:* Publicly available documents are preferred, but stakeholders may be asked to provide non-public documents if necessary.
- *Timing:* Only current functional policies, guidelines, and strategies are included, and those documents that were generally published within maximum three years before the assessment.

2. **Data Extraction**
   - **Purpose:** To ensure a clear evidence trail from data to findings.
   - **Process:** Evidence is systematically extracted using a structured analytical tool, with data plotted as it appears in the source document. Document names and page numbers are clearly indicated, and data gaps are flagged for further investigation. Additional information is sought on the quality of systems, consistency over time, evidence of implementation, and the context of the MO's operating environment.
3. **Analysis**
   - **Purpose:** To build a substantive foundation for the overall analysis and subsequent evidence streams.
   - **Process:** The initial analysis is thematic, identifying emerging themes, observations, and the strength of evidence against individual indicators. Triangulation is used to map data sources and flag any tensions or contradictions. Key points are generated for each micro-indicator, summarizing evidence and highlighting gaps.
4. **Drafting and Updating the Document Review**

- **Process:** interim document review is produced, covering each micro-indicator and element, with clear traceability to sources. Further data extraction and analysis are conducted to capture all relevant documentation up to an agreed cut-off point, ensuring a comprehensive final document review.

Stakeholders Survey

The stakeholders feedback survey is intended to gather insights from stakeholders when no evidence is achieved through document review. This survey seeks to understand stakeholders' perceptions and experiences regarding the indicators and elements of the localisation performance measurement assessments. It serves as a vital tool for collecting substantive data and plays a crucial role in validating and cross-referencing information from other data collection methods.

Ethical Standards for the Partner Feedback Survey

- **Confidentiality**: no anonymous data required.
- **Anonymity**: Survey responses are anonymized and analyzed at an aggregate level.
- **Informed Consent**: Respondents are informed about confidentiality, the survey's purpose, and how their feedback will be utilized.
- **Respect for Respondents' Time**: Survey length and communication frequency are carefully managed.

Approach and Process

The survey targets stakeholders who are relevant to the indicators. It is carefully designed to elicit responses from a diverse group of stakeholders ensuring a holistic perspective. However, it does not aim to cover all stakeholders or operations or to provide a statistically representative sample. The survey follows four key steps:

Step 1: Stakeholders and Respondent Identification

The survey identifies stakeholders playing various roles in relation to the performance area and indicators. Categories may stakeholders as identified in the grand bargain agenda. Potential organizations and entities are listed and their emails are collected.

Step 2: Survey Design

The survey tool features a streamlined set of questions designed to elicit both quantitative ratings and qualitative feedback related to the stakeholder perspective. A core set of questions is asked of all respondents, ensuring consistency across assessments. The survey also allows for customization to address specific respondent groups' OCHA for example" or the unique context of the stakeholder being assessed.

Step 3: Survey Administration

The survey is primarily conducted online, with offline options available if needed. Respondents are invited to participate over a few weeks, with the possibility of extending the period to increase responses. Reminders are sent to boost response rates.

Step 4: Data Cleaning and Analysis

Once collected, survey data undergoes a cleaning process to enhance response quality. The multi-step process ensures that the dataset is ready for analysis alongside other data streams. The analysis considers the number and types of respondents considering the diversity and coverage goals set during the selection process. Adjustments may be made to account for any biases in the respondent pool, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of respondents' perspectives. The analysis includes frequency statistics, distribution analysis, and a qualitative review of open-ended responses, which are integrated into the broader evaluation framework.

This structured approach ensures that the stakeholder feedback survey provides valuable insights into the localisation's performance in Yemen, contributing to a well-rounded assessment.

Interviews

Interviews are conducted when considered as critical component of the evidence-gathering process for evaluating localization performance in Yemen. These interviews, which include both individual and group formats, serve as the third stream of evidence for the localization performance measurement methodology. The systematic approach to conducting these interviews ensures that the data gathered is valid and contributes effectively to the overall assessment.

Approach and Process

Interviews are conducted with the following objectives in mind:

- To deepen and interrogate evidence obtained from other data sources such as document reviews and surveys.
- To provide contextual insights that clarify, refute, or validate observations from other lines of evidence.
- To generate new evidence in areas where other sources are lacking.
- To seek explanations for observed phenomena, understanding the underlying factors and reasoning.
- To update information on ongoing reform agendas and key changes by stakeholder organization since the last review.

The interview process follows three broad steps:

Step 1: Identification and Sampling of Interviewees

The selection of interviewees is designed to capture a holistic view by drawing on diverse information sources. However, the process is not exhaustive. Interviewees are selected from various levels within organizations (headquarters, country office, department level) and from different staff roles. The sampling process is purposive, identified during the inception phase of the assessment. It focuses on individuals whose roles and responsibilities align with the localization performance indicators being assessed. Sampling may also be iterative, employing snowball methods to follow up with individuals after initial interviews or to pursue emerging lines of enquiry from other evidence streams.

Step 2: Methods

Interviews are conducted using a semi-structured framework that covers the main assessment areas relevant to the interviewee. This framework allows for flexibility, enabling the interviewer to explore new questions that arise during the conversation. Interviews at headquarters are typically conducted in person, while country and regional interviews may be conducted by phone or video conference.

Ethical protocols are strictly followed, ensuring that interviewees' identities are protected, and their responses remain confidential. No attribution is made in the data or annexes. Group interview participants are also offered the opportunity for follow-up conversations if they wish to share information individually.

Step 3: Data Analysis and Use

The information collected during interviews serves as an independent stream of evidence, particularly useful for providing insight, triangulation, and verification of other data sources. The data from interviews is not fully transcribed; instead, it is plotted into a composite analytical framework against relevant indicators for analysis and triangulation. This approach ensures that the insights gained from interviews are integrated into the broader assessment of localization performance in Yemen.

Analytical Framework and Scoring

In the Localization Performance Measurement Framework for Yemen, the findings and ratings are underpinned by a robust analytical process to ensure the validity, reliability, and credibility of the evidence base used to evaluate localization efforts. This process involves a detailed approach to analyzing the evidence, applying the assessment framework, and transparently presenting the findings in reports.

Analytical Strategies and Scoring Principles

1. Evidence Integration: The framework relies on integrating evidence from multiple data streams, including document reviews, surveys, and interviews. These diverse sources are combined to form a comprehensive evidence base for each measurement indicator (MI) within the framework.

2. Triangulation and Validation: Triangulation is a critical component of the analysis. It involves using multiple data sources and methods to cross-verify findings, thus reducing bias and enhancing the accuracy of the results. The framework employs triangulation in three key areas:

- **Methods Triangulation:** This checks the consistency of findings across different data collection methods and sources, such as comparing results from document reviews with survey and interview data.
- **Source Triangulation:** This compares data within the same method, such as the application of policies at different levels (e.g., in Yemen vs.) to ensure consistency.
- **Analyst Triangulation:** Multiple analysts review findings independently to ensure a consistent approach to interpretation and analysis.

3. Scoring and Rating System: The scoring system is adapted from international best practices and involves assigning ratings based on the presence or absence of elements representing good practices in localization commitments. The framework's scoring scale ranges from high scores, reflecting the full implementation of good practices, to lower scores, indicating fewer or poorly implemented elements of these practices.

- **High-End Scoring:** The upper end of the scale represents strong performance, where good practices are fully implemented and integrated into localization strategies.
- **Low-End Scoring:** The lower end reflects weaker performance, where good practices are either partially implemented or not effectively applied.

4. Consolidated Ratings: Individual MIs form the basis for consolidated ratings for each Key Performance Indicator (KPI). These ratings provide a high-level overview of localization performance across various areas. However, it is crucial to contextualize these scores when this methodology is used for individual purposes.

5. Contextualization of Performance: The framework recognizes that stakeholders may be at different stages of their localization journey. Therefore, the scoring system is designed to situate each stakeholder along a continuum of performance, reflecting their maturity and progress in implementing localization strategies.

Validation and Quality Assurance

1. External Validation: Findings are shared for external validation, ensuring that the performance areas are accurately reflected. Feedback from stakeholders, including local/national NGOs, international agencies, and donors, is incorporated to enhance the credibility of the assessment.

2. Consistency and Standardization: To maintain consistency across assessments, all team members are trained in the framework's indicator and scoring system. Standardized procedures for data extraction, analysis, and review are implemented, with quality experts overseeing the entire process to ensure uniformity in scoring and analysis.

Analytical Deliverables

1. Evidence-Based Reporting: The framework emphasizes transparent reporting, where findings are supported by a clearly articulated evidence base. This approach ensures that the conclusions drawn from the assessment are grounded in solid data and credible analysis.

2. Continuous Improvement: The scoring and rating system is subject to ongoing review to ensure it remains relevant and effective in assessing localization efforts in Yemen. Adjustments are made as necessary to align with evolving practices and challenges in the humanitarian and development response systems.

This comprehensive analytical framework and scoring system provide a robust foundation for measuring and enhancing localization performance in Yemen, contributing to more effective and equitable humanitarian and development outcomes.

Scoring and Rating System for KPIs in Localization Performance Measurement in Yemen

In the Localization Performance Measurement Methodology for Yemen, scoring Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) is a critical process that ensures a structured and consistent evaluation of the localization efforts. The scoring methodology is adapted to assess the extent to which elements of international localisation commitments are implemented by international actors operating in Yemen.

Scoring Methodology for KPIs 1-8

Averaging MI Scores: KPIs 1-8 are scored by averaging the Measurement Indicator (MI) scores, which consist of various elements representing localisation commitments and CH. Each element is scored on a scale of 0 to 4, depending on the extent of its implementation:

- **Score 4:** Exceeds conditions/Good practice. The element is fully implemented in all relevant cases, representing localisation commitments.
- **Score 3:** Meets conditions. The element is substantially implemented in most cases.
- **Score 2:** Approaches conditions. The element is partially implemented in some cases.
- **Score 1:** Partially meets conditions. The element is present but not implemented or implemented in zero cases.
- **Score 0:** Does not meet conditions. The element is relevant but not present currently in Yemen.
- **N/A:** Not applicable. The element does not apply to the organization's mandate and context.
- **N/E:** No evidence. It is not possible to assess the element due to a lack of evidence.

Calculating KPI Scores: The average score for each MI's constituent elements determines the overall score for each KPI. When scoring mid-level elements (2 and 3), the evidence base is carefully appraised to differentiate between partially and substantially implemented practices. A score of 3 indicates consistent implementation, while a score of 2 reflects variable implementation.

Distinguishing Low Scores: Scores of 0 (poor performance), N/A (not applicable), and N/E (no evidence) are distinguished to ensure clarity:

- **Score 0:** Lowers the overall average and indicates that a relevant element is not implemented.
- **N/A:** Does not affect the overall score and is used when the element is not applicable to the organization's mandate or context.
- **N/E:** Also does not affect the overall score and is used when there is no evidence available to assess the element.

Annexes:

Annex A: the Indicator Framework

KPI	
Micro-Indicator	**Elements for Scoring and Rating**
Performance Area: Strengthening principled, equitable, and ethical partnerships with local actors in Yemen's	
KPI 1: Established equitable, simplified and standardized partnership frameworks, policy and procedures	
This KPI measures the extent to which the partnership framework/localisation strategy and partnerships promotes equity, simplicity, standardization, and localization commitments	
1.1 Localisation policy /Partnerships Framework	Partnership framework/localization strategy (or equivalent) in place and implemented within donor or intermediary to promote equitable partnerships with local/national actors in Yemen
	The framework/localization strategy define clear and transparent allocation of funds, including overhead costs, to local and national partners
	The framework/localization strategy define clear flexibility provisions to adapt to evolving needs and circumstances
	The framework/localisation strategy (or its equivalent), defines clearly dedicated support for building local/national actors' skills and institutional capacity
1.2 Localization Integration	Embedding of localization principles throughout the partnership cycle, from design to closure.
	Emphasis on supporting local ownership and leadership throughout the project cycle.
	Opportunities for capacity building of local actors to strengthen their technical skills and institutional capacity.
	Clear plan for exist strategy to local actors after funding ends, ensuring sustainability of project outcomes.
	Mechanisms for knowledge transfer and capacity retention to ensure local actors can continue project activities.
KPI 2: Effective Fund Planning and Allocation	
This KPI measures the extent to which the funding strategy aligns with national and international priorities, is transparent and accessible, and promotes inclusive partnerships.	
2.1 Funding Alignment and Transparency	Funding plan based on clearly defined priorities aligned with national government, local authorities' strategies, priorities, and with international plans.
	Accessible information on target beneficiaries, geographic focus areas, and funding amount per program.
	Documents are available in languages relevant to the local language
2.2 Inclusive Partnership Approach	Encouragement for local actor participation through dedicated funding streams or quotas.
	Openness to diverse partnership models, including consortiums led by local actors and joint ventures with international NGOs.
2.3 Communication Channels	Easy to understand communication materials (funding guidelines, FAQs) available on the donor's website and disseminated through partner networks.
	Multiple channels for inquiries established, including email, phone helpline, and online chat support (if available).
KPI 3: Accessible and Inclusive Call for Proposals (CFP) Process	
This KPI measures the degree to which the CFP process is designed to facilitate participation by local and national actors in Yemen.	
3.1 Accessibility	CFP documents widely disseminated through partner networks, social media, and relevant government websites.
	Translated versions of the CFP documents available in local languages.
	Simplified application forms that minimize administrative burden for local actors.
	Online application system available, with offline submission options for those with limited internet access.

KPI	
Micro-Indicator	**Elements for Scoring and Rating**
	Technical assistance offered to potential applicants for proposal development (workshops, online tutorials).
	Donor website, announcements, partner network communications
3.2 Timeline	Sufficient time allocated for proposal development and submission, considering local context and research needs.
	Clear deadlines and milestones communicated effectively.
	Flexibility for extensions in exceptional circumstances (e.g., natural disasters, political unrest).
3.3 Evaluation Criteria	Transparent and objective evaluation criteria clearly outlined in the CFP documents.
	Criteria aligned with program objectives, emphasizing local context, expertise, and capacity of potential partners.
	CFP documents Emphasis on proposals that demonstrate a clear understanding of community needs and propose solutions led by local actors.
KPI 4: Equitable and Transparent Partner Selection	
This KPI assesses the fairness, inclusivity, and transparency of the partner selection process.	
4.1 Fairness and Objectivity	Clear and consistent selection process documented in the partnership framework.
	Independent review committees composed of diverse experts with no conflict of interest.
	Established procedures for addressing complaints or appeals regarding the selection process.
4.2 Diversity and Inclusion	Active outreach to encourage applications from a diverse range of local actors, including those from marginalized communities and geographically diverse locations.
	Mechanisms in place to address potential power imbalances between international and local actors during the selection process.
4.3 Conflict of Interest	Clear policies on conflict of interest outlined in the framework.
	Procedures for identifying and mitigating potential conflicts of interest during partner selection and project implementation.
	Requirement for applicants to disclose any potential conflicts of interest.
KPI 5: Partnership Agreements	
KPI measures the quality and effectiveness of partnership agreements in ensuring clear roles, responsibilities, and mechanisms for collaboration, adaptation, and financial management.	
5.1 Agreement Clarity and Comprehensiveness	Clear roles, responsibilities, and expectations for both parties outlined in the agreement.
	Defined communication protocols for regular updates and progress reporting.
	Grievance redressal mechanism established for addressing any disputes or concerns arising during project implementation.
5.2 Partnership Flexibility and Adaptability	Flexibility to Adapt: The agreement includes provisions for adjustments to the scope, scale or budget of the agreement based on changing contexts or needs (e.g., monitoring and evaluation findings).
	Mechanisms for mutual agreement on modifications to the project scope or budget.
	Exit strategy outlining the handover process and sustainability plan for project outcomes.
5.3 Financial Accountability	Transparent and accountable financial management procedures outlined in the agreement.
	Flexible funding disbursement mechanisms that consider local financial systems and capacity.
	Capacity building support offered to local partners for strengthening financial management skills.
KPI 6: Partnership Implementation	
This KPI measures the quality and efficiency of partnership implementation, including due diligence, joint monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and knowledge sharing.	
6.1 Due Diligence	Due diligence processes balanced with streamlined application for low risk partners with a history of working with the donor.
	Clear communication of documentation required for due diligence (e.g., registration certificates, financial audits).

KPI	
Micro-Indicator	**Elements for Scoring and Rating**
	Risk based approach considering partner type, project size, and financial resources involved.
	Efficient and timely due diligence process with clear timelines for completion.
	Established procedures for addressing any issues or concerns identified during due diligence.
6.2 Joint Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	Collaborative approach to developing M&E frameworks with local partners, ensuring their ownership and participation in data collection and analysis.
	Emphasis on measuring impact and progress towards locally defined goals and objectives aligned with community needs.
	M&E frameworks adaptable to evolving project contexts and priorities, allowing for adjustments based on lessons learned.
	Consideration for local data collection methods and reporting formats that minimize burden on local partners.
6.3 Learning and Knowledge Sharing	Mechanisms for continuous learning and improvement throughout the partnership, including regular feedback loops.
	Opportunities for sharing lessons learned and best practices with other local actors.
Performance Area 2: Amplify the leadership role of local actors in the response system.	
KPI 7: Enhanced leadership and capacity of local responders in humanitarian efforts	
This KPI measures the progress made in increasing the participation and leadership of local actors within the humanitarian response system.	
7.1 Policy and Supportive Environment	A transition or exit strategy is planned in the early stages of the humanitarian programme to ensure longer-term positive effects and reduce the risk of dependency.
	Methods of supporting and incentivizing participation and leadership by donors and intermediaries
7.2 Increased Local Actor Participation	% members of a coordination body (HCTs, ICCGs, Clusters) who are L/NAs
	% members of a coordination body (HCT, ICCGs, Clusters) who are WLO or OPDs and other diversity groups
	% coordination meetings (HCTs, ICCG, clusters) held in local/national language(s) or offering translation and interpretation
	% of satisfaction level recorded in locally administrated qualitative surveys per different coordination level/body
7.3 Expanded Leadership Opportunities for L/NAs	% of national-level bodies (clusters) that have L/NAs as leads or co-leads
	% of subnational-level bodies (clusters) that have L/NAs as co-chairs or co-facilitators
	% clusters that have developed localization action plans (relevant for their context)
	Survey Indicator: Perceived effectiveness and opportunities for L/NAs in leadership roles
7.4 Capacity Building for L/NAs Leadership	% of coordination bodies that have induction packages adapted to L/NAs needs (as defined by L/NAs)
	% of coordination bodies (HCTs, ICCGs, Clusters) providing twinning/mentoring programs
	Survey Indicator: Perceived benefits of capacity-building initiatives for L/NAs leadership
7.5 Resources allocation to support L/NAs Leadership	# of CBPF advisory boards and review committees with L/NA members
	# of staff hours/ or equivalent dedicated to support localization of coordination (RC/HC Office, OCHA)
	Survey Indicator: Perceived adequacy of resource allocation for L/NA inclusion
7.6 Visibility and recognition of L/NAs in response plans	% of HRPs that achieve a medium to high quality score on localization (through an annual multi-agency scoring exercise)
	Survey Indicator: Perceived recognition of L/NA contributions in HRPs
Performance Area 3: Improved coordination and complementarity among all actors and between sectors in response include bridging the gaps between Relief, Development and Peacebuilding. (Under Development)	
KPI 8: Improved Cross-Sector Collaboration and coordination	
This KPI measures the level of collaboration and coordination among humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding actors, including local and national actors.	
	% IAHE (Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation) in-country advisory group members that are L/NA

KPI	
Micro-Indicator	**Elements for Scoring and Rating**
8.1 Strengthened Multi-Sector Collaboration	% L/NAs that are organizations contributing to 3/4/5Ws matrix
	% members of Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework teams who are L/NAs
	Survey Indicator: Perceived effectiveness of coordination and collaboration between L/NAs and international actors
8.2 Enhanced Private Sector Engagement	CSR and Private Sector Initiatives are instituationalized and integrated in the response system
	Increased Engagment and role of private sector entities regarding their role in response
	Effective partnership and collaboration models with private sector
8.3 Improved Program Design and Implementation	Programmes are appropriately designed and implemented based on an impartial assessment of needs and risks and an understanding of the vulnerabilities and capacities of different groups.
	a. Programmes are designed and implemented in order to promote early recovery. b. Programmes are designed and implemented in order to benefit the local economy
8.4 Effective Stakeholder Engagement	The roles, responsibilities, capacities and interests of different stakeholders are identified in the coordination of response
	The response complements the action of national and local authorities and other actors.
	Information is shared with partners, coordination groups and other relevant actors through appropriate communication channels.
Performance Area 4: Increased community participation, engagement, and ownership in response localization efforts (Under Development)	
KPI 9: Increased Community Engagement Index and inclusive community involvement	
This KPI measures the level of community engagement and ownership in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the response programs.	
9.1 Institutionalized Community Engagement	Community-Centric Approach: Implementation of incentives to promote community engagement.
	Community Participation Initiatives are instituationalized and integrated in the response system
9.2 Meaningful Community Engagement	Programmes are built on local capacities and work towards improving the resilience of communities and people affected by crisis.
	Information is provided to communities and people affected by crisis about the organisation, the principles it adheres to, the expected behaviours of staff, and its programmes and deliverables.
	Communication with communities and people affected by crisis uses languages, formats and media that are easily understood, respectful and culturally appropriate for different parts of the community, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups.
	Inclusive representation, participation and engagement of people and communities are ensured at all stages of the work.
	Communities and people affected by crisis are encouraged to provide feedback on their level of satisfaction with the quality and effectiveness of assistance, paying particular attention to the gender, age and diversity of those giving feedback.
	Communities and people affected by crisis are consulted on the a. design, b. implementation, and c. monitoring of complaints handling processes.
9.3 Accountability to Communities	Complaints are welcomed and accepted, and it is communicated how the mechanism can be accessed and the scope of issues it can address.
	a. Complaints are managed in a timely, fair and appropriate manner. b. Complaints handling mechanisms prioritise the safety of the complainant and those affected at all stages.
	The complaints-handling process for communities and people affected by crisis is documented and in place. The process covers programming, sexual exploitation and abuse, and other abuses of power.
	Communities and people affected by crisis are fully aware of the expected behaviour of humanitarian staff, including organisational commitments made on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.

KPI	
Micro-Indicator	**Elements for Scoring and Rating**
Performance Area 6: Strengthening Institutional Capacities of L/NAs (Under Development)	
KPI 10: Enhanced Institutional Capacity of Local and National Responders	
This KPI measures the improvement in the capacity of local and national responders to effectively deliver humanitarian assistance.	
1.1 Strengthening Institutional Capacities	Existence of a cost sharing and wages policy.
	Provision of capacity-building support.
	Average percentage of capacity building support in partnership agreements.
	Types of capacity-building support received.
	Effectiveness rating of capacity-building support.
	Main capacity gaps faced by the organization.
	Most beneficial types of capacity-building support.
Performance Area 7: Improving Funding Accessibility and Quality to local/national actors in Yemen	
KPI 11: Increased Funding to Local and National Actors	
This KPI measures the volume and type of funding provided to local and national actors (LNAs) as well as the degree of funding flexibility and transparency.	
11.1 Direct Funding to LNAs:	Volume and percentage of humanitarian funding provided directly to local and national non-state actors.
	Volume and percentage of humanitarian funding provided directly to local and national state actors.
	Number of International Funding Models that provided 25% or more of their allocations directly to LNAs.
11.2 Indirect Funding to LNAs:	Volume and percentage of humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to local and national non-state actors.
	Volume and percentage of humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to local and national state actors.
11.3 Multi-year Funding	Volume and percentage of multi-year humanitarian funding received and provided to all partners.
	Volume and percentage of multi-year humanitarian funding received and provided to local and national actors.
11.4 Flexible Funding	Volume and percentage of humanitarian funding received as Flexible Funding.
11.5 Funding Disclosure	Disclosure of funds provided to local/national actors.
KPI 12: Financial Health and Sustainability of Local and National Actors	
This KPI measures the financial health and sustainability of local and national actors (LNAs) compared to international actors operating in Yemen.	
12.1 Financial Reserves:	Level of unrestricted reserves (days of operating expenses)
	Level of total reserves (days of operating expenses)
12.2 Income Diversification	Percentage of income from largest funder,
	top three funders
	Level of unrestricted income
	Number and variety of income sources
12.3 Financial Management Practices	Evidence of budgeting, cost monitoring, and cost control
	Existence and implementation of a reserves policy
	Evidence of efforts to develop new income streams and seek unrestricted funding
KPI 13: Income Quality and Sustainability of Local and National Actors	
This KPI measures the quality and sustainability of income sources for local and national actors (LNAs) compared to international actors operating in Yemen.	
13.1 Unrestricted Income	level of unrestricted income
	Types of unrestricted income sources (e.g., grants, donations, fundraising)
	Number of unrestricted income sources
13.2 Cost Recovery:	Percentage of administration costs recovered from restricted income
	Number of agreements providing full and fair share of costs / total number of agreements
	Use of unrestricted income or other restricted agreements to cover costs

KPI	
Micro-Indicator	**Elements for Scoring and Rating**
	Total administration costs recovered / total administration costs incurred
12.3 Overall Income Quality	Compliance with criteria for high, medium-high, medium-low, or low ratings
	Percentage of administration costs recovered directly
	Total administration costs recovered / total administration costs incurred
KPI 14: Cost Recovery Practices of Local and National Actors	
This KPI assesses the cost recovery practices of local and national actors (LNAs) compared to international NGOs operating in Yemen, identifying key factors influencing cost recovery and providing recommendations for improvement.	
14.1 Cost Recovery Capacity	Existence of cost categories, cost recovery policy, knowledge of administration cost rate, budget management systems, and cost charging systems
14.2 Cost Recovery Strategy:	Evidence of negotiation with donors, cost recovery targets, and staff training
	Evidence of cost recovery considerations in partnership policies and decision-making processes
	Compliance with criteria for high, medium-high, medium-low, or low ratings
14.3 Identify key factors	Barriers to accessing diverse funding, capacity constraints, regulatory environment, etc.
14.4. Compare financial performance	Comparison of financial indicators (reserves, income, expenses, etc.)
14.5 Develop recommendations	Potential solutions based on research findings
Performance Area 8: Cross-Cutting Issues	
KPI 15: Cross-Cutting Issues	
This performance area aims to measure key cross-cutting issues within the response, including support for women-led organizations, risk sharing, and disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.	
15.1 Support for Women-Led Organizations (WLOs)	Volume and percentage of humanitarian funding provided directly to local or national women-led and/or WROs.
	Volume and percentage of humanitarian funding provided through one intermediary to women-led and/or women's rights organizations.
15.2 Risk Sharing and Partnership:	Steps taken to progress risk sharing in partnerships.
	Progress in collaborative promotion of risk sharing by funding partners.
15.3 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation	Incorporation of climate change considerations in response plans and projects.
	Number of capacity-building sessions conducted for local actors.
	Volume of funding (USD) allocated to disaster risk reduction and climate change initiatives.
	Percentage of total funding allocated to disaster risk reduction and climate change initiatives.
	Number of projects implementing climate-resilient infrastructure and practices.

Annex B: Scoring System

Score 4	Exceeds good practices. The element is fully implemented in all relevant cases, representing commitments localisation.	
Score 3	Meets conditions. The element is substantially implemented in most cases.	
Score 2	Approaches conditions. The element is partially implemented in some cases.	
Score 1	Not functional in Yemen. The element is present but not implemented or implemented in zero cases.	
Score 0	Does not meet conditions. The element is relevant but not present at all.	
N/A	Not applicable. The element does not apply to the organization's mandate and context.	
N/E	No evidence. It is not possible to assess the element due to a lack of evidence.	

KPI		**KPI and MI scores and ratings**						
Micro-Indicator	**Question**							
Performance Area: Strengthening principled, equitable, and ethical partnerships with local actors in Yemen's		**N/E**	**N/A**	**Score 0**	**Score 1**	**Score 2**	**Score 3**	**Score 4**
KPI 1: Established equitable, simplified and standardized partnership frameworks, policy and procedures for the engagement of local actors								
This KPI measures the extent to which the donors and intermediaries are committed to the localisation agenda and promoting equitable and principled partnerships with local actors in Yemen								
1.1 Localisation policy /Partnerships Framework	1. Is there published by [Donor or Intermediary] a partnership framework/localisation strategy (or its equivalent) outlining clear vision for the application of GB localisation commitments or equivalent localisation agenda in your organization promoting equitable partnerships with local/national actors in Yemen??							
	2. Does the [Donor Or Intermediary] cover overheads/indirect costs of your local and national partners in Yemen?							
	3. Does the [Donor Or Intermediary] provide flexibility provisions to local/national partners according to flexibility terms of the GB or other terms for local and national actors in Yemen?							
	4. Are there opportunities for capacity building of local actors to strengthen their technical skills and institutional capacity included in your localisation strategy/partnership frameworks?							
1.2 Localization Integration	1. Are localisation principles embedded throughout the partnership framework, from funding priorities to monitoring and evaluation?							
	2. Is there an emphasis on supporting local ownership and leadership throughout the project cycle?							
	3. Are there opportunities for capacity building of local actors to strengthen their technical skills and institutional capacity?							
	4. Is there a clear plan for project handover to local actors after funding ends, ensuring sustainability of project outcomes?							

	5. Are there mechanisms for knowledge transfer and capacity retention to ensure local actors can continue project activities?							
KPI 2: Effective Fund Planning and Allocation								
This KPI measures the extent to which the funding strategy aligns with national and international priorities, is transparent and accessible, and promotes inclusive partnerships.								
2.1 Funding Alignment and Transparency	1. Are the funding priorities clearly defined and aligned with the strategies and priorities of the national government, local authorities, and international plans?							
	2. Is there accessible information available on target beneficiaries, geographic focus areas, and the funding amount for each program?							
	3. Is information available in multiple languages relevant to the target region?							
2.2 Inclusive Partnership Approach	1. Are there dedicated funding streams or quotas to encourage local actor participation?							
	2. Is the donor open to diverse partnership models, such as consortiums led by local actors and joint ventures with international NGOs?							
2.3 Communication Channels	1. Are the funding guidelines and FAQs easy to understand and available on the donor's website and through partner networks?							
	2. Are there multiple channels for inquiries, such as email, phone helpline, and online chat support?							
KPI 3: Accessible and Inclusive Call for Proposals (CFP) Process								
This KPI measures the degree to which the CFP process is designed to facilitate participation by local and national actors in Yemen.								
3.1 Accessibility	1. Are CFP documents widely disseminated through partner networks, social media, and relevant government websites?							
	2. Are translated versions of the CFP documents available in local languages?							
	3. Do the application forms minimize administrative burden for local actors?							
	4. Is there an online application system available, with offline submission options for those with limited internet access?							
	5. Is technical assistance offered to potential applicants for proposal development?							
	6. Are CFP documents and related information clearly communicated through the donor's website, announcements, and partner networks?							
3.2 Timeline	1. Is sufficient time allocated for proposal development and submission, considering local context and research needs?							
	2. Are clear deadlines and milestones communicated effectively?							
	3. Is there flexibility for extensions in exceptional circumstances?							
3.3 Evaluation Criteria	1. Are the evaluation criteria transparent, objective, and clearly outlined in the CFP documents?							
	2. Are the evaluation criteria aligned with program objectives, emphasizing local context, expertise, and capacity of potential partners?							

	3. Does CFP documents Emphasis on proposals that demonstrate a clear understanding of community needs and propose solutions led by local actors?							
KPI 4: Equitable and Transparent Partner Selection								
This KPI assesses the fairness, inclusivity, and transparency of the partner selection process.								
4.1 Fairness and Objectivity	1. Is the selection process clear, consistent, and documented in the partnership framework?							
	2. Are independent review committees composed of diverse experts with no conflict of interest?							
	3. Are there established procedures for addressing complaints or appeals regarding the selection process?							
4.2 Diversity and Inclusion	1. Does the donor actively reach out to encourage applications from a diverse range of local actors, including those from marginalized communities and geographically diverse locations?							
	2. Are there mechanisms in place to address potential power imbalances between international and local actors during the selection process?							
4.3 Conflict of Interest	1. Are clear policies on conflict of interest outlined in the framework?							
	2. Are there procedures for identifying and mitigating potential conflicts of interest during partner selection and project implementation?							
	3. Are there requirement for applicants to disclose any potential conflicts of interest?							
KPI 5: Effective Partnership Agreements								
KPI measures the quality and effectiveness of partnership agreements in ensuring clear roles, responsibilities, and mechanisms for collaboration, adaptation, and financial management.								
5.1 Agreement Clarity and Comprehensiveness	1. Are there clear roles, responsibilities, and expectations for both parties outlined in the agreement.							
	2. Are the roles, responsibilities, and expectations for both parties clearly outlined in the agreement?							
	3. Are there defined communication protocols for regular updates and progress reporting?							
5.2 Partnership Flexibility and Adaptability	1. Is there a grievance redressal mechanism established for addressing disputes or concerns during project implementation?							
	2. Are there provisions for adjusting activities based on changing contexts or needs?							
	3. Are there mechanisms for mutually agreeing on modifications to the project scope or budget?							
5.3 Financial Accountability	1. Is there an exit strategy outlining the handover process and sustainability plan for project outcomes?							
	2. Are transparent and accountable financial management procedures outlined in the agreement?							
	3. Do the funding disbursement mechanisms consider local financial systems and capacity?							
KPI 6: Effective Partnership Implementation								
This KPI measures the quality and efficiency of partnership implementation, including due diligence, joint monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and knowledge sharing.								
6.1 Due Diligence	1. Are due diligence processes balanced with streamlined applications for low-risk partners with a history of working with the donor?							
	2. Is there clear communication about the documentation required for due diligence?							

	3. Does the donor use a risk-based approach for due diligence considering partner type, project size, and financial resources?							
	4. Is the due diligence process efficient, timely, and with clear completion timelines?							
	5. Are there established procedures for addressing issues or concerns identified during due diligence?							
6.2 Joint Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)	1. Is there a collaborative approach to developing M&E frameworks with local partners, ensuring their ownership and participation in data collection and analysis?							
	2. Is there an emphasis on measuring impact and progress towards locally defined goals and objectives aligned with community needs?							
	3. Are M&E frameworks adaptable to evolving project contexts and priorities, allowing for adjustments based on lessons learned?							
	4. Are local data collection methods and reporting formats considered to minimize the burden on local partners?							
6.3 Learning and Knowledge Sharing	1. Are there mechanisms for continuous learning and improvement throughout the partnership, including regular feedback loops?							
	2. Are there in the partnership opportunities for sharing lessons learned and best practices with other local actors?							
Performance Area 2: Amplify the leadership role of local actors in the response system.								
KPI 7: Enhanced leadership and capacity of local responders in humanitarian efforts								
This KPI measures the progress made in increasing the participation and leadership of local actors within the humanitarian response system.								
7.1 Policy and Supportive Environment	Is there a transition or exit policy or strategy promoting local leadership in coordination?							
	How is local participation in coordination mechanisms supported by donors and intermediaries?							
7.2 Increased Local Actor Participation	What percentage of members in coordination bodies are local/national actors (L/NAs)?							
	What percentage of members in coordination bodies are women's leadership organizations (WLOs) or other diversity groups?							
	What percentage of coordination meetings are held in local/national languages or offer translation and interpretation services?							
	How satisfied are L/NAs with their level of representation in coordination bodies?							
7.3 Expanded Leadership Opportunities for L/NAs	What percentage of national-level bodies have L/NAs as leads or co-leads?							
	What percentage of subnational-level bodies have L/NAs as co-chairs or co-facilitators?							
	Have any clusters developed localization action plans?							
	Survey Question: How do you perceive the opportunities for L/NAs to take on leadership roles in coordination bodies?							
7.4 Capacity Building for L/NAs Leadership	Does your coordination body provide induction packages adapted to L/NAs' needs?							
	Does your coordination body offer twinning/mentoring programs for L/NAs?							

	Survey Question: How beneficial do you find the current capacity-building initiatives for L/NAs?							
7.5 Resources allocation to support L/NAs Leadership	How many CBPF advisory boards and review committees have L/NA members?							
	How many staff hours (or equivalent) are dedicated to supporting localization of coordination (RC/HC Office, OCHA)?							
	Survey Question: How adequate do you find the resource allocation for supporting L/NA inclusion?							
7.6 Visibility and recognition of L/NAs in response plans	What percentage of Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs) achieve a medium to high quality score on localization?							
	Survey Indicator: Perceived recognition of L/NA contributions in HRPs							
Performance Area 3: Improved coordination and complementarity among all actors and between sectors in response include bridging the gaps between Relief, Development and Peacebuilding. (Under Development)								
KPI 8: Improved Cross-Sector Collaboration and coordination								
This KPI measures the level of collaboration and coordination among humanitarian, development, and peacebuilding actors, including local and national actors.								
8.1 Strengthened Multi-Sector Collaboration	What percentage of IAHE in-country advisory group members are L/NA?							
	What percentage of L/NAs contribute to the 3/4/5Ws matrix?							
	What percentage of Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework team members are L/NAs?							
	Survey Question: How effective do you think the current coordination and collaboration efforts are between L/NAs and international actors?							
8.2 Enhanced Private Sector Engagement	Are CSR and private sector initiatives institutionalized and integrated into the response system?							
	Has there been an increased engagement and role of private sector entities in response efforts?							
	Are there effective partnership and collaboration models established with the private sector?							
8.3 Improved Program Design and Implementation	Are programmes designed and implemented based on an impartial assessment of needs, risks, and an understanding of the vulnerabilities and capacities of different groups? a. Are programmes designed and implemented to promote early recovery? b. Are programmes designed and implemented to benefit the local economy?							
8.4 Effective Stakeholder Engagement	Are the roles, responsibilities, capacities, and interests of different stakeholders identified in the coordination of the response?							
	Does the response complement the actions of national and local authorities and other actors?							
	Is information shared with partners, coordination groups, and other relevant actors through appropriate communication channels?							
Performance Area 4: Increased community participation, engagement, and ownership in response localization efforts (Under Development)								
KPI 9: Increased Community Engagement Index and inclusive community involvement								
This KPI measures the level of community engagement and ownership in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the response programs.								

9.1 Institutionalized Community Engagement	Are there policies promoting participation of crisis-affected people?							
	Community Participation Initiatives are instituationalized and integrated in the response system							
9.2 Meaningful Community Engagement	Programmes are built on local capacities and work towards improving the resilience of communities and people affected by crisis.							
	Information is provided to communities and people affected by crisis about the organisation, the principles it adheres to, the expected behaviors of staff, and its programmes and deliverables.							
	Communication with communities and people affected by crisis uses languages, formats and media that are easily understood, respectful and culturally appropriate for different parts of the community, especially vulnerable and marginalized groups.							
	Inclusive representation, participation and engagement of people and communities are ensured at all stages of the work.							
	Communities and people affected by crisis are encouraged to provide feedback on their level of satisfaction with the quality and effectiveness of assistance, paying particular attention to the gender, age and diversity of those giving feedback.							
	Communities and people affected by crisis are consulted on the a. design, b. implementation, and c. monitoring of complaints handling processes.							
9.3 Accountability to Communities	Complaints are welcomed and accepted, and it is communicated how the mechanism can be accessed and the scope of issues it can address.							
	a. Complaints are managed in a timely, fair and appropriate manner. b. Complaints handling mechanisms prioritise the safety of the complainant and those affected at all stages.							
	The complaints-handling process for communities and people affected by crisis is documented and in place. The process covers programming, sexual exploitation and abuse, and other abuses of power.							
	Communities and people affected by crisis are fully aware of the expected behaviour of humanitarian staff, including organisational commitments made on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse.							
Performance Area 6: Strengthening Institutional Capacities of L/NAs (Under Development)								
KPI 10: Enhanced Institutional Capacity of Local and National Responders								
This KPI measures the improvement in the capacity of local and national responders to effectively deliver humanitarian assistance.								
1.1 Strengthening Institutional Capacities	1. Is there a policy for cost sharing and fair compensation?							
	2. Is capacity-building support provided to local/national partners?							
	3. What is the average percentage of capacity-building support in partnerships?							
	4. What types of capacity-building support are received?							
	5. How effective is the capacity-building support received?							
	6. What are the main capacity gaps faced by the organization?							
	7. Most beneficial types of capacity-building support.							
Performance Area 7: Improving Funding Accessibility and Quality to local/national actors in Yemen								

KPI 11: Increased Direct and flexible funding to Local and National Actors								
This KPI measures the volume and type of funding provided to local and national actors (LNAs) as well as the degree of funding flexibility and transparency.								
11.1 Direct Funding to LNAs:	What volume/percentage of funding is provided directly to local/national non-state actors?							
	What volume/percentage of funding is provided directly to local/national state actors?							
	How many International Funding Models provide 25% or more of their allocations directly to LNAs?							
11.2 Indirect Funding to LNAs:	What volume/percentage of funding is provided through one intermediary to local/national non-state actors?							
	What volume/percentage of funding is provided through one intermediary to local/national state actors?							
11.3 Multi-year Funding	What volume/percentage of funding is multi-year for all partners?							
	What volume/percentage of multi-year funding is provided to local/national actors?							
11.4 Flexible Funding	What volume/percentage of funding is flexible?							
11.5 Funding Disclosure	Does the organisation disclosue funds provided to local/national actors.							
KPI 12: Financial Health and Sustainability of Local and National Actors								
This KPI measures the financial health and sustainability of local and national actors (LNAs) compared to international actors operating in Yemen.								
12.1 Financial Reserves:	1. What is the level of unrestricted reserves?							
	2. What is the level of total reserves?							
12.2 Income Diversification	3. How reliant is the NGO on its largest funding source?							
	4. How reliant is the NGO on its top three funding sources?							
	5. What is the level of unrestricted income?							
	6. How diverse are the NGO's income sources?							
12.3 Financial Management Practices	7. Does the NGO have a clear cost management strategy?							
	8. Does the NGO have a reserves policy and targets?							
	9. Evidence of efforts to develop new income streams and seek unrestricted funding							
KPI 13: Income Quality and Sustainability of Local and National Actors								
This KPI measures the quality and sustainability of income sources for local and national actors (LNAs) compared to international actors operating in Yemen.								
13.1 Unrestricted Income	What is the level of unrestricted income?							
	What is the nature of unrestricted income?							
	How spread is the unrestricted income?							
13.2 Cost Recovery:	What is the level of administration cost recovery from restricted income agreements?							
	What proportion of restricted funding agreements provide a full and fair share of administration costs?							
	How are under-provided administration costs subsidized?							
	What is the overall level of administration cost recovery achieved by the NGO?							

12.3 Overall Income Quality	What is the overall income quality rating of the NGO?							
	What is the NGO's ability to recover administration costs directly from restricted funding agreements?							
	What is the total administration costs recovered / total administration costs incurred?							
KPI 14: Cost Recovery Practices of Local and National Actors								
This KPI assesses the cost recovery practices of local and national actors (LNAs) compared to international NGOs operating in Yemen, identifying key factors influencing cost recovery and providing recommendations for improvement.								
14.1 Cost Recovery Capacity	Does the NGO apply necessary tools and processes for cost recovery?							
14.2 Cost Recovery Strategy:	Does the NGO demonstrate intent and ability to ensure adequate cost recovery?							
	Does the NGO integrate cost recovery into partnership and decision-making?							
	What is the overall cost recovery practice rating of the NGO?							
14.3 Identify key factors	What are the key factors influencing the financial sustainability of local NGOs?							
14.4. Compare financial performance	What are the disparities in financial resources and capabilities between local and international NGOs?							
14.5 Develop recommendations	Potential solutions based on research findings							
Performance Area 8: Cross-Cutting Issues								
KPI 15: Cross-Cutting Issues								
This performance area aims to measure key cross-cutting issues within the response, including support for women-led organizations, risk sharing, and disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.								
15.1 Support for Women-Led Organizations (WLOs)	What volume/percentage of funding is provided directly to women-led/WROs?							
	What volume/percentage of funding is provided through one intermediary to WLOs?							
15.2 Risk Sharing and Partnership:	What steps are taken to progress risk sharing in partnerships?							
	What progress is made in promoting risk sharing by funding partners?							
15.3 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation	Is disaster risk reduction and climate change considered in response plans/projects?							
	How many capacity-building sessions on disaster risks and climate change were conducted for local actors?							
	What volume of funding was allocated to disaster risk reduction and climate change initiatives in the last year?							
	What percentage of total funding was allocated to disaster risk reduction and climate change initiatives?							
	How many projects are implementing climate-resilient infrastructure and practices?							

Annex C: Glossary of Key Terms:

Term	Definition
	General Terms
Donor:	An individual, organization, or government that provides financial or other resources to support humanitarian and development action.
Intermediary	An organization that receives funding from a donor and then passes it on to a local or national partner.
Local and national actors (LNAs):	**Local and national non-state actors:** Organizations engaged in relief that are headquartered and operating in their own aid recipient country and which are not affiliated to an international NGO. **National and sub-national state actors:** State authorities of the affected aid recipient country engaged in relief, whether at local or national level.
Local and national non-state actors:	**Local NGOs:** Focus: Primarily operate within a specific geographic area, often a city, region, or district, within a country. Reach: Their activities and impact are primarily focused on the local community. Funding: May rely heavily on local funding sources, community donations, or small grants from local organizations. Expertise: Often have deep knowledge and understanding of local needs, cultural contexts, and community dynamics. Example: A community-based organization in a specific city working on providing healthcare services to marginalized groups. **National NGOs:** Focus: Operate across a wider geographic area, often nationwide, within a country. Reach: Their activities and impact can extend to multiple regions or the entire country. Funding: May receive funding from national and international sources, including government grants, foundations, and international NGOs. Expertise: Often have expertise in specific thematic areas, such as human rights, disaster response, or environmental protection, and may work on national-level advocacy. Example: A national organization working to promote women's rights and access to education across the country. **Key Differences:** Geographic Scope: Local NGOs operate within a smaller geographic area, while national NGOs operate across a wider area. Funding Sources: Local NGOs often rely on local funding, while national NGOs may have access to national and international funding. Focus: Local NGOs often focus on community-level needs, while national NGOs may have a broader focus on national-level issues.
Grand Bargain	A set of commitments made by humanitarian actors to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian assistance.

Accountability to affected populations (AAP)	The process of ensuring that humanitarian actors are accountable to the people they are trying to help.
Partnerships:	
Equitable Partnerships:	Partnerships between international actors and L/NAs that are characterized by: Mutual Respect: Recognizing the value of each partner's expertise, experience, and perspectives. Shared Decision-Making: Involving both partners in decision-making processes, ensuring that both voices are heard and considered. Equal Opportunities: Providing L/NAs with equal opportunities to participate in coordination structures, leadership roles, and funding opportunities. Transparency and Accountability: Operating transparently and holding both partners accountable for their actions. Shared Goals: Working towards common goals that benefit both partners and the communities they serve.
Flexibility Provisions:	Features or clauses within funding agreements, contracts, or partnerships that allow for greater flexibility in how funds are used, how projects are implemented, and how partnerships are managed. **Examples of Flexibility Provisions:** Flexible Budgeting: Allowing L/NAs to adjust their budgets based on changing needs and priorities. Extended Reporting Periods: Providing L/NAs with more time to submit reports, particularly in challenging contexts. Simplified Application Processes: Making it easier for L/NAs to apply for funding and reducing bureaucratic barriers. Shared Decision-Making: Involving L/NAs in decision-making processes related to project implementation and funding allocation.
Leadership Termnology	
Transition plan	Strategic framework outlining the gradual handover of responsibilities and resources from international actors to local and national actors. This plan would aim to ensure a smooth and sustainable transition towards local ownership and leadership in humanitarian action.
Importance of L/NAs	L/NAs are often the first responders and have invaluable knowledge of local challenges and solutions. They contribute to more effective, efficient, and sustainable humanitarian response.
Barriers to Participation	L/NAs face barriers such as language barriers, cultural differences, social discrimination, logistical and technological obstacles, and resource constraints.
Leadership	L/NAs should have equitable opportunities to take on leadership roles. This includes promoting co-leadership, elevating national staff, and supporting transparent and inclusive selection processes.
Capacity Strengthening	L/NAs should be provided with capacity strengthening opportunities, including funding, coaching, and mentoring.

Leadership Resources	L/NAs should have access to adequate resources, including funding, equipment, and security.
Visibility	L/NAs should be given visibility in coordination structures, including co-chairs, floor time, and highlighting their perspectives.
Accountability	L/NAs should be held accountable for their actions, and international actors should be accountable to L/NAs.
Equitable partnerships	Partnerships that involve joint planning and decision-making, with local and national actors playing a more visible and active role in programme steering.
Overheads/indirect costs	Costs incurred by an organization that are not directly related to the delivery of services, such as administrative costs, rent, and utilities.
Funding Quality and Quantity	
Direct Fund	Funding that is provided directly to local and national actors.
Indirect Funding:	Financial support that is provided to local and national actors (L/NAs) through a third party or intermediary, rather than directly from the donor or funding agency. **Examples of Indirect Funding:** International NGOs/UN Agencies: A donor agency provides a grant to a large international NGO, which then subcontracts or partners with local NGOs to implement a project. The local NGOs receive funding indirectly through the international NGO. National Governments: A donor agency provides funding to a national government for humanitarian response, and the government then allocates funds to local NGOs or organizations. Intermediary Organizations: A donor agency provides funding to a national or international organization that specializes in supporting local actors. This intermediary organization then distributes funds to L/NAs based on specific criteria or projects.
Multi-year funding:	unding with a duration of 24 months or more based on the start and end dates of the original formal funding agreement. This definition aligns with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
Flexible funding:	**Different levels of earmarking of humanitarian funding, categorized as:** Unearmarked: No specific restrictions on how the funds can be used. Softly earmarked: Some restrictions on how the funds can be used, but flexibility is maintained. Earmarked: Funds are allocated for a specific purpose or activity. Tightly earmarked: Funds are allocated for a specific purpose or activity with strict restrictions on how they can be used.
Financial Health, Sustainability and Diversity of Resources	
Administration costs	Costs necessary to administer and manage the organization. Shared across all activities.
Administration cost rate	Organization's administration costs as a percentage of (programme costs + unrestricted fundraising costs + ineligible costs), excluding gifts in kind and capital expenditure.

Capital expenditure	Purchase costs of vehicles, equipment, and other capital items.
income	Income from local, national, or international organizations (grants, sponsorships, etc.). Can be restricted or unrestricted.
Deferred income	Funds received in advance for future activities. Recognized as income once activities are delivered.
Donor direct costs	Costs charged as direct costs per the donor budget (often "above the line").
Donor indirect costs	Contributions to indirect costs (overheads, management fee, running costs) as defined in the donor budget (often "below the line"). Typically charged as a % of direct costs or a fixed lump sum.
Extent of Recovery of Administration Costs	Measures the difference between full and fair share of administration costs that should have been provided from restricted income, and the actual administration costs provided, as a proportion of the full and fair share. Applies to both overall restricted income and individual restricted funding agreements.
Foundations, trusts and other NGO's income	Income from foundations, trusts, and other NGOs. Can be restricted or unrestricted.
Full and fair share (of administration costs)	Portion of administration costs associated with restricted funding agreement(s), calculated according to the organization's administration cost rate.
Gifts in kind	Physical items (equipment, stock) donated to the organization.
Governments and multilateral bodies income	Income from foreign and domestic governments and multilateral bodies. More likely to be restricted but can be unrestricted.
Indirect costs	See donor indirect costs rates.
Indirect cost rate	Rate offered by funders as a contribution towards overheads or administration costs. Often a percentage of direct programme costs, but can be a lump sum. Not strictly comparable across funders due to different definitions of "direct" and "indirect" costs.
Individuals, appeals and events income	Income from private individuals, public, fundraising events, legacies, or appeals. Can be restricted or unrestricted.
Ineligible costs	Costs not eligible for funding, including losses due to fraud, disallowed costs from funded activities, depreciation on grant-funded assets, gifts and donations given out, alcohol, and entertainment costs.
Local government income	Income from local or regional government departments. More likely to be restricted but can be unrestricted.
Other income	Income from sources not listed above (e.g., bank interest, exceptional income). More likely to be unrestricted but can be restricted.
Programme costs	Necessary and reasonable costs for delivering a specific programme or project. Arise directly from activities required to implement the programme or project.
Programmes or projects	Packages of activities contributing directly to the agency's mission (humanitarian, development, advocacy, etc.).
Restricted expenditure	Expenditure funded from restricted income or restricted reserves.

Restricted funding agreement	Restricted income provided to cover specific activities agreed with the donor.
Restricted income	Income required by the donor to be used for a specific purpose, cost, or activity. Some NGOs may classify income as restricted even if the funder intended it to be unrestricted.
Restricted reserves	Funds held for a specific purpose, cost, or activity agreed by the donor but not yet spent. Reported as restricted reserves instead of deferred income.
Self-generated and trading income	Income from projects or activities to generate income and trading (e.g., rental income, consultancy services, sales). More likely to be unrestricted.
Unrestricted expenditure	Expenditure funded from unrestricted income or unrestricted reserves.
Unrestricted fundraising costs	Costs directly necessary to raise unrestricted income. Arise from activities required to raise unrestricted income. See Appendix 1 for details.
Unrestricted income	Income raised and can be spent at the organization's discretion for any purpose.
Unrestricted reserves	Accumulated unrestricted funds that can be used for any purpose. Includes capital and revaluation reserves related to owned assets.
Cross Cutting Issues:	
Women-Led Organizations (WLOs)	An organization with a humanitarian mandate and/or mission that is (1) governed or directed by women; or (2) whose leadership is principally made up of women, demonstrated by 50 per cent or more occupying senior leadership positions.
Women's Rights Organisations (WROs): An organization that	self-identifies as a woman's rights organization with primary focus on advancing gender equality, women's empowerment, and human rights; or has, as part of its mission statement, the advancement of women's/girls' interests and rights (or where 'women,' 'girls', 'gender' or local language equivalents are prominent in their mission statement); or has, as part of its mission statement or objectives, to challenge and transform gender inequalities (unjust rules), unequal power relations and promoting positive social norms.
Risk Sharing Framework	A framework that helps donors and implementing organizations to share the risks associated with humanitarian assistance.