



Local Engagement Refugee Research Network Paper No. 8 –
May 2020

Opportunities and Challenges for Localization of Humanitarian Action in Tanzania

Merve Erdilmen

McGill University

Witness Ayesiga Sosthenes

University of Dar es Salaam

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
List of Acronyms	5
Introduction.....	6
Research Design and Brief Findings.....	8
1. History of Humanitarian Action with Respect to Refugees in Tanzania	11
1.1. Refugee Politics and History of Localization in Tanzania.....	12
1.2. Current State of Humanitarian Action and Cooperation Initiatives	14
2. Global Norm and Policy-Based Drivers of Localization.....	17
2.1. International Normative and Policy-Based Sources of Localization	17
3. Identifying Opportunities and Challenges for Localization Initiatives	20
3.1. Obstacles Regarding the Current Political Climate and Laws on Civil Society	20
3.2. Gaps in Policy Making and Implementation.....	22
3.3. Financial and Capacity-Related Challenges.....	23
Policy and Research Recommendations	25
Conclusion	27
Appendix A: Challenges to Localization.....	29
Works Cited	30

Executive Summary

The idea of strengthening local humanitarian actors' capacities, and access to funding and information, as well as making local non-governmental organizations essential partners in strategic decision-making processes, has been around globally since the early 1990s. Localization efforts have gained momentum since the World Humanitarian Summit (2016), alongside other international platforms and commitments, including the Charter for Change (2015), the Grand Bargain (2016), and the Global Compact on Refugees (2018). Recently, the COVID-19 pandemic has reinforced the essential role local actors play in responding to the crisis. Amid greater efforts to realize localization ideals in different parts of the world, many have raised concerns about the issues at stake in these initiatives, and the factors that affect their success or failure. Hence, it remains important to better understand localization efforts in various contexts, the opportunities they provide, and challenges they pose.

This paper provides a general overview of opportunities and challenges for localization initiatives in Tanzania. Our research has aimed to understand the impediments faced by local non-governmental actors and the sources of impediments to localization of humanitarian assistance and refugee protection initiatives in Tanzania. During our five weeks of field work in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, we employed a mix of in-depth stakeholder interviews, participant observation and process tracing. Our findings show that even though the localization process has made important progress globally, it remains to be studied how international political economy concerns and power inequalities embedded in humanitarian action inform localization initiatives on the ground. Our paper provides the first analysis of this link in localization between global and local. Furthermore, we also provide several recommendations for policymakers and future research. These recommendations are as follows:

- There is a need for more direct funding for local non-governmental organizations not only in Tanzania but globally.
- Donors should also accept to fund local actors' administrative and logistical expenses, rather than only supporting project-related costs, which has no long-term capacity-building impact on LNGOs.

- To ensure equal partnership between local and international non-governmental organizations, existing platform for local and international organizations' collaboration should be supported. There should also be common accountability mechanisms both for international and local organizations to have rights to keep each other accountable and transparent.
- There is a growing emphasis on the integration of regional and situational approaches into the localization processes. Context-specific responses to localization challenges require taking regional and situational conditions into account. Regional humanitarian organizations and situation-based needs of local actors should be supported as key drivers of localization.
- Private-public partnership to support humanitarian action can be encouraged, while it must be ensured that actors respect humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, and operational independence.
- Humanitarian actors should be encouraged to incorporate gender frameworks into localization initiatives as humanitarian operations impacts women and men disproportionately.
- A localization framework should be applied to the Humanitarian-Development nexus as humanitarian and development initiatives are inherently intertwined and many local actors provide both humanitarian and development services.
- Future research should focus on the question of responsibility pertaining to the localization of humanitarian action. Different actors' expectations regarding whether governments or civil society should be the main drivers of localization would generate additional mechanisms to progress ongoing localization initiatives.
- There is a need to investigate the role of the local faith-based organizations, traditional leaders, and host populations themselves on the localization processes, as inclusion of these actors in the research will provide a more holistic account of what local means and how localization processes can be accelerated.

List of Acronyms

CCM	Camp Coordination and Camp Management
CRRF	Comprehensive Refugees Response Framework
FBOs	Faith-based organizations
FCS	Foundation for Civil Society
INGOs	International non-governmental organizations
IPS	International practice theory
LERRN	Local Engagement Refugee Research Network
LHRC	The Legal and Humanitarian Rights Centre
LNGOs	Local non-governmental organizations
NaCoNGO	National Council of Non-Governmental Organizations
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PARinAC	Partnership in Action
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TANGO	Tanzanian Association of Non-Governmental Organizations
TANLAP	Tanzania Network of Legal Aid Providers
TAREMINET	Tanzania Refugee and Migration Network
TCRS	Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service
THRDC	Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene Programs
WHS	World Humanitarian Summit

Introduction

The concept of localization has been highlighted prominently in the humanitarian sector since the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) in 2016. The recent global outbreak of COVID-19 has also brought attention to the role that is being expected of local organizations in the current response. Alongside other similar initiatives, the United Nation (UN)'s Global Response Plan for COVID-19 highlights the importance and advantages of the local organizations in responding to the crisis (OCHA 2020). These developments illustrate the need to ensure the inclusion and capacity-building of local organizations in all humanitarian responses.

The idea of strengthening local actors' capacities, and access to funding and information, as well as making local non-governmental organizations (LNGOs) essential partners in strategic decision-making processes, has been around globally since early 1990s. However, localization has gained momentum since the WHS, alongside other international platforms and commitments, including the Charter for Change (2015), the Grand Bargain (2016), and the Global Compact on Refugees (2018). Amid increasing efforts to realize localization ideals in different parts of the world, many have raised concerns about the issues at stake in localization initiatives, if not their failure (IFRC 2018; de Geoffroy and Grunewald 2017; Oxfam International 2018; IASC 2020; Development Initiatives 2017). Hence, it remains important to better understand localization efforts in various contexts, the opportunities they provide, and challenges they pose for the next steps of localization processes.

In 2019, Local Engagement Refugee Research Network (LERRN) undertook research on what localization of humanitarian action means in practice, and current opportunities and gaps within localization initiatives in two East African countries, Kenya and Tanzania. Working with LERRN's Tanzania Working Group and wider humanitarian actors in Tanzania in the summer of 2019, we investigated how the global localization initiative is implemented on the ground in Tanzania. During our one-month field work, we aimed at identifying the impact of localization processes in the Tanzanian humanitarian community and operations, as well as shedding light on the meaning, scope, opportunities and challenges of localization. This paper presents an overview of our findings regarding humanitarian localization efforts in Tanzania and recommendations to

policymakers and researchers on how to further empower local actors and create genuine and equal partnerships between LNGOs and INGOs.

Although there is not yet a globally accepted definition of localization, it is possible to compile a list of common characteristics of localization as defined in main global platforms and commitments. Drawing upon Partnership in Action (PARinAC) (1994), Charter for Change (2015), WHS (2016), and the Grand Bargain (2016), this paper defines localization of humanitarian action as a collective process with four main objectives, involving humanitarian INGOs, LNGOs, donors, state bodies, local communities, including faith-based organizations (FBOs), host communities, and refugee populations. These objectives are (i) making local actors less dependent on funding from INGOs and hence increasing the proportion of direct, multi-year or basket funding channeled to LNGOs; (ii) strengthening local capacities through institutional development, more equal partnership relations with international actors, greater involvement and influence of local actors in each step of decision-making processes; (iii) encouraging the local ownership of policies, humanitarian work and knowledge by lessening recruitment imbalances between international and local humanitarian workers, i.e. hiring as many locals as possible, giving voice to local and refugee communities, and respecting local knowledge; and finally, (iv) ensuring support to already existing local actor networks, especially by investing in local human capital in the form of education and acquisition of new skills alongside honing existing skills. To attain these objectives, localization requires a considerable power shift in how the humanitarian field operates.

Many of the challenges localization processes face derive primarily from an ambiguous understanding of what localization is, what kind of responsibilities each actor should take and who counts as 'local', and secondarily from how the international humanitarian field operates. Taking stock from our fieldwork and growing literature on localization, we argue that to better implement localization in Tanzania, it is still essential to change the larger humanitarian community's structures of funding, collaboration between international and local actors and the state, and myths of efficiency-based response to humanitarian emergencies which render local actors more vulnerable and less a part of decision-making processes that affect their lives directly.

This paper makes two overall contributions to the scholarship on the localization of humanitarian action. First, we provide a fine-grained analysis of opportunities and issues at stake in implementing the global localization initiative on the ground in the context of Tanzania. Detailed accounts of how and the extent to which localization processes have been implemented in Tanzania lay the groundwork for future multi-year, same country and multiple-case comparative research. Second, we problematize the idea of localization as something ‘new’ in Tanzania by showing the country’s often overlooked history of strong local actors, which were the main respondents to refugee flows into Tanzania in the 1960s and 1970s. We hope that remembering how essential Tanzanian local actors were in earlier decades will make other humanitarians more cognizant of how LNGOs are capable of succeeding and will provide stronger commitments to localization.

Research Design and Brief Findings

In implementing this study, we drew on the epistemological and methodological approaches located in forced migration studies and international practice theory (IPS). We employed a mix of in-depth semi-structured stakeholder interviews, participant observation, and process-tracing. Being part of a research network, LERRN, that has strongly committed to an equal knowledge production process and decolonization of knowledge (Jones 2006), our methodological choices are informed by our epistemology and inspiration to be part of a more equitable research process. We follow first, international practice theory’s emphasis on the interconnectedness between practices and actors, and second, forced migration studies’ focus on prioritizing local knowledge and voices. Our research aims to unpack (1) the content and scope localization practices; and (2) the way actors realize, challenge or change certain practices, contextualizing practices with a reference to background knowledge, culture, and historicity that gave rise to practices in the first place.

A closer look at localization practices, how they have challenged and changed in the Tanzanian humanitarian context, how actors see who counts as ‘local’ and what is included in localization practices set us in a good position to grasp opportunities and challenges to localization in Tanzania. LERRN’s commitment to co-production of knowledge and involvement of local researchers, Canadian researchers and humanitarian actors as well as international practice theory’s perspective

on the relationship between various actors, ideas and knowledge have been the main sources of our research approach in Tanzania. *Subjectivism* as associated directly with international practice theory emphasizes on interconnectedness between practice, background knowledge, dissolution of material-ideational and agency-structure dualities. Pouliot (2007) coins the term *subjectivism* to denote how practices should be empirically studied and more importantly, what practice theory's epistemological and methodological sources are. He defines *subjectivism* as "a three-step methodology that moves along a continuum bordered at one end by experience-near concepts and at the other by experience-distant concepts" (Pouliot, 2007: 65). Intersubjective reality as formed by culture, knowledge, and language provides contextual understanding of what micro localization practices mean and do within broader network of practices. Taking stock from the key role local practices and background knowledge play in humanitarian work, we followed *subjectivism's* epistemological and ethical commitments while conducting our research. We contend that localization processes are composed of global practices of localization and their reflections on the ground, i.e., micro or local practices of localization. Locating broader sources of localization practices within a specific history, which is Tanzania's humanitarian history, lays the groundwork for our methodological choices.

Our methodological and epistemological commitments helped us to answer the following research questions:

- What are the main operational obstacles faced by LNGOs in Tanzania?
- What are the sources of impediments to localization of humanitarian assistance and refugee protection initiatives in Tanzania?
- What are the ways that LNGOs impact the policies on durable solutions and protection for refugee populations?

As we aim to understand how micro localization practices in Tanzania have been shaped by actors, the country's socio-political and humanitarian history, and lastly, international normative principles and networks of localization practices, we employ a mix of in-depth stakeholder interviews, participant-observation, and process tracing.

In-depth interviews are appropriate to depict the way humanitarian actors evaluate their practices and to “gain a sense of social-context” (Kapiszewski et al. 2015: 196). In-depth interviews also reveal perspectives of each stakeholder on the same issue and provide a unique tool for researchers to unpack the multiple challenges for localization. Interviews were semi-structured with a mix of entry point questions and follow-up questions. The entry point questions aimed to understand: (1) The role of the interviewee and her organization’s operations, resources, history in Tanzania and collaborations with other INGOs or LNGOs; (2) the degree of visibility of LNGOs and local network of humanitarian actors, (3) the nature of interactions and collaborations between INGOs, LNGOs, and the Tanzanian government, (4) the strengths and drawbacks of LNGOs and perceptions about the success, challenges and effectiveness of humanitarian and development assistance in Tanzania, (5) who gets to claim themselves as local, and (6) how perceptions about the role of LNGOs in the humanitarian field have changed over time. The advantage of focusing on how LNGOs’ role in humanitarian action has changed is that it provides us a sense that current marginalization of local NGOs is not a perpetual feature of the international humanitarian field. Often, hierarchical and unequal structures of humanitarian action seem resilient most of the time, implying that it is a struggle to strengthen local capacities and transform embedded power imbalances. However, being aware of the transformations of the humanitarian field in Tanzania will erode the illusion that ‘things have been always like this’ and localization is a brand-new idea.

We conducted thirteen stakeholder interviews in Dar es Salaam, made up of three LNGOs, eight INGOs, one refugee and one academic, in the period of five weeks in the summer of 2019. Alongside the interviews with a wide range of humanitarian stakeholders, we also conducted participant-observation by attending the meetings of an active networks of LNGOs, Tanzania Refugee and Migration Network (TAREMINET), LERRN Tanzania Working Group meetings and an inter-NGO conference on statelessness in Southern Africa. We were also given desks at the offices of DIGNITY Kwanza, which is a local advocacy NGO and the chair of LERRN’s Tanzania Working Group. We worked closely with DIGNITY Kwanza personnel, which enabled us to have better insights on the advantages of LNGOs, and strengths and challenges of collaboration among LNGOs and between LNGOs and INGOs. There are limitations to our findings as well, in particular the difficulty of generalizing our results and the limited scope of our current findings. Due to relatively short period of our field work, we did not have a chance to conduct research in

Kigoma. Kigoma region hosts almost all refugee populations in Tanzania, therefore we are certain that having interviews with local and international NGOs based in Kigoma would provide us a richer picture of localization initiatives in Tanzania.

Lastly, process tracing was employed as a complementary method to in-depth interviews and participant-observation. Process tracing helped us to historicize the practices and interactions between various humanitarian actors embedded in today's socio-cultural milieu in Tanzania. More specifically, process tracing is an appropriate tool to explore evolution of localization practices as it is "well suited to...a world marked by multiple interaction effects, where it is difficult to explain outcomes in terms of two or three independent variables" (George and Bennett 2005: 206). This method has allowed us to develop a detailed narrative account of the factors that shape the implementation of localization practices in Tanzania and the diverse drivers or blocks of this ongoing process.

To complete this process tracing, we analyzed following materials: UNHCR Tanzania's key operation documents, such as the 2019 Partner Integrity Capacity and Support Costs which affects the proportion of overall programmatic funding allocated directly to the Tanzanian NGOs in early 2020, as well as the organizational policies, project plans, country reports and policy briefs of other INGOs, LNGOs, and NGO collaboration networks. Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition's (THRDC) 2016 Report on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders in Tanzania, for instance, was a valuable source for us to trace current issues at stake for capacity building for LNGOs back to 2016. Lastly, we completed the process tracing by interpreting our fieldwork data in the light of a thorough analysis of the secondary literature on localization, the political economy of humanitarianism, and international and local institutions in emergencies and peacebuilding, particularly those implicated in the forced migration regime after World War II.

1. History of Humanitarian Action with Respect to Refugees in Tanzania

This section provides first a brief overview of Tanzania's history of refugee policy and the development of a humanitarian community in the country, and later a brief look at a current state of humanitarian action and issues at stake for civil society.

1.1. Refugee Politics and History of Localization in Tanzania

Scholars have contended that there are four drivers of Tanzania's response to refugee flows into the country: Nyerere era's political ideology of Pan Africanism, related foreign policy issues, international economic pressures, and a wave of democratization in the 1990s (Nalule and Namboozee 2020; Milner 2009; Rutinwa 2002; Landau 2001). These factors shaped the role and strengths of local actors as well. Starting from early 1960s, Tanzania has been a host to many refugee populations from southern African countries, such as Angola, Namibia, and Zimbabwe, and its neighbouring countries: Burundi, Mozambique, Rwanda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Motivated by Nyerere's ideology of pan-Africanism and support for national liberation movements in other African countries, Tanzania has followed inclusive and open-door refugee policies. Refugees who fled conflict in their countries of origin and ones who sought a safe refuge after liberation movements and wars elsewhere in the continent arrived in Tanzania. Many have argued that Tanzania warmly welcomed newcomers to the country in the 1960s and 1970s as refugees were seen as an asset for realizing the government's ambitious *Ujamaa* policies, which aimed for villagization of production and self-reliance of Tanzanians, and also it signaled Tanzania's support for ending colonial rule in the continent and pan-African ideals other African countries (Milner 2009: 110, Rutinwa 2001). Local actors were the main service and protection providers to refugees in this period. Local tribe leaders, local faith-based organizations, and the local Tanzanian government public sector managed the reception and settlement of refugees, with almost no INGOs providing service and operating in the field (Rutinwa 2002: 76). UNHCR's only role was to provide funding to refugee operations led by LNGOs. Moreover, refugee leaders and volunteers contributed to the distribution of supply and education services, which is not the case anymore in 2019. Considering the strength of a large variety of local actors and their dominance in the newly emerging humanitarian sector in Tanzania, and following Rutinwa's categorization of refugee policy periods, we contend that the period of the 1960s and 1970s was an era of localization.

During this era of localization, refugees were settled in rural parts of Tanzania with land and support to provide them tools for self-sufficiency. The number of local actors and the sophistication of refugee empowerment continued to increase with new refugee flows. Increasing

complexity of refugee work mostly resulted from conflict and competition among local actors (Rutinwa 2001:78). Conflict and competition led to a need for an external agency to coordinate humanitarian operations, and decline in local capacity by increasingly centralized governance.

With the need of solving interest-driven conflict and competition among local humanitarians, the government entered into a tripartite partnership model with UNHCR and the Tanganyika Christian Refugee Service (TCRS), which was the Lutheran World Services' Tanzania country operation in 1964, rather than a proper LNGO in the literal sense of the term. The tripartite partnership is simply a mechanism of responsibility sharing and ensured more financial contribution by UNHCR, less economic burden for the government in refugee operations and service delivery, and implementation by TCRS. Following the tripartite partnership agreement, more and more INGOs started to operate in Tanzania. This flow of INGOs as main carriers of funding for refugee aid created a prioritization of INGO existence over LNGOs, and established a hierarchy between INGOs and LNGOs who were the main implementing agencies in the mid 1970s (Rutinwa 2002: 84). While INGOs were present in Tanzania's humanitarian sector in the 1970s, their role was confined to mostly provide funds and aid, rather than implementing policies on the ground. UNHCR was still considered as a 'non-operational partner' (Gasarasi 1987: 102). LNGOs were still important actors with considerable capacities, even though their more autonomous position had been hampered.

In the mid-1970s, Tanzania faced economic difficulties which became acute in the 1980s, rendering the government unable to provide basic services to its citizens and refugees. In the 1980s and 1990s, the Tanzanian government gradually reduced its involvement in refugee work as INGOs expanded into service provision operations (Milner 2009; Landau 2001). Both the government's economic and operational role shrunk and the localization trend of 1960s and 1970s transformed into a trend of internationalization of the humanitarian field in Tanzania (Rutinwa 2001). The more INGOs brought aid and funding to the country, the more their tasks and areas of responsibility expanded. This reality in turn made LNGOs more dependent on international actors both for funding and collaboration in the implementation of policies. The gradual process from localization to internationalization became more visible with recent global demands for

localization initiatives. It is perhaps ironic that Tanzania's localization efforts began strongly, only to fall into neglect, and become desired again once more.

1.2. Current State of Humanitarian Action and Cooperation Initiatives

The international humanitarian image of Tanzania's refugee response has been mostly positive, although demands for more international support and international sharing of responsibilities were understandably vocalized many times by the government. On the one hand, in 2014 Tanzania granted citizenship to 162,000 Burundian refugees who have resided in the country since 1972 (UNHCR 2014), making Tanzania one of the handful countries worldwide who granted citizenship to a large number of refugees. On the other hand, the government withdrew from the Comprehensive Refugees Response Framework (CRRF) in 2018, and restricted cross-border movement and refugees' access to various livelihood projects, including involvement in small businesses. Moreover, the government's framing of voluntary repatriation as the most preferred solution to refugee emergencies and the related rising number of voluntary repatriations, mounting to 71,971 as of 30 June 2019 (UNHCR 2019), have been seen as indicators of the government's perspective that non-governmental actors may hinder refugees from repatriating for fear of losing their jobs. It is important to note that increasing preference for voluntary repatriation is not specific to Tanzania. It is rather a global trend (Toft 2007). The global humanitarian community has to understand the reasons behind Tanzania's withdrawal from CRRF and encouragement of repatriation (Fellsson 2019).

Although the number of NGOs in Tanzania grew from 224 in 1993 to over 9,000 in 2014 (Harrison 2018: 9), most of our interviewees defined the current state of humanitarian work and civil society as 'shrinking'. Space for civil society in Tanzania has been shrinking for a number of reasons. A shift in the government's attitude towards refugees combined with a feeling of being 'left behind by international community of humanitarians with not sufficient support and recognition of Tanzania's own struggles' led to changes of laws regulating NGO operations (Norwegian Church Aid 2015). The Cybercrimes Act of 2015, The Media Services Act of 2016, and the Electronic and Postal Communications Regulation of 2018, and 2019 amendments to the Non-Governmental Organizations Act No 24 of 2002 have created new obstacles for NGO administration, operation, access to information, knowledge dissemination, and advocacy for refugees' rights. Bureaucratization has reduced the autonomy of INGOs and LNGOs: a narrower definition of

NGO, more onerous and costly requirements for NGO registration, the need for approval directly from regions themselves where NGOs intend to operate (instead of one approval from the central government), the limit and validity of registration certificates, and regulation of private companies and individuals in relation to the publication and access to online content. Many NGOs voiced their concerns regarding changes in laws and recently on May 13, 2019, 38 Tanzanian and international NGOs published a letter expressing concerns over human rights in Tanzania and asking for states to bring up these concerns in the next session of the UN Human Rights Council (CIVICUS, 2019).

It is also possible to argue that the Tanzanian government has been responding to demands of civil society. The government seems to respond to the concerns of NGOs, as on June 28, 2019, the government amended and repealed the Statistics Act of 2015 which made it a crime to publish “false official statistics” (Human Rights Watch 2019). Some of our interviewees also argued that the government has been supportive to NGOs, saying: “The government does not tell UNHCR so far things like ‘work with this NGO, but not with others.’ It is totally up to UNHCR to choose. I have been in countries where government said with whom to work. It did not happen here yet.... I see the government’s rule as ensuring. Situation is this basically: Our NGOs are allowed to register and work in the country. There are no problems on that.” This statement might indicate that humanitarian actors in Tanzania can be hopeful for the future of refugee work in the country.

Reconciling the different, if not contradictory, views on the relationship between government and civil society, Harrison articulates that NGO-government relations in Tanzania have long been uneasy, fueled by mutual mistrust (2018). He adds that “under the current President, this suspicion has escalated into more overt hostility” (2018: 3). Amid tensions between rising concerns about space for civil society and satisfaction with the way in which government has been handling politics and NGO demands, there are several forums for partnership among various humanitarian actors to cooperate and pursue joint action. There are three collaboration platforms for NGOs and INGOS at the national level: National Council of NGOs (NaCoNGO), the Tanzanian Association of NGOs (TANGO) and the Foundation for Civil Society.

NaCoNGO was established in 2001, mandated under Tanzanian law through the NGO Act and plays a mediating role between government and NGOs. Our respondents defined NaCoNGO as “a platform where government can communicate with NGOs on a variety of issues, including the capacity building efforts and seeking resources for strengthening local NGOs.” It has also been reported that the National Council has not been very active in the last couple of years and “some organizations do not even know what the National Council is.” TANGO dates back to 1988 and aims to “empower NGOs at the national and district levels and....to effectively engage and influence leaders, policies, strategies and development programmes, through capacity building, information and knowledge sharing” (TANGO 2020). Foundation for Civil Society (FCS) is distinct from NaCoNGO and TANGO in the sense that it is itself an NGO, rather than a formal network of NGOs, which provides “grants and capacity building services to civil society organizations” (FCS 2018). FCS manages basket funds by donors and provides a networking platform to a large cross-section of civil society organizations (Harrison 2018: 28). Therefore, whereas the National Council is for providing a connecting platform between government and NGOs, TANGO and FCS play more of an advocacy role. Almost all NGOs we interviewed are members of at least of one of these collaboration platforms.

At the camp and issue-area specific levels, there also exist active platforms for INGOs and LNGOs to cooperate and to be part of a larger community of likeminded organizations. The Refugee Operations Working Group led by the government and UNHCR, the Protection Working Group, and the Child Protection Group in camps are the main networks where INGO and LNGOs working in same issue areas in camps or in Dar es Salaam meet monthly. While the Country Directors Group is a monthly meeting network for the directors of INGOs operating in Tanzania in a refugee context, TAREMINET is an organization for LNGOs to collaborate and increase the sense of partnership among them. One LERRN partner stated that these working groups are effective both in terms of developing more coordinated policies and responses to the changing context of refugee situations in Tanzania, and for strengthening partnership between different actors in the field. These platforms are essential for implementing global localization policies on the ground and for succeeding at more equal partnership relations between INGOs and LNGOs. Furthermore, some LNGOs work to provide networks for other humanitarian LNGOs. The Legal and Humanitarian Rights Centre (LHRC), Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition (THRDC) and Tanzania

Network of Legal Aid Providers (TANLAP) are prominent network-oriented LNGOs. The presence of many platforms and organizations aiming for collaboration and partnership between INGOs and LNGOs demonstrate Tanzania has a vibrant civil society dedicated to humanitarianism.

2. Global Norm and Policy-Based Drivers of Localization

The following subsection presents global normative and policy-based reasons behind increasing emphasis on localization processes. Looking at the global normative sources of localization, starting from the 1994 PARinAC Agreement to the initiative to localize the implementation of the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals, provides the main avenue for applying process tracing methods to unfolding localization processes in Tanzania.

2.1. International Normative and Policy-Based Sources of Localization

We have identified seven main pillars of the emergence and spread of global localization processes. These pillars include (1) Partnership in Action (PARinAC) process in 1994; (2) The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008); (3) Charter for Change (2015) harmonizing principles for localization; (4) Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Grand Bargain (2016); (5) the World Humanitarian Summit (2016); (6) Global Compact on Refugees (2018); and (7) 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) calling for cooperation between local and international humanitarians. Aiming at strengthening local capacities and bettering cooperation between INGOs and LNGOs, an overall outcome of all these forums has been to compile a list of normative principles for localization.

Partnership in Action process in 1994 is the foundation of localization debated in the field of humanitarian action. PARinAC defined the framework for collaboration between local and international NGOs. A Code of Conduct that frames the cooperation between various humanitarian actors has been developed and endorsed by many NGOs globally. PARinAC has been important to set conditions for minimum standards of performance and efficiency. The need for local ownership, refugee involvement, and sustainable outcomes and operations have been also emphasized during the PARinAC process.

Steps taken with the introduction of PARinAC led to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008). Both are important as they defined the main elements of sustainable development efforts. These elements are ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results and mutual accountability (OECD 2019; Bissio 2013). Principles of ownership, alignment and mutual accountability are still used in more current localization frameworks as the main pillars of localization initiatives. “Ownership principles” points out prioritizing the agendas of conflict and crisis-affected countries, whereas “alignment” means that donors should respect these principles of development and “use local systems” to achieve development goals. The emphasis on the local system can be seen as the first seed of localization in the global humanitarian platforms. “Mutual accountability” states that both donors and policy implementation partners should be held responsible for development outcomes.

While Charter for Change (2015) defines the principles of localization, Inter-Agency Standing Committee’s Grand Bargain (2016) defines localization as one of its main pillars. Although the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) (2016) and Grand Bargain share similar commitments, WHS is the first global platform that focused on systemic participation of local NGOs in needs assessment, planning and decision making. Relatedly, the Global Compact (2018) coins the concept of “equitable responsibility sharing,” suggesting localization practices should not overlook the need for even and genuine partnership. Finally, the 2030 SDGs Agenda calls on “humanitarians locally, nationally, and internationally to work differently with one another... to move people out of crisis” (UN, n.d.). Following the step by step development of what localization comprises helps us to articulate how these internationally-set practices and norms are implemented in different local contexts. Policy-driven concerns regarding INGOs’ limited success to responding several humanitarian emergencies in the 1990s complemented global normative sources of localization initiatives.

The most recurrent rationales for advocating for localization initiatives worldwide are efficiency in the emergency response, opportunities for transition from emergency and relief to sustainable development, easier access and prompt response to humanitarian emergencies, cost-efficient humanitarian response, and unifying the divide between humanitarian and development operations often called the ‘humanitarian-development nexus.’ These normative principles have been

collectively developed as a result of lessons learned from problems experienced in prominent refugee crises of the 1990s, like Great Lakes, Kosovo and Afghanistan. Juma and Suhrke (2002: 7) notes while traditionally humanitarian actors in the Global North have been responsible for creating global humanitarian norms and providing financial and knowledge dissemination resources, actors in the Global South have been more marginalized, even though it is mostly their countries that experience humanitarian crises and that are primary providers of protection and solutions for refugees. The mismatch between the source of financial and operational capabilities and the location where most of the humanitarian operations take place brought along policy-driven sources for the need to build more local capacity.

Local actors are thought to remedy the shortcomings of INGOs in emergency response and the often conflictual and poverty-driven aftermath of INGOs' withdrawal from emergency areas. Limited resources, international actors' lack of local knowledge, earmarked funding that has rendered local actors unemployed after the emergency situation is over, and the complicated nature of forced migration and cross-border operations have required local actors to be more active parts of decision-making and policy implementation processes. Unintended and negative consequences of INGO operation in emergency zones raised concerns in the global humanitarian community in the 1990s. This made international actors more aware of how strengthening local capacity and empowering local humanitarians would lead to more successful humanitarian operations (Juma and Suhrke 2002). Many have also argued that in some long-term emergencies, arrival of INGOs in the country has grinded down the local aid capacity, as international NGOs carried with them higher staff turnover rates for LINGOs, competition for funding, and international aid dependency to implement the local policies (Accelerating Localisation through Partnership 2019; Juma and Suhrke 2002; de Geoffroy and Grunewald 2017; Saha 2011).

Combined outcomes of a wide range of factors have gradually led to more emphasis on localization in the 2000s, while in earlier decades strengthening local humanitarians has been marked by non-action and remained mostly as a lip service.

3. Identifying Opportunities and Challenges for Localization Initiatives

We classify key operational impediments faced by LNGOs and issues at stake in implementing localization in Tanzania under three main categories: obstacles regarding the current political climate and laws on civil society, gaps in policy-making and implementation, and financial and capacity-related challenges. Underlying these difficulties is a sense of ambiguity concerning what localization includes, how equal partnership can be realized, and how the larger socio-political context of Tanzania affects the areas of operation for humanitarian actors. These findings are the outcome of our fieldwork, and they are parallel to findings and analyses in other countries.

3.1. Obstacles Regarding the Current Political Climate and Laws on Civil Society

Key impediments to progress in localization in Tanzania include a high degree of uncertainty regarding the government's actions on civil society and refugees, more restrictions in humanitarian space and refugee advocacy, the government's cumbersome procedures – especially current amendments in laws concerning civil society and policy changes on refugees, the government and civil society organizations' lack of familiarity with what localization includes in practice, and finally, the prevailing discourse of refugee operations as 'emergency responses' rather than protracted situations which require long-term planning and preparedness. We briefly explain each of these challenges.

Interviewees suggested that the changing socio-political climate in Tanzania has led to increasing uncertainty regarding how humanitarians operate in the country. When asked what the biggest obstacles are to implementing localization processes on the ground, a respondent stated that "The biggest problem is that what is going to happen next. We never know what the next statement, amendment, and change in the policy will be. What we do know is that this uncertainty will continue. The context changes rapidly here." This view is shared by others too. Concerns regarding how the political climate will affect humanitarian work is one of the most recurrent impediments to localization in Tanzania. "We have been ruined by politics," an interviewee said, suggesting that politics-related concerns are encountered widely.

There is also an agreement regarding the negative and discouraging effects on NGOs of Tanzania's withdrawal from the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework. Access to limited funding and more onerous conditions for humanitarian work are main reasons why interviewees find the impacts of withdrawal not favorable. Concurrent amendments to laws on civil society is another factor contributing to the sense of uncertainty for humanitarian actors.

We witnessed an interesting nuance about how geographies and the camp-city divide affect localization practices. While none of the respondents reported concerns over high circulation of government officials in the capital Dar, many pointed out that in camps there are many changes in personnel, which alters working conditions for NGOs. Concerns about doing advocacy work in camps was raised by several respondents. High circulation of government officials in the camps requires humanitarian actors to reformulate and resubmit all applications, permits and demands. As one interviewee suggested: "In the camp, every time there is a new change of the government people, you have to explain to them from scratch what voluntary repatriation is and what your organization is doing there. With every new person, you are starting from the beginning."

A number of respondents working for civil society organizations reported that it is not clear for government how to implement localization in practice. To some of our respondents, localization seems to remain mostly an abstract concept for government officials with limited implementation on the ground. The need for transparent and applicable localization indicators would remedy this understandable challenge for actors to implement localization. Related to the ambiguity of the term localization, vague and often miscommunicated language on refugees and humanitarian action also seem to hamper localization initiatives. Pointing out the prevalent emergency discourse to describe refugee work in Tanzania, an interviewee addressed how language pertaining to humanitarian action can hinder localization processes:

"I also don't find the language of 'emergency assistance' helpful anymore. When refugees started to pour into Tanzania in 2015, we saw this as a form of emergency and framed the issues of refugeehood in terms of emergency. Our projects were all planned for two or three years and aimed to be ceased after three years. Yet, it has been more than three years that we have refugees and our projects are not well designed for the protracted refugee situations. We should use the language of 'protracted refugee situations in Tanzania,' not the discourse of emergency, because clearly this is not an issue of emergency. This is a long-term issue which requires longer term and permanent policies. The humanitarian assistance to

refugees and local NGO-based delivery should be long time investment since the reality is that they are staying, not leaving.”

3.2. Gaps in Policy Making and Implementation

The common policy-driven concerns that relate to localization processes consist of a lack of clear ideas about what the best collaboration practices are, an absence of standardized ways of working together, limited coordination in the camps, the public’s lack of familiarity with the refugee context and related definitions, and the public’s narrow awareness of what humanitarian NGOs’ objectives and operations include. Inconsistencies between refugee laws and their implementation on the ground also was stated many times as a negative factor for localization in Tanzania. Perspectives on the role of local NGOs on affecting the government’s policies varied. While most INGOs consider the impact of LNGOs limited, LNGOs define their access to government and other local actors, as well as familiarity with local know-how as their main strengths over INGOs.

We found that many actors highlighted the importance of finding sustainable ways of collaborating. Many expressed the need for more structured mechanisms of cooperation, which will hopefully bring equal partnership between international and local humanitarians. Some of the many recurrent concerns of interviewees include: “There is no structured way of engagement between INGOs and LNGOs” and “the initiatives for collaboration are there and it is a growing initiative. It is ideal to make this a unified voice. We need to find a way to come together. That is still ongoing...”

Regarding the effect of city-camp division on localization processes, the lack of collaboration in the camps was also mentioned as related to coordination problems in network and advocacy platforms for humanitarian action. It looks like each service provider in the camps focuses solely on their own tasks, which has eventually led to disconnectedness between various issue areas in the camps. INGOs and LNGOs that we interviewed provide various services to refugee populations including community-based protection, women empowerment, prevention of sexual and gender-based violence, self-resilience mechanisms, livelihoods, general food distribution, education services to refugee children, awareness about children’s needs and rights, and hygiene promotion through Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) Programs. They are also all involved

in host community empowerment projects, such as access to clean water, training and financial support for local entrepreneurs, installment of solar systems, establishment of income generation groups, and the organization of platforms for local communities and refugee groups to foster peaceful coexistence. Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCM) is also held by various, mostly international, humanitarian actors. However, each local and international humanitarian organization undertakes different parts of these tasks. While the division of labour and responsibility ensures the provision of needed services, the coordination between various tasks remains an area on which to collectively work, if actors commit to empower local NGOs, who mostly suffer from camp-based coordination challenges.

3.3. Financial and Capacity-Related Challenges

Local NGOs, even the most established ones, describe the difficulty they have in gaining access to long-term funding that would strengthen their institutional capacity. They also feel that lack of aid for administrative costs and capacity-building funds, difficulty in providing technical skills to their employees, and competition for funding have been obstructing local capacity development.

LNGOs' access to funding remains difficult. Most of them do not only compete with each other for limited funding from INGOs, they also need to compete with international NGOs, which they feel is unfair. LNGOs struggle to find partners, to meet their partnership criteria, and if they are lucky to be funded, to meet the sophisticated and onerous reporting and accountability mechanisms. According to an interviewee, INGO-LNGO competition over funding denotes to power dynamics inherent to humanitarian action: "It looks like INGOs think local NGOs are competitors. If all donors will go to local NGOs, this situation will push away INGOs...How do you assure that INGOs collaborate with local NGOs on equal basis is the main question that we have to think about. There are general fears about this discrepancy."

Even applying for project partnership openings, local NGOs are required to compile a variety of application materials. This process can be very challenging, especially for smaller and newly established LNGOs which do not necessarily have sufficient experience to be familiar with the complex and cumbersome application process. Hence, we can say that access to funding is not only an issue because of competition with other LNGOs and INGOs. It is also an obstacle because

of the way the humanitarian field is structured, which keeps certain local actors outside of the funding game, if they do not acquire enough sectoral proficiency to compete with others.

All local NGO representatives describe the problem of high staff turnover. There is a huge gap between the rate of salaries for employees of LNGOs and INGOs. Due to inherent difficulties of funding, many local NGOs are only able to provide a modest salary to their staff, unlike salaries offered by INGOs. These unequal salary policies that stem from imbalances of power at the structural level leads to high turnover for local NGOs. Local NGOs feel that they put time and effort to train their employees, but once those employees become highly skilled and professional, they are charmed by working conditions in INGOs, which lead to gradual high turnover rates.

As it pertains to high employee turnover rates, the lack of capacity-building training provided by INGOs to LNGO is regularly mentioned. While local NGOs mostly find helpful UNHCR's trainings to its partners and capacity-building activities, such as workshops and forums, they also see these 'activities' as not effective enough. LNGOs ask for channels for long-term capacity-building in the form of learning through partnership and higher administrative and institutional funding, complemented by ongoing partner trainings and often regional opportunities for discussing ways of improvement at the forums and workshops.

Certain INGOs feel that it is hard to work with local NGOs because of accountability and transparency problems. International humanitarians pointed out that local actors not following accountability and transparency mechanisms has affected INGOs' relations with donors in a negative way. While UNHCR assured that "accountability and transparency on NGOs' side is our responsibility. It is our responsibility to assess the implementation of the project. If our systems are not working, we are taking measures," other INGOs sees accountability as each actor's own responsibility. Parallel to worries about accountability, we also found that there are concerns about local NGOs' capacity to handle certain projects. These concerns are also justifications for INGOs not to work with some local actors. However, local NGO respondents feel that it is an unfair judgement not to work with local NGOs over capacity concerns. One local NGO partner commented "We cannot give you funding because you don't have capacity, they said, and we don't have capacity because you did not give us the money." Apparently, the issue of capacity is a

vicious cycle. Local NGOs need funding to hone their technical skills, organizational operations and mechanisms. Yet with no long-term capacity-building funds, with no change in sight, it is very challenging for locals to meet the preferred level of capacity to receive more funds.

Policy and Research Recommendations

- Localization initiatives have made important progress concerning the financial capabilities of local actors, especially with UNHCR's 2019 policy of allocating 4% of Partner Integrity Capacity and Support Costs directly to national NGOs. However, many scholars, local and international humanitarians alike raise the concern over local NGOs' access to financial and administrative capacity sources. While one of the Grand Bargain's targets is to donate at least 25% of humanitarian funding to local humanitarian actors, as of 2017, LNGOs have received only 0,4% directly of all international humanitarian aid (Oxfam 2018). More direct funding for LNGOs is necessary in all countries, including Tanzania.
- Basket funds and funds allocated to the country may help LNGOs to have access to more financial resources. However, as far as local humanitarians do not have their own institutional budget, strengthening local NGOs seems to be a hard to achieve ideal. Donors should also accept to fund local actors' administrative and logistical expenses, rather than only supporting project-related costs, which has no long-term capacity-building impact on LNGOs.
- Many of our interviewees reported that the will to empower local NGOs and create equal partnership between local and international humanitarians exists. However, what they found challenging was to develop common frameworks to pursue common goals. To learn how to collaborate collectively requires collective institutional memory which will build up in time. It is important to ensure that existing platforms for collaboration and partnership remain to help various humanitarian actors to develop genuine partnerships. Furthermore, there should be common accountability mechanisms both for INGOs and LNGOs to have rights to keep each other accountable and transparent. Currently, the mechanism of accountability seems to be a one-way street where it is only INGOs who have rights to demand more accountability and transparency from LNGOs. If the global humanitarian community genuinely wants equal partnership, it must ensure that any mechanisms should be reciprocal and mutual, making both actors bona fide partners.

- There is a growing emphasis on the integration of regional and situational approaches into the localization processes. Context-specific responses to localization challenges require taking regional and situational conditions into account. Regional humanitarian organizations and situation-based needs of local actors should be supported as key drivers of localization.
- Private-public partnership has also become important related to funding challenges of LINGOs. Our interviewees stated that the private sector has not been supportive of local humanitarian actors. Integration of private and public partnership may help alleviate obstacles to access to aid for local NGOs. Yet there is one caveat here: the balance of private-public partnership in the humanitarian realm is a delicate one and it is necessary to respect humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, and operational independence.
- The need to incorporate gender frameworks into localization processes has become an increasingly voiced concern (Oxfam Canada 2018; Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships 2019). Defining gender-sensitivity and Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse principles as main pillars of localization are the first steps of further handling gender-based intrinsic power imbalances in humanitarian operations. Humanitarian actions often affect women more negatively and fail to protect their rights. The disproportionate impacts of humanitarian operations on women and men is valid for localization initiatives as well. A feminist lens to localization focuses on power inequalities between women and men in access to roles in decision making processes. Although women's leadership in local contexts continues to flourish, the inclusion of feminist perspectives into localization processes is a necessary and yet often neglected step to progress localization.
- Rising interest in the Humanitarian-Development nexus shows that humanitarian and development initiatives are inherently intertwined. The international community should pursue common frameworks for integrating humanitarian and development concerns. Localization is highly related to the Humanitarian-Development nexus (de Geoffroy and Grunewald 2017). Many humanitarian agencies in Tanzania do both humanitarian and development work. However, humanitarian and development operations have been traditionally seen separate realms. Local actors' advantage of having access to affected populations puts them in a better position to deliver humanitarian and development work more effectively and comprehensively. This advantage lays the groundwork for the demand for merging localization and the

Humanitarian-Development nexus. Humanitarian actors should advocate for the ‘Localization of the Humanitarian-Development nexus.’

- For many policymakers and humanitarian actors, it is still not clear who should be responsible for localization initiatives. While some attribute the key role in advancing localization to the government, such as in Nigeria and Nepal, others expect humanitarians and civil society to take the responsibility and strive for progressing localization (Accelerating Localisation through Partnerships 2019). We found that expectations in Tanzania are more mixed, meaning that all our respondents see both government and civil society as sharing responsibility to strengthen local NGOs. However, the question of whose responsibility it is to localize deserves more research, as answers to this question would also generate additional mechanisms to progress ongoing localization initiatives.
- The local faith-based organizations, traditional leaders, and host populations themselves have played prominent aid and protection roles in Tanzania, especially in the 1960s and 1970s. These actors still shape solutions and protection for refugees, even though there have not been many academic studies on the ways in which more conventional humanitarian actors interact with these actors. Future research should include these groups. Inclusion of local faith-based groups, tribes, and local populations in the research will provide a more fruitful and holistic account of what local means and how localization processes can be accelerated.

Conclusion

The idea of localization emerged in the humanitarian jargon in the 1990s and has become prominently articulated over time. With the World Humanitarian Summit, the Grand Bargain in 2016 and the Global Compact on Refugees in 2018, localization has been gaining momentum and changing the ways of working for humanitarian actors. The recent global pandemic reinforces the importance of local actors and the need for increasing their capacities. Today, the need for strengthening local capacity is accepted more than before by a wide variety of actors, ranging from humanitarians to health care providers to economists. Relatedly, more and more local NGOs are growing in impact, strength and visibility. However, as it has been argued in this paper, further steps should be taken to tackle deep-seated power imbalances in humanitarian action as it relates to the objectives of localization.

We argued that it is necessary to understand how intertwined relationships between political economy-driven mechanisms and power imbalances embedded in the humanitarian field shape localization processes on the ground in Tanzania. This research will help to understand perspectives and struggles of various humanitarian actors to progress localization. Future research should take our findings as a starting point and integrate them into ongoing localization processes in Africa. Questions such as how to define who counts as local actors, what are the indicators of localization, how the camp-city division affects the way in which localization initiatives are implemented, and how different actors understand localization and what it includes remain to be further investigated.

Appendix A: Challenges to Localization

Obstacles	For LNGOs from the perspective of LNGOs	For LNGOs from the perspective of INGOs	For INGO-LNGO cooperation from the perspective of LNGOs	For INGO-LNGO cooperation from the perspective of INGOs
Political and Legal Obstacles	1) Current changes in the laws and amendments 2) Anti-refugee political climate 3) Government's lack of familiarity with what localization means and includes on the ground in practice	1) Current changes in the laws and amendments 2) Anti-refugee political climate 3) The treatment of refugee operations as an emergency response, rather than protracted situation	1) The treatment of refugee operations as an emergency response, rather than protracted situation	1) Some current policy changes. (closure of markets and encampment policy)
Gaps in Policy-Making and Implementation	1) Lack of awareness of what NGOs are actually doing 2) Public's lack of familiarity with the refugee context and definitions 3) Circulation of government officials in ministries and camps	1) Circulation of government officials in ministries and camps 2) Difficulty for local NGOs to influence the government's decisions	1) Circulation of government officials in ministries and camps 2) Lack of clear ideas about how to collaborate/best collaboration practices	1) Circulation of government officials in ministries and camps 2) Lack of coordination in the camps 3) Standardizing the ways of working
Financial and Capacity Related Challenges	1) Lack of funding and uncertainties about future funding 2) Lack of capacity-building funds for NGOs 3) Lack of capacity (the emphasis on capacity-building) 4) Lack of technical expertise	1) Lack of funding certainty 2) Lack of resources (including human capital and technical capacity) 3) Lack of capacity (the emphasis on capacity-building)	1) Lack of capacity (the emphasis on capacity-building) 2) High employee turnover rates for LNGOs 3) Lack of context awareness and local know-how for INGOs 4) Power dynamics and competition between LNGOs and INGOs	1) Lack of long term funding devoted to localization and strengthening local NGOs 2) Issues of accountability and transparency for LNGOs' work 3) Lack of capacity (the emphasis on capacity-building) 4) High employee turnover rates for NGOs 5) Power dynamics and competition between LNGOs and INGOs

Works Cited

- ACCELERATING LOCALISATION THROUGH PARTNERSHIP.** (2019) ‘Pathways to Localisation: A Framework towards Locally-Led Humanitarian Response in Partnership-Based Action’, C. Schmalenbach and Christian Aid, CARE, Tearfund, ActionAid, CAFOD, Oxfam, <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/pathways-localisation-framework-towards-locally-led-humanitarian-response-partnership> (accessed March 2020)
- AGENDA FOR HUMANITY.** (2016) ‘World Humanitarian Summit 2016’, <https://www.agendaforhumanity.org/summit> (accessed February 2020)
- BENNETT, A. and CHECKEL, J.** (eds.) (2014). *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BISSIO, R.** (2013) ‘Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness’. In UNHCR. *Realizing the Right to Development: Cooperating for the Rights to Development*. <https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Development/RTDBook/PartIIIChapter17.pdf> (accessed March 2020)
- CHARTER FOR CHANGE.** (2015) ‘Localisation of Humanitarian Aid’, <https://charter4change.files.wordpress.com/2019/06/charter4change-2019.pdf> (accessed February 2020)
- CIPESA.** (2019) ‘The Shrinking Civic Space in East Africa’, https://cipesa.org/?wpfb_dl=299 (accessed March 2020)
- CIVICUS.** (2019) ‘Tanzania: 38 NGOs Calls on States to Express Concern Over Human Rights’, <https://www.civicus.org/index.php/media-resources/news/united-nations/geneva/3860-tanzania-38-ngos-call-on-states-to-express-concern-over-human-rights> (accessed March 2020)
- DE GEOFFROY, V., and GRUNEWALD, F.** (2017) ‘More than the Money – Localisation in Practice’, <https://www.trocaire.org/sites/default/files/resources/policy/more-than-the-money-localisation-in-practice.pdf> (accessed February 2020)
- DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES.** (2017) ‘Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2017’, <https://devinit.org/publications/global-humanitarian-assistance-report-2017/> (accessed February 2020)
- FELLESSION, M.** (2019) ‘From Roll-Out to Reverse: Understanding Tanzania’s Withdrawal from the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF)’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 1-21.

- FOUNDATION FOR CIVIL SOCIETY.** (2018) ‘Mission, Vision & Core Values’, <https://thefoundation.or.tz/mission-and-vision/> (accessed March 2020)
- GASARASI, C.** (1987) ‘The Tripartite Approach to the Resettlement and Integration of Rural Refugees in Tanzania’. In Rogge, J.R. *Refugees, A Third World Dilemma*. Roman and Littlefield.
- GLOBAL TASK FORCE OF LOCAL AND REGIONAL GOVERNMENTS.** (2016). ‘Roadmap for Localizing the SDGs: Implementation and Monitoring at Subnational Level’, https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/commitments/818_11195_commitment_ROADMAP%20LOCALIZING%20SDGS.pdf (accessed March 2020)
- HARRISON, T.** (2018) ‘Political Economy Analysis of the Relationship between Civil Society Organisations and Local Government in Tanzania’, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, <https://www.ids.ac.uk/download.php?file=wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Report-on-PEA-of-CSOs-in-Tanzania-THarrison.pdf> (accessed March 2020)
- HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH.** (2019) ‘Tanzania Drops Threat of Prison Over Publishing Independent Statistics’, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/07/03/tanzania-drops-threat-prison-over-publishing-independent-statistics> (accessed March 2020)
- IASC.** (n.d.) ‘About the Grand Bargain’, <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/about-the-grand-bargain> (accessed February 2020)
- IASC.** (2017). ‘Grand Bargain Annual Self-Reporting Exercise: UNHCR 2017’, https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/unhcr_-_self-report_.pdf (accessed March 2020)
- IFRC.** (2018) ‘IFRC Policy Brief – Localization: What It Means and How to Achieve It?’, <https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2018/05/Localization-external-policy-brief-4-April.pdf> (accessed February 2020)
- IASC.** (2020) ‘ActionAid: Partnership for Humanitarian Action: Challenges for Large INGOs without a Traditional Partnership Approach’, <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-official-website/actionaid-partnerships-humanitarian-action-challenges-large-ingos-0> (accessed February 2020)
- JONES, B. G.** (eds.) (2006). *Decolonizing International Politics*. Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- JUMA, M. K., and SUHRKE, A.** (2002) *Eroding Local Capacity: International Humanitarian Action in Tanzania*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.

- KAPIZEWSKI, D., MACLEAN, L.M., and READ, B.L.** (2015) *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KASANDA, P., SIMON, A., MAGANGA, M., KILIMBA, E., and BOARDMAN, K.** (2019) ‘Tanzania: Amendments to the Non-Governmental Organisations Act’, <https://www.mondaq.com/Government-Public-Sector/827546/Amendments-To-The-Non-Governmental-Organisations-Act> (accessed March 2020)
- LANDAU, L.** (2001) ‘The Humanitarian Hangover: Transnationalization of Governmental Practice in Tanzania's Refugee-Populated Areas’, UNHCR Working Paper No:40, <https://www.unhcr.org/research/working/3af66cb24/humanitarian-hangover-transnationalization-governmental-practice-tanzanias.html> (accessed March 2020)
- MILNER, J.** (2009) *Refugees, the State and the Politics of Asylum in Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NGOS TANZANIA (NaCoNGO).** (2020) ‘About NaCoNGO’, <https://www.nacongo.or.tz/about/category/overview> (accessed March 2020)
- NORWEGIAN CHURCH AID.** (2016). ‘Norwegian Church Aid Tanzania Strategy: 2016-2020’, <https://www.kirkensnodhjelp.no/contentassets/a11f250a5fc145dbb7bf932c8363c998/tanzania--nca-country-strategy-2016-2020.pdf> (accessed March 2020)
- OCHA.** (2020). ‘Global Humanitarian Response Plan COVID-19’, <https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/Global-Humanitarian-Response-Plan-COVID-19.pdf> (accessed May 2020)
- OECD.** (2019) ‘Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action’, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/parisdeclarationandaccraagendaforaction.htm> (accessed March 2020)
- OXFAM CANADA.** (2018) ‘A Feminist Approach to Localization: How Canada Can Support the Leadership of Women’s Rights Actors in Humanitarian Action’, <https://www.oxfam.ca/publication/a-feminist-approach-to-localization-how-canada-can-support-the-leadership-of-womens-rights-actors-in-humanitarian-action/> (accessed March 2020)
- OXFAM INTERNATIONAL.** (2018). ‘Money Talks. A synthesis report assessing humanitarian funding flows to local actors in Bangladesh and Uganda’, <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/money-talks-a-synthesis-report-assessing-humanitarian-funding-flows-to-local-ac-620447> (accesses February 2020)

- OXFAM INTERNATIONAL.** (2018) ‘The Global Humanitarian Assistance 2018 Report Is Out Today-Here Are Six Top Findings’, <https://oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/the-global-humanitarian-assistance-2018-report-is-out-today-here-are-six-top-findings/> (accessed March 2020)
- NALULE, C. and NAMBOOZE, A.** (2020). ‘Report on Citizenship Law: Tanzania’ GLOBALCIT Country Report, https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/66748/RSC_GLOBALCIT_2020_6.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed April 2020)
- POULIOT, V.** (2007). ‘Subjectivism: Toward a Constructivist Methodology’. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51(2): 359-384.
- RUTINWA, B.** (2002) ‘The Marginalisation of Local Relief in Tanzania’. In Juma, M. K. and Suhrke, A. *Eroding Local Capacity: International Humanitarian Action in Tanzania*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- SAHA, S.** (2011) ‘Working through Ambiguity: International NGOs in Myanmar’. The Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations: Harvard University. https://cpl.hks.harvard.edu/files/cpl/files/myanmar_report_final_version_2011_09_08.pdf (accessed March 2020)
- TANGANYIKA CHRISTIAN REFUGEE SERVICE (TCRS).** (2020). ‘Who We Are’, <https://www.tcrs.or.tz/about-us/who-we-are> (accessed March 2020)
- TANZANIA ASSOCIATION OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (TANGO).** (2020) ‘Know About Us’, <http://www.tango.or.tz/about-us.html> (accessed March 2020)
- TANZANIAN EMBASSY-US.** (2005). ‘Registration of NGOs in Tanzania According to the NGO Act No.24/2002 as Amended by Act No.11/2005’, https://tanzaniaembassy-us.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/NGO_Roundtable_Presentation_Registrar_of_NGOs_May2012.pdf (accessed March 2020)
- TANZANIA HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS COALITION (THRDC).** (2016) ‘Report on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders in Tanzania’. Dar es Salaam.
- TANZANIA NATIONAL BUREAU OF STATISTICS.** (2019) ‘Amendment of the Statistics Act, 2019’, <https://www.nbs.go.tz/index.php/en/about-us/policies-and-legislations/acts/424-amendments-of-the-statistics-act-2019> (accessed March 2020)
- TAREMINET.** (n.d.) ‘TAREMINET: From Vulnerability to Ability’, <http://tareminet.or.tz/home/> (accessed February 2020)

- TCRA.** (2018) ‘Electronic and Postal Communications (Online Content) Regulations, 2018’, https://www.tcra.go.tz/images/documents/regulations/SUPP_GN_NO_133_16_03_2018_EP_OCA_ONLINE_CONTENT_REGULATIONS_2018.pdf (accessed March 2020)
- THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA.** (2016). ‘The Media Services Act, 2016’, <http://acme-ug.org/wp-content/uploads/1481107152-MEDIA-SERVICE-ACT-20161.pdf> (accessed March 2020)
- TOFT, M.** (2007). ‘The Myth of the Borderless World: Refugees and Repatriation Policy’. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 24(2): 139-157.
- TURNER, S.** (2004) ‘Under the Gaze of the ‘Big Nations’: Refugees, Rumours and the International Community in Tanzania’. *African Affairs* 103(411): 227-247.
- UN.** (n.d.) ‘Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’, (accessed March 2020)
- UN.** (2018) ‘Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees: Global Compact on Refugees’, https://www.unhcr.org/gcr/GCR_English.pdf (accessed February 2020)
- UNHCR.** (1995) ‘Report in PARinAc’, <https://www.unhcr.org/excom/scaf/3ae68bf41c/report-parinac.html> (accessed February 2020)
- UNHCR.** (2001). ‘Evaluation of UNHCR’s Role in Strengthening National NGOs’, <https://www.unhcr.org/3b0a2a5512.pdf> (accessed March 2020)
- UNHCR.** (2002) ‘Report on PARinAC and Plan of Action 2000’, <https://www.unhcr.org/partners/partners/3bbc64637/report-parinac-plan-action-2000.html> (accessed February 2020)
- UNHCR.** (2014) ‘Tanzania Grants Citizenship to 162,000 Burundian Refugees in Historic Decision’, <https://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2014/10/5441246f6/tanzania-grants-citizenship-162000-burundian-refugees-historic-decision.html> (accessed March 2020)
- UNHCR.** (2017) ‘Progress toward Implementing the “Grand Bargain” Commitments’, <https://www.unhcr.org/59c4e25f7.pdf> (accessed March 2020)
- UNHCR.** (2019) ‘Tanzania Country Refugee Response Plan. The Integrated Response Plan for Refugees from Burundi and Democratic Republic of the Congo: January 2019-December 2020’, <https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/68448> (accessed March 2020)
- UNHCR.** (2019) ‘Burundi Refugee Situation - Tanzania Voluntary Repatriation Statistics as of 30 June 2019’.

- UNHCR.** (2019). ‘UNHCR’s Policy on Contributions towards Partner Integrity Capacity and Support Costs’, https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=2ahUKEwjAvdjLn77oAhXFIXIEHQh_DBoQFjABegQIBBAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.unhcr.org%2Fpartners%2Fpartners%2F5cf5310b4%2Fguidance-note-partner-integrity-capacity-support-cost-2018-unhcr-ngo-survey.html&usg=AOvVaw25cxJ7_2_io5fOx0miapG1 (accessed March 2020)
- WORLD HUMANITARIAN SUMMIT.** (2016) ‘Restoring Humanity – Global Voices Calling for Action’, <http://synthesisreport.worldhumanitariansummit.org> (accessed March 2020)



Local Engagement Refugee Research Network

<https://carleton.ca/lern/>

lern@carleton.ca

 @lerning



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada