

Locally-Led Peacebuilding Self-Assessment Tool (LLPBSAT)

User Guidance

Guidance for the Testing Phase

This prototype of the tool has been designed to be tested by approximately 30 organisations and their in-country partners. The tool will be then revised based on all the feedback gathered. The testing phase is expected to begin in September 2025 and be completed within six months. We are seeking clear, candid feedback on the tool including the questions, guidance, and accompanying documents, and on its overall value-add compared to existing processes.

Please use this guidance document and templates to design an assessment process that best fits your organization and network. The questions proposed are meant as guidance, to be adapted to the context, the size of the organisation, etc. It will be useful to learn which questions are most relevant to you and how you have adapted them. We also encourage you to include the experience of your in-country partners, keeping the questions of the testing feedback form in mind. The testing phase will determine whether one version of the tool is versatile enough for all use cases.

Since the LLPB self-assessment tool is for your own learning and reflection with partners, users will not be expected to share the details of the input gathered. However, for the purpose of the testing exercise, it would be very useful to receive a short summary of the key reflections and actions from your process, and/or a few examples of good and bad practices you identified (this will help us further inform the section on illustrative practices).

Send your feedback using [this form](#). The testing period will close on 28 February 2026. For any queries and clarifications needed while testing feel free to contact us via Carole Frampton at carole.frampton@peacenexus.org.

Envisaged next steps - We plan to send all participants a recap of the feedback received and a summary of changes and improvements under consideration during the first quarter of 2026. Additionally, we will host a few virtual sense-making sessions with testing partners. The goal of these sessions is to share mutual experiences with the tool from both funders and civil society organizations and to discuss and validate proposed adjustments and improvements.

Disclaimer & consent: use and storage of your information - All information and data received will be handled in strict accordance with the principles of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Your feedback and insights will be stored securely by the PeaceNexus Foundation and will be used exclusively by the members of this initiative's Steering Group¹ for the sole purpose of improving this tool. By submitting your feedback through this form, you are providing your consent to the use and storage of the information provided, as detailed above. We strongly advise against sharing any sensitive information that might jeopardise data security and privacy of your organisation and/or in-country partners.

¹ The Steering group (SG) of funding institutions consists of representatives from PeaceNexus Foundation, Robert Bosch Stiftung, Humanity United and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

1. Overall Tool Guidance

Background - The discourse on locally-led peacebuilding (LLPB) has largely overlooked conflict sensitivity. The Locally-Led Peacebuilding Self-Assessment Tool (LLPBSAT) was co-created by funders and civil society actors to help fill that gap. It helps organizations reflect on how their practices—from day-to-day work to long-term strategy—align with a conflict sensitive locally-led approach and lead to equitable partnerships. The tool aims to help organizations operating in conflict-affected regions understand how to integrate a careful focus on conflict dynamics into their ways of working with in-country partners and communities.

Purpose & Philosophy - The ultimate goal of this tool is to help facilitate the emergence of common standards on what locally-led peacebuilding looks like in practice in a more conflict-sensitive way, and how to operationalise it within organisations and partnerships. This tool is not about passing judgment or "punishing" for shortcomings. Instead, it's about making space for honest dialogue, genuine reflection, mutual learning through a collective transformation journey. We believe that locally-led peacebuilding can only happen if there is integrity and coherence at every level - from funders to international organisations and in-country partners.

By outlining key building blocks, guiding questions and illustrative examples of good and bad practice, the LLPBSAT aims specifically to:

- Create a common framework for open and honest dialogue
- Help us learn from our experiences and each other
- Support in making concrete improvements to our practices and policies
- Inspire other actors, including funders, to use this framework and tool

Guiding Framework: Two Core Dimensions

Built around two core dimensions of locally-led peacebuilding, the tool features several practice areas and 13 guiding questions per dimension.

Dimension 1 Internalising conflict-sensitive locally-led peacebuilding

- A. Strategic Direction
- B. Conflict/Context analysis
- C. Negotiations with donors
- D. Contribution to system change

Organisational awareness

Dimension 2 Building equitable partnerships

- A. Organisational compatibility
- B. Programme design and learning
- C. Budget
- D. Fundraising
- E. Communication and advocacy
- F. Monitoring and Evaluation
- G. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability
- H. Care and accountability

Mutual awareness & accountability

Dimension 1: Internalising conflict-sensitive locally-led peacebuilding (LLPB). This dimension focuses on the internal work of an organisation. It asks to reflect on your vision and commitments, how you embed conflict analysis and LLPB in your decisions, programs, negotiations with donors, and to reflect on your possible contribution to wider system change. The commitment to conflict sensitivity means that organisations will need to tailor how they support locally-led peacebuilding to the context. It is not a matter of setting common standards

or indicators that apply everywhere, but rather of embedding processes to agree how to protect civic space, share and manage risks and empower partners in a particular context. The tool offers guidance and templates to help you create a process of internal dialogue and reflections with selected members of staff and leadership to make progress on embedding practices.

Dimension 2: Building equitable partnerships. This dimension looks outward at the ways of working between an organisation and its partners. It covers everything from programme design and budgeting to fundraising, care and accountability. The tool offers guidance and templates to help you create a process enabling dialogue and reflections both with selected members of staff/leadership and with in-country partners.

Users - This tool is primarily intended for intermediary organisations (specifically INGO) committed to locally-led peacebuilding as a way to hold themselves accountable, learn, and improve practices. The tool can also be easily used by other actors to hold themselves accountable to the communities and grassroots actors they serve, by adapting the questions as needed to reflect the reality of their context and relationships.

How to use the tool

This tool should not be approached as a rigid checklist, but rather as a flexible guide for dialogue, reflection, action and accountability around the LLPB assessment framework. The guiding questions are meant to help surface how decisions are made and by whom, more than compiling descriptions of policies. They also help harvest good/weak practice and areas for improvement.

As the framework is quite comprehensive and addressing all the questions (and sub-questions) can be time-consuming, we encourage you to prioritise the parts of the tool most useful by choosing the mix of questions and sub-questions most relevant for your organisation. Ultimately, it is up to you to design a process that works best, whether as a standalone dialogue or integrated into other ongoing processes (e.g., a periodic partnership review).

To achieve a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of practice, advice, and reflections we suggest combining open-ended questions with rating questions. This mixed-method approach allows to gather both rich, qualitative insights and structured, aggregatable data assessing the overall sentiment or maturity of certain practices, providing a high-level overview that complements the granular detail from the open-ended responses.

Whichever approach suits you best, a key part of a well thought-out process will be creating safe spaces where all voices, from designated staff to in-country partners, feel comfortable sharing honest feedback and understand how the insights and examples provided are being used for practice improvement.

Remember, the dialogues and collective sense-making are only the first step. The real value comes from turning those insights and reflections into concrete actions for improvement. Use the findings to inform your plans, and make sure you "close the loop" by sharing your findings, decisions and ways forward with everyone who participated.

Do you have questions or feedback on this tool? Do not hesitate to reach reach us via Carole Frampton @carole.frampton@peacenexus.org.

3. Collecting and Reflecting on Insights & Examples of Practice: STEPS AND TOOLS

This chapter offers an indicative step-by step guidance on how insights and examples could be harvested from staff and partners, and then reflected upon through a collaborative process. The overall idea is to facilitate a process of reflection aiming at:

- **Internal Awareness (Dimension 1):** The focus is on your internal team and organisation. We've included guiding questions to help you reflect on your own practices, culture, and processes.
- **Mutual Awareness & Accountability (Dimension 2):** This part of the tool is designed for integrating internal reflections with feedback from in-country partners. The goal is to create an open space for two-way feedback and shared learning.

Step 1: Gathering Insights, examples, and advice

To gather this information on the chosen practice areas and guiding questions, we encourage you to be creative and to think of what processes work best for your organisation and networks. You can for example:

- Run a survey to collect thoughts individually and asynchronously from staff and partners before hosting group sessions to present findings and reflect on current practices and priority areas for improvement.
- Organise a series of focus group discussions with staff and/or partners
- Integrate some of the guiding questions into existing surveys or include slots into other planned assessment processes
- Gather information relevant to these questions from findings of other existing processes
- Use one-on-one interviews with key staff or partners
- Combine a mix of the above

If you plan to cover many of the questions and sub-questions featured in the tool, the most practical approach might be to first send a survey to staff and partners, and then present and discuss the summary of the insights received in group settings. For large intermediary organisations that may not be able to involve all their in-country partners directly, partner input can also be sought through other means (e.g., validation surveys).

Be mindful of power dynamics! When gathering insights and advice with staff and especially with partners, it's crucial to create a safe process, being mindful of possible power dynamics at play. For example, consider holding separate sessions for different groups to allow for more honest feedback; or using surveys that allow both staff and partners to share feedback anonymously where preferred, and then present the information compiled for a collective reflection. Ensure everyone understands that this is a learning exercise, not an audit, and that candid feedback and advice are really welcome.

Have a look at the overall tool framework and identify the guiding questions and sub-questions you'd like to use. To help you design your data collection process, we created templates for staff/partners in these different forms:

- **Google Sheets.** [The tool's main spreadsheet](#) provides the information and guiding questions to help create templates for data collection from staff and partners on both dimensions, and includes some guidance on the logic of the framework, and on the

guiding questions. This format can be particularly useful when integrating the questions into your own processes and templates, or when creating offline data collection templates.

- **Google Form.** If you are planning to run online surveys to compile information individually and asynchronously, you can simply copy these templates for surveying [staff \(both dimensions\)](#) and [partners \(dimension 2\)](#) and adapt them with the questions you'd like to use. Alternatively you can replicate the templates into another platform of your choice. The advantage of using Google Forms is that it can be easily linked to a Google Sheet, later simplifying the compilation and summarisation of responses.

You are welcome to use and adapt these templates to fit your specific context and needs, including using other softwares and platforms instead of the ones mentioned above!

Step 2: Summarising and Collective Sense-Making

Once you have gathered your insights, the next step is to summarise and make sense of them. Here are some ideas:

- **Compile** all the examples, ratings, and reflections you've collected from staff and partners (and from other assessment processes covering similar information) into a single document, for ex. a single spreadsheet. There are ways to automate this process, for example by linking the results of the surveys into the spreadsheet.
- **Summarise** the information per dimension and per practice area. Artificial intelligence can assist with this! This short summative report will be a good repository of evidence, useful for broader organisational MEAL processes and for the kind of questions donors are increasingly going to ask about. Consider organising the summary as follows:

Dimension xxx, Practice Area xxx

Insights from Staff

Visual summary of aggregated ranking results (organisational maturity perception)
2-3 most recurrent good practices
2-3 most recurrent insufficient practices
2-3 most recurrent areas for improvement
Other relevant advice / insights received

Insights from partners (for Dimension 2)

Visual summary of aggregated ranking results (equity perception)
2-3 most recurrent good practices
2-3 most recurrent areas for improvement
Other relevant advice / insights received

- **Host Sense-Making Session(s):** Bring together relevant staff members (and partners, if appropriate) to present the summative insights. Discuss what you've learned, what's working well, and where the biggest opportunities for growth are. Ideally find convergence towards fewer key insights per dimension (good practices, areas for growth and reflections) and a shortlist of 5-10 priority areas for improvement for the organisation. This step is all about validating findings and creating shared understanding that, ultimately, will enable a collective commitment to action. Platforms like Menti or Slido can be useful to facilitate the discussion and capture live the input from participants using both for qualitative feedback and for prioritization.

- **Capture the summative compilation** of insights and rankings into a single point of reference for your action planning. To help with this, the tool offers a [Dashboard template](#), including some ideas of how to automate this process as much as possible. Feel free to adapt it as deemed fit.

4. From Learning to Action

Learning and reflection are powerful, but they are just the beginning. The real impact comes from using these insights to make concrete changes. The insights you've gathered should be used to inform organisational decisions and be woven into your organisation's plans. This isn't just a good practice—it's a critical step toward genuinely shifting your ways of working.

To move from "what we learned" to "what we will do about it", the tool offers some guidance on how to enable prioritisation and commit to concrete actions. You can find a [dedicated section in the Dashboard template](#) to add specific commitments or steps adopted by the organisation.

Finally, it's vital to close the feedback loop with everyone who participated in the process. Consider sharing a copy of the dashboard (or a short summary of the highlights), including your organisation's responses and commitments. This shows that their time and input were valued and ensures that the learning process leads to real, visible change.

5. Useful Resources

This section offers a suite of resources and information to support anyone using the tool. Parts of it can be extracted and shared with in-country partners and staff involved in the assessment process. Use the links below to navigate directly to each subsection:

- [The Tool's Framework: Components and guiding questions](#)
- [Glossary of terms used](#)
- [Platforms useful for gathering feedback](#)
- [Illustrative examples from intermediary organizations](#)
- [List of relevant tools and frameworks](#)

5.1 The Tool's Framework, Components and guiding questions

Below you'll find direct links to the different components of the tool. Feel free to share these (as a link or downloaded file) with staff and partners where appropriate.

- **Dimension 1:** [Guiding questions specifically for staff](#)
- **Dimension 2:** Guiding questions designed for both [staff](#) and [partners](#)

5.2 Glossary of terms used in the guiding questions

To ensure everyone has a consistent understanding of the guiding questions, this glossary clarifies some of the terms that might be perceived as jargony. If you come across additional terms that should be clarified, please let us know!

Locally-Led Peacebuilding (LLPB) - This approach to peacebuilding places local communities and organizations at the forefront. They are the ones who lead the process, make the key decisions, and set

the priorities. The goal is to ensure that peace efforts are relevant, effective, and sustainable because they are rooted in local knowledge and context. Sources: [OECD](#), [GPPI](#) and [Peace Direct](#)

Conflict Sensitivity - as promoted by the [OECD](#) - is an approach that aims to understand the context of a conflict and how interventions might affect it. It emphasizes minimizing the negative impact of development, humanitarian, and peacebuilding activities while maximizing their potential to contribute to strengthen social cohesion, build trust, or promote peaceful conflict resolution. Conflict Sensitivity assessments inform strategic, program, partnership and other operational decisions, and should be done by or with local actors.

Equitable Partnerships - These are partnerships built on fairness, mutual respect, and a balance of power. Instead of a top-down relationship, equitable partnerships share decision-making, resources, and responsibility. This ensures that the priorities and needs of local partners are equally valued. Source: [OECD](#)

DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion)

- **Diversity** means having a wide range of people from different backgrounds.
- **Equity** is about ensuring fairness and providing everyone with what they need to succeed.
- **Inclusion** is making sure that everyone feels welcome, valued, and able to fully participate.

Proximity In peacebuilding, this means being both physically and socially close to the communities you work with. This “rootedness” allows for a deeper, more nuanced understanding of the conflict and helps build the trust needed to create lasting solutions. Sources: [PARTOS](#), [GFCF](#), [GPPI](#).

Governance This refers to the systems and structures that guide an organization's leadership, decision-making, and accountability. Good governance is essential for fostering an environment of trust and transparency. Strong governance ensures an organization is well-managed, transparent, and acts with integrity.

Flexible Funding Grants or financial support given without strict restrictions or pre-defined conditions on how the money should be spent. This is money provided by funders that is not tied to a rigid, pre-determined plan. It allows organizations to adapt to changing situations, respond to urgent needs, and allocate funds where they will have the most impact.

Reserves An organization's reserves are funds that have been set aside for unexpected costs, financial emergencies, or to invest in new opportunities. It acts as a safety net that helps ensure financial stability and sustainability.

Overheads - Also known as “indirect costs”, these are the essential costs of running an organization that are not directly linked to a specific project. This includes things like rent for an office, utilities, and the salaries of administrative staff.

5.3 Platforms useful for gathering feedback and data visualization

*There is no shortage of digital platforms and tools to help you collect and visualize your data. Below are some of the most commonly used options, some offering free (limited) versions. **Let us know if you have ideas of other useful tools to feature!** Especially options that support multiple languages and work well in areas with limited internet or power supply.*

Google Forms - A globally available tool that supports a wide range of languages, including French, Arabic, and Spanish. A good option for gathering structured feedback, especially for pre-meeting or asynchronous input.

- **Pros:** It is entirely free and doesn't have limitations on the number of questions, responses, or time. It is highly customizable and integrates seamlessly with Google Sheets for easy data compilation and analysis. Users can complete the survey at their own pace, and the platform is designed to save progress, making it ideal for intermittent internet or power. It is also inherently mobile-friendly.
- **Cons:** Storing sensitive information on a centralized, third-party service like Google's cloud might raise data security concerns.

SurveyMonkey - one of the most well-known platforms for creating and distributing surveys. It offers a wide range of question types and robust analytical tools.

- **Pros:** highly customizable survey tool that works well on all devices. GDPR compliant and supports over 50 languages for both the interface and survey content. Saves responses, making it perfect for intermittent internet or power supply.
- **Cons:** The free plan is very restrictive, limiting to 10 questions and 40 responses per survey. Many of the most valuable features, such as data export and advanced question types, are only available with a paid subscription.

Mentimeter - a popular platform making discussions interactive and giving all participants a voice with live polls, quizzes, and word clouds.

- **Pros:** The free version allows unlimited questions and polls, making it a great option for workshops with numerous discussion points. It's intuitive to set up and provides visually appealing results in real-time. Participants can respond easily from their phones without needing to download an app. [GDPR compliant](#).
- **Cons:** You can't export your results in the free version, you have to copy/paste them manually. Open-ended answers have a 200 characters limit. The free plan is limited to two quiz questions and two "open-ended" questions per presentation, which may be restrictive for more complex feedback sessions. Not suitable for use with poor internet conditions.

Slido - widely used platform that integrates well with PPT slides and various video conferencing tools. Particularly strong for Q&A and surveys.

- **Pros:** The interface is clean and user-friendly. It offers robust features for managing Q&A sessions, including the ability for participants to upvote questions, which helps for prioritisation.
- **Cons:** The free plan only allows for three polls and one Q&A per event. A subscription is required for advanced features like event analytics, multiple Q&A rooms, or unlimited polls. Not suitable for use with poor internet conditions.

Poll Everywhere - a versatile tool that allows to collect feedback in real time through a variety of formats, including live polls and Q&A.

- **Pros:** The (1-month) free plan allows unlimited questions and is integrated with AI to generate polls based on prompts given. It allows up to 25 audience members per session which could be a good fit for smaller focus groups. Can set instructions into various languages.
- **Cons:** While the free plan is useful, the 25-person limit may be a challenge for larger meetings. Not suitable for use with poor internet conditions.

Microsoft Power BI - is a data visualization tool that turns data from various sources into interactive dashboards and reports. For organizations already using it, could be a good option for creating a dashboard linked to Microsoft Forms, Microsoft Excel, and similar products. It's quite tech-savvy, so we would only recommend it for existing users.

- **Pros:** Integrates seamlessly with the Microsoft ecosystem (Forms, Excel, etc.); powerful data visualization capabilities.
- **Cons:** Requires technical knowledge to set up and maintain; may incur licensing costs; not ideal for

those outside the Microsoft ecosystem; can be difficult to access in low-connectivity environments; less ideal for sensitive data as it centralizes storage in the Microsoft cloud; can be used in various languages but requires a license for all users.

Google Looker - is a business intelligence tool that helps organizations explore, analyze, and share data in real time. It is designed to connect to a range of structured data sources. However, is a quite sophisticated platform, difficult for non-technical users to learn and master, so a tool like this would require in-house knowledge/expertise or external support.

- **Pros:** Free to use; queries data directly from its source without centralizing storage which can be an advantage for handling sensitive information; connects to various structured data sources such as databases (like MySQL or BigQuery), cloud spreadsheets (like Google Sheets), and properly formatted files (like CSVs or Excel files) that are stored in a linked cloud drive.
- **Cons:** Steep learning curve for non-technical users; requires a stable internet connection for real-time queries; not suitable for offline use due to its cloud-based nature; language accessibility is primarily managed through the browser and may not be fully integrated into the platform's UI.

5.4 Illustrative examples from intermediary organizations

We've compiled a collection of real-life examples from intermediary organizations, organized by practice area and guiding question. The full collection is also [available as a spreadsheet here](#). We welcome receiving additional examples!

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of Good Practices	Illustrative Examples of Insufficient Practices
<u>DIMENSION 1</u> Internalising conflict-sensitive locally-led peacebuilding	A. Strategic Direction	A.1 Does our organisation have an existing commitment to Locally-Led Peacebuilding (LLPB) and to adapting our roles in relation to in-country/local partners?	1. Formally establishing core commitments (e.g., through a partnership policy) on ways of working with civil society partners for aspects vital to achieving locally-led peace goals. This approach includes: (a) regularly monitoring progress on commitments through honest conversations with staff and annual reviews with partners to understand what is working well and what could be improved; and (b) reporting annually, both internally and externally, on achievements. 2. Specific commitments made often seen in practice include: directly transferring a minimum percentage of restricted peacebuilding expenditure to partners; developing budgets jointly with partners; exploring diverse and flexible funding mechanisms; ensuring partners have direct input and influence in strategic planning processes; and prioritising joint advocacy strategies with partners.	1. An organisation's public-facing mission statement includes a general commitment to "supporting in-country partners to achieve their goals." However, this statement is not formally translated into a specific commitment to LLPB or a clear plan to adapt the organisation's own roles and ways of working. There is no official policy or strategy document outlining how the organisation will intentionally shift power dynamics or move towards a more equitable partnership model. The general statement therefore remains as a non-binding aspiration rather than a driver of meaningful change.
		A.2 Do we have a clear plan for organisational change, with targets that are both organisation-wide and context-specific?	1. Developing an organisational change plan that includes measurable targets, such as "increase direct funding to partners by 10% each year" or "conduct annual power audits with partners to track decision-making authority."	1. An organisation sets a general, aspirational goal to "be more locally-led" but fails to define specific, measurable targets, a clear timeline, or a dedicated budget for the change process.
		A.3 How are our existing partners involved in developing our organisational	1. Involving local partners and community members throughout the development and review of an organisational strategy, to ensure it reflects a truly shared vision, grounded in local realities and priorities. This process ensures that partners have a direct and influential role, guiding not only	1. Partners are invited to provide feedback on draft versions of the organisation's strategy or priorities, but they are not involved in the initial conceptualisation or co-development process. Their input is treated as validation rather than foundational to strategic direction.

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of <u>Good</u> Practices	Illustrative Examples of <u>Insufficient</u> Practices
		strategy and priorities?	the thematic direction and peacebuilding priorities but also the operational approaches. In practice, this has involved co-creation workshops, regular consultation forums, or dedicated seats for partners on a strategic advisory committee.	
		A.4 How is our governance aligned with our vision for Locally-Led Peacebuilding (LLPB), and are there plans for any governance adjustments?	1. An organisation has established a governance body composed entirely of local peacebuilders and experts from the countries where they operate. This body is not advisory; it has the formal authority to set the organisation's strategic direction. This includes making key decisions on programmatic priorities, resource allocation, and overall mission alignment. 2. Following a process of localisation and decentralisation, an international organisation's operational sites are now fully self-governing. The organisation's governance model is reviewed at least annually, both at the local site level and across the broader network, but the model allows for earlier review invocation if necessitated by context changes and agreed upon by a quorum of members.	1. The organisation's governance structure remains centralised, with decision-making power concentrated at headquarters or within an international board. While there are discussions about including local representation, no concrete plans or timelines for governance changes have been established.
		A.5 How are diversity, conflict sensitivity, and proximity to local contexts prioritised in our staff roles and human resources practices?	1. An organisation adopts a proactive and structural commitment to embedding Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) principles within its core human resources (HR) functions and practices. This includes changing job descriptions and terms of employment to reflect these values, offering comprehensive training, and actively creating opportunities to hire local consultants as key advisors to leverage in-country expertise.	1. An international organisation, as part of a network commitment made in November 2024, prioritised recruiting and integrating people with disabilities into their teams and among participants. However, current data reveals that individuals with visible, mobility-related disabilities constitute only 7% of their teams and 5% of participants. This acknowledged gap, particularly concerning given recent escalations in violence, is targeted for an increase to over 15% in the next programme cycle, with progress to be reviewed in November 2025.
	B. Conflict/ Context analysis	B.1 How does our organisation analyse the context and identify conflict sensitivity risks	1. Conducting a joint conflict analysis with local partners, which includes their lived experiences and local expertise, and reviewing this analysis on an ongoing basis to inform program adaptations.	1. The organisation relies on a one-off conflict analysis conducted by headquarters staff or an external foreign consultant, without direct input from local partners or communities.

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of <u>Good</u> Practices	Illustrative Examples of <u>Insufficient</u> Practices
		and peacebuilding opportunities before engaging in a new context or programme?		
		B.2 What are the key considerations and processes our organisation follows when selecting partners?	1. Employing a two-pronged approach to partner selection: (a) being directly guided by communities to partner with local conflict resolution mechanisms or specific population sector groups; and (b) during monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) processes or during programme design, identifying needed expertise and then seeking out values-aligned actors within their ecosystem who possess community trust and demonstrable expertise.	1. An international organisation selects partners primarily through a process of context mapping, network referrals, and a standard due diligence process, without explicit mechanisms for communities to direct partnerships or for comprehensive mutual learning and values alignment.
		B.3 What process does our organisation follow to adapt its work to changes in context?	1. Proactively seeking out and securing relatively flexible funding streams that can be used to respond to sudden changes in context or to provide emergency support to partners. These funds are specifically designated to be quickly deployed for a variety of needs. 2. Employing multiple avenues for programme adaptation including updates to risk monitoring, conflict analyses, building flexibility in budgets (trusting partners when they need to make changes to programmes) and especially being responsive to direct participant and community input.	1. Programme adaptation decisions are primarily made during annual review cycles or in response to donor reporting requirements. While some feedback mechanisms exist, there is no agile process for rapid, significant programmatic shifts in response to sudden, critical changes in the conflict context or urgent community feedback.
	C. Fundraising	C.1 How does our organisation work with in-country partners on fundraising and donor engagement?	1. Actively involving partners in co-writing proposals and budget narratives from the earliest stages of a project, and allowing partners to lead on donor relationships for projects they have designed.	1. An international organisation handles all fundraising and donor relations, only informing partners after a grant has been secured and a project has been defined. Partners are not involved in donor communications.
	D. Communication and advocacy	D.1 How does our organisation approaches involving	1. Co-designing with partners country advocacy strategies that define the key messages, key target actors and respective roles for who leads on targeting which one.	1. The international organisation primarily leads communication about the joint work, informing partners of messages after they have been developed. Partners have limited opportunities to shape the narrative or

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of <u>Good</u> Practices	Illustrative Examples of <u>Insufficient</u> Practices
		in-country partners in external communication and advocacy efforts?	2. Partners lead communication about their work and jointly develop advocacy messages. The international organisation then amplifies their messages through its networks and provides support as needed, ensuring local voices are central to external narratives.	directly engage in external advocacy. 2. International partners consistently take credit for work done by local actors, often placing their logos first and controlling all communications. In some instances the international organisation has even published reports using data from local partners without proper attribution or consent.
	E. Monitoring and Evaluation	E.1 How is the monitoring and evaluation of results conducted, and by whom?	1. Ensuring a continuous, daily Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) process by centering dialogue in all activities, rather than limiting it to MEL-specific events. For instance, during individual-level peacebuilding activities, staff conduct monthly individual interviews and weekly group interviews with participants to monitor quantitative economic indicators. 2. Supporting partners in hiring local consultants to lead on in-country evaluations of joint projects. This includes designing the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the consultancy with partners and defining the learning questions to focus on. 3. An organisation supports partners in defining learning questions about the ongoing collaboration itself. They then work together to collect evidence and contribute to answering these questions.	1. The international organisation primarily leads the monitoring and evaluation of results, often setting the indicators and methodology without meaningful input from partners. Partners are mainly responsible for providing data as requested, with limited opportunities to shape the process or interpret the findings.
		E.2 How is feedback from communities integrated into learning and monitoring & evaluation (M&E) processes?	1. An international organisation adopts a variety of collaborative and community-driven approaches to its Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) processes. This includes: (a) Facilitating partners in sharing their learning questions directly with communities to ensure relevance and gather input; (b) Actively involving in-country partners and non-participant community members in MEL activities and community dialogues to evaluate programmes; and (c) Employing participatory methodologies like outcome harvesting and participatory monitoring and evaluation.	1. Community feedback is collected, often through surveys or complaint mechanisms, but it is primarily used for internal international organisation reporting. There is limited direct integration of this feedback into partner learning processes or programme adaptation decisions.

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of <u>Good</u> Practices	Illustrative Examples of <u>Insufficient</u> Practices
	F. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability	F.1 How do our partnerships facilitate mutual learning and strengthen the capacities of both organisations?	1. Establishing a formal mechanism for reciprocal training where local partners teach the international staff about the local context, culture, and conflict dynamics, in addition to the international organisation providing technical support.	1. The partnership is primarily a one-way street where the international organisation provides capacity-building to the local partner, with no reciprocal learning or knowledge exchange.
		F.2 How do our partnerships approach contribute to in-country partners' organisational development, financial sustainability and independence?	1. Providing core, institutional funding in addition to project-based grants, allowing partners to invest in their long-term growth and organisational stability. 2. Actively helping partners to diversify their donor base and develop their own fundraising strategies, building their independence.	1. The international organisation only offers project-based funding, which provides no opportunity for the partner to build institutional capacity or long-term financial sustainability.
	G. Care and accountability	G.1 How are safety and wellbeing considerations integrated into partnership discussions and practices?	1. Holding regular, joint check-ins with partners to discuss and adapt safety protocols based on real-time risks, and allocating a dedicated budget for well-being and psychosocial support for partners' staff.	1. The international organisation has a top-down security policy that does not account for specific local risks, and it provides no additional support for the well-being of local partners' staff.
		G.2 How do our organisation and our partners approach sharing feedback and fostering mutual accountability?	1. Implementing a joint accountability framework that includes clear, agreed-upon metrics for success and regular, structured feedback sessions where both parties can offer candid feedback on the partnership.	1. The partnership relies on informal feedback channels or a single, annual review, making it difficult to address issues in real time or to hold each other accountable for agreed-upon actions.

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of <u>Good</u> Practices	Illustrative Examples of <u>Insufficient</u> Practices
DIMENSION 2 - Building equitable partnerships	A. Design	A.1 How does our organisation design programmes, and who is involved in this process?	1. Co-designing programmes with local partners from the initial concept phase, incorporating their ideas and local knowledge, and ensuring they have a primary role in defining programme objectives and activities.	1. The international organisation designs the programme at headquarters and then presents it to partners for feedback, which is not true co-creation but rather a review process.
		A.2 How does our organisation integrate learning and make adaptation decisions throughout a programme's lifecycle? who is involved in this process?	1. Setting up a continuous learning cycle with partners to review progress and adapt based on real-time feedback from the community and changes in context. This includes frequent check-ins and shared decision-making.	1. The international organisation only makes major programmatic adjustments at the end of the project or during a mid-term review, without regular input from partners.
	B. Budget	B.1 How does our organisation approach the development of programmatic budgets?	1. Employing a bottom-up budgeting approach, asking partners to submit their own detailed budgets that accurately reflect their operational needs. 2. The international organisation defines a transparent ceiling for its own recovery costs (e.g., 25% of the total budget), which is clearly communicated to all partners from the outset. 3. An international organisation serves as a fiscal sponsor, which means it handles administrative and financial tasks while retaining a very low percentage of the recovery costs (e.g., 2-5%).	1. An international organisation is not transparent with partners about the full budget shared with the funder or the total amount of funding available. Partners receive only limited information about the original donor budget, how indirect costs are calculated, or how final budget decisions are made.
		B.2 How does our organisation approach the allocation of overheads and the provision of	1. An organisation, whenever allowed by funders, is committed to sharing overhead costs with partners, either directly in project budgets based on partners' requests or through a clearly defined shared-costs allocation policy at the end of the year.	1. An organisation applies a flat, pre-determined indirect cost rate (e.g., 7%) to all partner budgets, regardless of their actual operational needs. They do not share their own overhead rate or discuss the rationale behind the fixed percentage with partners. Furthermore, the organisation makes no effort to use flexible funding or its

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of <u>Good</u> Practices	Illustrative Examples of <u>Insufficient</u> Practices
		flexible funding (including reserves) to in-country partners?	2. An organisation ringfences a dedicated portion of the budget specifically for capacity transfer and partners' long-term sustainability.	own reserves to cover essential partner costs that funders do not support.
	C. Fundraising	C.1 How does our organisation work with in-country partners on fundraising and donor engagement?	1. Proactively involving partners in joint fundraising strategies, including grant writing, and allowing them to take the lead on donor relationships where they have a comparative advantage.	1. The international organisation maintains full control over all fundraising and donor engagement, only informing the partner after funding has been secured.
	D. Communication and advocacy	D.1 How does our organisation approaches involving in-country partners in external communication and advocacy efforts?	1. Co-designing with partners country advocacy strategies that define the key messages, key target actors and respective roles for who leads on targeting which one. 2. Partners lead communication about their work and jointly develop advocacy messages. The international organisation then amplifies their messages through its networks and provides support as needed, ensuring local voices are central to external narratives.	1. The international organisation primarily leads communication about the joint work, informing partners of messages after they have been developed. Partners have limited opportunities to shape the narrative or directly engage in external advocacy. 2. International partners consistently take credit for work done by local actors, often placing their logos first and controlling all communications. In some instances the international organisation has even published reports using data from local partners without proper attribution or consent.
	E. Monitoring and Evaluation	E.1 How is the monitoring and evaluation of results conducted, and by whom?	1. Ensuring a continuous, daily Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) process by centering dialogue in all activities, rather than limiting it to MEL-specific events. For instance, during individual-level peacebuilding activities, staff conduct monthly individual interviews and weekly group interviews with participants to monitor quantitative economic indicators. 2. Supporting partners in hiring local consultants to lead on in-country evaluations of joint projects. This includes designing the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the consultancy with partners and defining the learning questions to focus	1. The international organisation primarily leads the monitoring and evaluation of results, often setting the indicators and methodology without meaningful input from partners. Partners are mainly responsible for providing data as requested, with limited opportunities to shape the process or interpret the findings.

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of <u>Good</u> Practices	Illustrative Examples of <u>Insufficient</u> Practices
			on. 3. An organisation supports partners in defining learning questions about the ongoing collaboration itself. They then work together to collect evidence and contribute to answering these questions.	
		E.2 How is feedback from communities integrated into learning and monitoring & evaluation (M&E) processes?	1. An international organisation adopts a variety of collaborative and community-driven approaches to its Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) processes. This includes: (a) Facilitating partners in sharing their learning questions directly with communities to ensure relevance and gather input; (b) Actively involving in-country partners and non-participant community members in MEL activities and community dialogues to evaluate programmes; and (c) Employing participatory methodologies like outcome harvesting and participatory monitoring and evaluation.	1. Community feedback is collected, often through surveys or complaint mechanisms, but it is primarily used for internal international organisation reporting. There is limited direct integration of this feedback into partner learning processes or programme adaptation decisions.
	F. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability	F.1 How do our partnerships facilitate mutual learning and strengthen the capacities of both organisations?	1. Creating platforms for mutual learning, such as regular peer-to-peer exchanges and reciprocal training, where both international and local staff can share knowledge and expertise.	1. The international organisation provides capacity-building and technical support as a one-way transfer of knowledge, without reciprocal learning from the local partners about their context or practices.
		F.2 How do our partnerships approach contribute to in-country partners' organisational development, financial sustainability and independence?	1. Providing core funding in addition to project-based grants, allowing partners to invest in their own long-term strategies and institutional development. 2. Supporting partners in developing their own fundraising strategies and diversifying their donor base to reduce reliance on a single funding source.	1. An international organisation only provides project-based funding, which is tied to specific, short-term deliverables and does not support the partner's institutional development or financial sustainability.
	G. Care and	G.1 How are safety	1. Actively discussing and jointly developing a security and	1. An international organisation imposes a top-down

Dimension	Practice Area	Guiding Question	Illustrative Examples of <u>Good</u> Practices	Illustrative Examples of <u>Insufficient</u> Practices
	accountability	and wellbeing considerations integrated into partnership discussions and practices?	well-being protocol with partners, which is regularly reviewed to ensure it reflects the real-time context and needs of local staff. 2. Allocating a dedicated portion of the budget for partner well-being, including psychosocial support, as an integral part of the project.	security policy that does not account for specific local risks, and it does not provide any support for the well-being of local partners' staff.
		G.2 How do our organisation and our partners approach sharing feedback and fostering mutual accountability?	1. Implementing a joint accountability framework that includes clear, mutually agreed-upon metrics for success and regular, structured feedback sessions where both parties can offer candid feedback on the partnership.	1. The partnership relies on informal feedback channels or a single, annual review, making it difficult to address issues in real time or to hold each other accountable for agreed-upon actions.

5.5 List of relevant tools and frameworks

This list below compiles existing tools, frameworks, and commitments that align with the LLPBSAT. It might help you:

- Identify potential overlaps with other processes your organization is involved in, to avoid duplication
- Gain additional insights, relevant indicators, and further dimensions to inform your assessment and work on LLPB.

*These resources were sourced from a mapping conducted by Alex Martins in September 2024 as part of the Funder Report Card. **If you know other relevant tools that should be included, do let us know!***

Curated List of tools and other relevant resources	Relevance to LLPAT's dimensions/practice areas
Funder Report Card A tool curated by Peace Direct for Global North funding organizations (bilateral, philanthropic, and NGOs) to reflect on and improve their practices, particularly regarding locally led development and decolonization. It aims to assess how well they are implementing commitments to "shift and share power" with local actors, particularly the Donor Statement on Supporting Locally Led Development. The tool focuses on five key dimensions, which were identified as priorities by Southern actors: Framing and choice of issues (<i>who decides which problems to address and their causes?</i>) Programme design (<i>How are the strategy and goals of a program determined?</i>) Programme delivery and operations (<i>Who has decision-making power during a program, and is there flexibility to adapt?</i>) Financial flows (<i>What is the quantity and quality of funding reaching Southern organizations?</i>) Monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (<i>Who decides how progress is measured and who is accountable?</i>) It also includes a cross-cutting element of Gender and racial justice to ensure these principles are promoted throughout the relationship.	Dimension 1: D. Contribution to system change. Dimension 2: B. Programme design and learning; C. Budget; E. Communication and advocacy; F. Monitoring and Evaluation.
Community-led Assessment Tool Developed in 2020 by GlobalGiving and the Global Fund for Community Foundations. Its main purpose is to help organizations evaluate the extent to which they are genuinely community-led. The tool examines nine essential characteristics of community-led work, such as cultivating community ownership, gaining community trust, and prioritizing community needs. It also considers 17 other important characteristics that are context-dependent. The target audience for this tool is civil society organizations, and it uses a rating scale from "never true" to "always true" to measure how well an organization embodies each characteristic. This allows organizations to assess their practices and identify areas where they can strengthen their community-led approach.	Dimension 2: A. Organisational compatibility; B. Programme design and learning; G. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability.

Pledge for Change Promoted by Adeso in 2021/2022, <i>Pledge for Change</i> is a series of three commitments aimed at re-imagining the role of international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) in the global humanitarian aid and development system. By signing on to the Pledge for Change – as a signatory or supporter – the goal is to shift the power more directly to local organizations in the global south while building a stronger aid ecosystem based on the principles of solidarity, humility, self-determination, and equality. Progress is measured across three key pillars: equitable partnerships, authentic storytelling, and influencing wider change.	Dimension 1: D. Contribution to system change. Dimension 2: Overall focus on equitable partnerships; E. Communication and advocacy.
Becoming locally led as an anti-racist practice: a guide Curated by Bond in 2022 and also known as <i>Locally-Led Development Guide</i>, is a tool for INGOs to assess their journey toward becoming locally-led. It evaluates organizations across nine elements, including values, purpose, and governance, using a three-stage scoring system (Just beginning, Moving along, Well on their way) to help them identify their current stage and areas for improvement.	Dimension 1: A. Strategic Direction.
Humentum Equitable, Resilient, Accountable (ERA) Index Developed by Humentum in 2024 this is a self-assessment tool for Northern INGOs. Its purpose is to measure progress on shifting power dynamics and increasing institutional autonomy. It uses a four-point scale to evaluate actions across four areas: institutional architecture, people and culture, funding, and risk and compliance, encouraging a move from talking to implementing systemic change.	Dimension 1: A. Strategic Direction; B. Conflict/Context analysis. Dimension 2: C. Budget; D. Fundraising; H. Care and accountability.
NEAR Localization Performance Framework, (LPMF) Developed by the NEAR Network in 2019, the framework provides a way to measure progress on localization commitments. Intended for local and national actors but also relevant to INGOs, UN agencies, and donors, the framework evaluates performance across six key areas: partnerships, funding, capacity, coordination, policy, and participation. This helps organizations provide evidence of how they are shifting power and resources to local actors.	Dimension 1: A. Strategic Direction. Dimension 2: A. Organisational compatibility; C. Budget; D. Fundraising; G. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability; H. Care and accountability.
Pando Localization Learning System & Equity Report The Pando Locally-Led Systems (LLS) platform, developed by Root Change in 2020, is a tool for Northern international development organizations. Its purpose is to provide metrics and empirical methods to	Dimension 2: A. Organisational compatibility; B. Programme

measure the strength of local systems and the quality of relationships within them, addressing the lack of a usable way to measure trust and relationships. The tool focuses on four main indicators, derived from social network analysis: Leadership, which measures local actors' ability to lead and make decisions; Mutuality, which assesses the quality of relationships and trust; Connectivity, which examines collaboration and connections to local resources; and Financing, which tracks the decrease in dependence on external funding. The platform also produces an Equity report, which provides an overall indexed score of these four measures.	design and learning; C. Budget; G. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability.
Participatory CLD Assessment Tool Tool developed by the Movement for Community-led Development in 2019/2020 as a participatory review tool. Its purpose is to help funders, governments, or NGOs determine how their programming aligns with community-led development (CLD) characteristics. The tool consists of seven key dimensions, including participation, Inclusion, voice and local resources & knowledge, and each is scored on a scale from 0 (insufficient information) to 4 (succeeds) to help organizations identify areas for course correction.	Dimension 2: A. Organisational compatibility; B. Programme design and learning; G. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability; H. Care and accountability.
The Equity Index Developed by The Equity Index social enterprise in 2020, is a tool for UK-based development organizations. Its purpose is to advocate for greater equity across the international development sector by measuring and tracking various dimensions of equity within organizations. This includes racial and gender equity, as well as equity in knowledge production, funding, and partnerships. The tool offers an anti-racist and feminist framework that supports the broader decolonizing development and Shift the Power movements. It is divided into two main categories: Internal Equity, which measures things like staff diversity and commitment to intersectional equity, and External Equity, which assesses the meaningful engagement of partners, the value of funding given to partners in the Global South, and their representation in donor meetings.	Dimension 1: A. Strategic Direction. Dimension 2: B. Programme design and learning; C. Budget; D. Fundraising; E. Communication and advocacy; G. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability; H. Care and accountability.
The Racial Equity Index Developed in 2021, is a tool and a set of accompanying advocacy resources for international development organizations. Its purpose is to foster greater accountability for racial equity within the global development sector in order to dismantle structural racism and create a more equitable system. The index assesses an organization across eleven indicators, including its mission, programming, funding allocations, partnerships, communications, workplace culture, leadership, and human resources. The tool provides a framework for organizations to reflect on their practices, from how they engage with communities to how they handle salary and compensation, and helps them work towards a more just and dignified system.	Dimension 1: A. Strategic Direction. Dimension 2: B. Programme design and learning; C. Budget; E. Communication and advocacy; G. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability; H. Care and accountability.

Partos Power Awareness Tool The Partos Power Awareness Tool (PAT) was developed by Partos in 2021, with a digitized 2.0 version released in 2024. Its purpose is to make power relations more visible within partnerships, specifically those between Northern and Southern actors. The tool allows different stakeholders to monitor and share their insights on decision-making practices, which helps partners reflect on power dynamics and agree on necessary changes. The target audience for the PAT is these partnerships themselves. The tool's main indicator is a Ladder of participation, which assesses decision-making across partners on a scale from 0 (excluded from the process) to 4 (partner decides). This framework is used to evaluate specific areas of decision-making, such as partnership building, program implementation, and monitoring and evaluation.	Dimension 2: A. Organisational compatibility; B. Programme design and learning; C. Budget; E. Communication and advocacy; F. Monitoring and Evaluation; G. Mutual Capacity & Sustainability; H. Care and accountability.
Decision Mapping Tool (DMAT) The Decision Mapping Tool (DMAT), developed by King's College London in 2023, is a tool for partnerships between Northern and Southern actors. Its purpose is to help program actors, specifically in aid interventions, reflect on the allocation of decision-making power and the extent to which that power is localized. The tool identifies three key decision spaces: the Local Decision Space, where local actors make decisions; the Partnership Decision Space, where local and external actors negotiate; and the External Decision Space, where external actors make decisions without direct local involvement. These spaces are assessed across various areas of an aid intervention, including goals, design, delivery, monitoring and evaluation, funding, and exit strategy.	Dimension 1: B. Conflict/Context analysis. Dimension 2: A. Organisational compatibility; B. Programme design and learning; C. Budget; F. Monitoring and Evaluation; H. Care and accountability.
Power Footprint Is a concept developed by WeRobotics in 2021 and is currently ongoing. Its purpose is to help international development organizations measure and reduce the authority, control, and influence they wield, similar to how a carbon footprint measures environmental impact. The tool's target audience was initially Global North NGOs, but it has since expanded to include a broader range of actors like funders and multilaterals. The tool uses five preliminary metrics to illustrate an organization's power footprint: assessing whether country offices are independent, if they are locally-led, if they can exit at any time, if the organization is ceding market share, and if it has a clear exit strategy.	Dimension 1: A. Strategic Direction; B. Conflict/Context analysis. Dimension 2: A. Organisational compatibility.
Donor Statement on Supporting Locally Led Development A framework developed by USAID and signed by bilateral DAC donors and Northern foundations in 2022, aimed at promoting development approaches where local actors have ownership and leadership. It emphasizes shifting and sharing power, channeling high-quality funding directly to local actors, and publicly advocating for locally led development through partnerships, networks, and intentional engagement.	Dimension 1: D. Contribution to system change. Dimension 2: C. Budget; D. Fundraising; E. Communication and advocacy.

[OECD DAC Enabling Locally Led Development](#)

Published in 2023, this framework helps OECD DAC members improve their support for locally led development through peer learning. It guides donors to assess their strategies—across policy, institutional arrangements, financing, and management—using a "spectrum of agency" that measures the shift from consulting local partners to empowering them.

Dimension 1:

A. Strategic Direction.

Dimension 2:

B. Programme design and learning; C. Budget.