Making Partnerships work in Afghanistan:
Guiding Principles and Modalities

1 Introduction

Widespread aid cuts across the humanitarian and development sectors have underscored the need for a fundamental rethinking of how assistance is designed and delivered—prompting what is now referred to as the *Humanitarian Reset*. There is growing recognition that transactional, top-down models are no longer adequate to meet today's complex challenges. This shift calls for a decisive move toward equitable, principle-based collaboration with local and national NGOs—particularly in contexts like Afghanistan, where local actors have long led frontline responses despite being systematically under-recognised and underfunded.

The centrality of equitable partnerships is rooted in global commitments like the *2007 Principles of Partnership*[1] and the *2016 Grand Bargain*[2], which recognise that those closest to crises are often best placed to lead effective responses. As ICVA notes, such partnerships are the foundation for meaningful localisation.[3] In Afghanistan, local NGOs have long played a critical role in sustaining services, negotiating access, and managing risks. Reflecting this, the *UN Strategic Framework for Afghanistan 2023–25*[4] commits to strengthening collaboration with community-level actors. Equitable partnerships are thus essential—not only for timely and effective aid delivery, but also for catalysing social change, promoting shared humanitarian values, and fostering sustainable, locally driven solutions. By balancing power and resources, they help safeguard civic space, strengthen accountability and resilience, and lay the foundations for lasting peace and development.

> **Equitable partnership** in this document refers to **an approach in which power, resources, and decision-making are fairly shared** between local and international humanitarian and development actors. It is grounded in **mutual respect, trust, and accountability**, and prioritises the leadership, expertise, and agency of local organisations.
>
> Stakeholders consulted agreed that **equitable partnerships** are not only about technical alignment, but a **shared vision and values**—anchored in mutual commitment to **community-driven change, social justice, compassion, and integrity**. These shared values are essential for guiding decisions, sustaining trust, and ensuring that collaboration remains principled and responsive the needs and rights of affected communities.

Despite global commitments to localisation and equitable aid reform, partnership models in Afghanistan remain largely transactional. Afghan NGOs are too often treated as service providers rather than strategic partners, with limited influence over programme design, funding decisions, or long-term planning. This disconnect between rhetoric and reality not only undermines the effectiveness of aid but also marginalises the very actors best positioned to lead contextually grounded responses. Recognising this gap is essential to advancing structural change—shifting

[1] https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/other/principles-partnership-global-humanitarian-platform-17-july-2007
[2] https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain; Including subsequent iterations in the form of Grand Bargain 2.0 and 3.0
[3] https://www.icvanetwork.org/uploads/2025/04/ICVA-HF-Pocket-Guide-Equitable-Partnerships-Localisation_250410.pdf
[4] https://afghanistan.un.org/en/238795-united-nations-strategic-framework-afghanistan

from short-term, extractive arrangements toward principled partnerships rooted in shared power, mutual accountability, and local leadership.

This document, produced by the Afghanistan Localisation Technical Working Group[5] with the support of the Agency Coordinating Body for Afghan Relief & Development (ACBAR) and the Afghanistan Context Support Mechanism (ACSM)[6], is intended for anyone involved in establishing partnerships in Afghanistan. It provides practical guidance to strengthen equitable and effective partnerships in line with localisation commitments in Afghanistan.

This document speaks directly to international NGOs, UN agencies, and donors, who play a critical role in shaping the terms of partnership. These actors are encouraged to reflect on how their funding modalities, risk management approaches, and institutional behaviours enable—or hinder—equitable collaboration. Regular assessment of partnership practices, a commitment to mutual learning, and the creation of space for local leadership and co-creation are essential. Continued research, dialogue, and practical innovation will also be needed to expand options for direct, principled engagement with communities. Advancing localisation in Afghanistan will require not only stronger partnerships with local actors, but a broader transformation in how the aid sector listens, learns, and shares power. While the primary focus is on partnerships with national and local NGOs and community-based organisations (CBOs), it also underscores the importance of fostering meaningful partnerships with communities themselves.

The document draws on a rapid review of existing guidance and insights from consultations with 17 international and 30 national NGOs held in Kabul in April 2025. The focus is on partnership modalities and barriers between international actors (INGOs/UN organisations) and national and community-based organisations (NNGOs/CBOs), while recognising that future guidance should also address partnerships with local communities. The table below provides an overview of the actors this document speaks to.

Partner Type	Description
Donors	Bilateral (e.g. USAID, GIZ) or multilateral (e.g. EU, World Bank) funding agencies that provide financial support for humanitarian or development work.
UN Agencies	Multilateral organisations mandated to deliver humanitarian or development support (e.g. UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP), often acting as donors or coordinators.
International NGOs (INGOs)	Non-governmental organisations operating across borders, often with international funding and headquarters outside the country of operation.
National NGOs (NNGOs)	Civil society organisations registered and operating within a specific country. Often rooted in local context and serving national populations.
CBOs	Community-based organisations that are closely embedded in the communities they serve. Typically, smaller in scale and more informal in structure.

2   Afghanistan Context: Existing Partnership Modalities and Barriers to Equitable Partnerships

Despite their central role, local actors are often marginalised by a humanitarian and development architecture that continues to reinforce top-down, donor-driven dynamics. Since mid-2021 in particular, local Afghan organisations have been up against systemic barriers rooted in power imbalances, rigid donor policies and operational frameworks that favour international actors over national ones. This has created a variety of existing partnership models presented with varying levels of equality and agency for local actors. Furthermore, many partnership models offer limited **flexibility in funding, compliance, and timelines**, undermining the ability of local actors to adapt and innovate in response to rapidly changing needs. The table below provides an **overview of**

---

[5] The Localisation Technical Working Group (LTWG) was established in July 2023. It is a multi-stakeholder group comprising donors, UN agencies, clusters, INGOs, and NNGOs and is coordinated by ACBAR.
[6] The UK Aid funded Afghanistan Context Sensitivity Mechanism (ACSM) is a collaboration between Saferworld and swisspeace and has supported the LTWG for the past two years.

existing partnership modalities in Afghanistan; the orange-coloured row reflects an equitable partnership model that is aspirational but rare in the Afghanistan context.

Modality	Key Features	Strengths	Limitations
Subcontracting	NNGOs act as implementers; INGO/UN retains strategy and budget control	Fast, administratively simple	Disempowering; minimal NNGO influence on design or decisions
Sub-partnering	NNGOs contribute to activities/adaptations but lack strategic role or decision-making power	Allows some contextual input	Limited say in budgeting or strategic direction; Budgetary control remains with INGO/UN Org.
Consortium Models	INGOs/UN and NNGOs work under joint frameworks	Enables coordination and co-creation	NNGO influence often depends on power-sharing arrangements
Joint Ventures / Co-leadership	INGOs/UN and NNGOs share power, design, implementation, and reporting responsibilities	Reflects equitable partnership; shared leadership	Requires high trust, long-term funding commitment, and aligned systems
Direct Funding	Donors or pooled funds directly support NNGOs	Promotes local leadership and autonomy	High entry barriers; limited access for grassroots and women-led organisations

2.1   Key Barriers to Equitable Partnerships

Despite their differences, most partnership modalities in Afghanistan face common challenges rooted in the **broader aid ecosystem** linked to **donor-driven priorities, risk aversion**, **rigid funding structures** with limited adaptive flexibility, and persistent **capacity stereotypes** that **undermine trust in local leadership** and constrain meaningful localisation.

Consultations identified a set of **interconnected, mutually reinforcing factors**—with issues in one area often compound problems in others—ultimately undermining trust, collaboration, and the potential for long-term, locally led engagement. Three cross-cutting concerns emerged consistently: the exclusion of local actors from strategic influence, the concentration of resources and decision-making among international actors, and the persistence of rigid, top-down models ill-suited to the Afghan context.

2.1.1   Power Imbalances and Limited Influence

- **Tokenistic Engagement in Design and Strategy:** While some international actors involve local partners in consultations, engagement is often superficial. NNGOs are frequently asked to validate pre-determined frameworks rather than shape strategic direction or programme design meaningfully. Proposal development remains heavily INGO-driven, with NNGOs brought in only at the implementation stage, undermining ownership and excluding critical local knowledge.

- **Top-Down Funding Structures:** Funding flows typically follow a hierarchical chain—from donors to UN agencies and INGOs, then to NNGOs—leaving Afghan actors with little say in strategic or financial decision-making. This structure reinforces dependency and limits opportunities for long-term institutional growth.

- **Exclusion from Strategic Forums:** Local actors are routinely excluded from coordination spaces, advocacy forums, and donor roundtables, limiting their ability to influence policies, funding flows, and sector-wide strategies.

- **Limited Joint Implementation and Learning**: Many INGOs operate independently during design and implementation, with little co-branding, joint analysis, or structured learning with

NNGO partners. This undermines adaptive learning and reduces programme effectiveness in dynamic contexts.

2.1.2   Trust Deficits and Politicisation

- **Perceived Neutrality Risks Linked to Political and Bureaucratic Shifts:** Evolving political conditions and administrative controls in Afghanistan have led to growing concerns over the neutrality of local actors, reducing donor confidence and trust.

- **Donor Risk Aversion and Politicisation:** Fears of political alignment or coercion have led some donors to avoid direct engagement with national NGOs, reinforcing short-term, transactional partnerships and sidelining opportunities for deeper collaboration.

2.1.3   Institutional Barriers and Operational Constraints

- **Overreliance on Intermediaries:** Many donors and UN agencies cite the capacity gaps or contextual limitations as reasons for relying on INGOs or UN organisations as intermediaries, even as intermediaries—even in cases where NNGOs have demonstrated readiness and capacity to lead.

- **Rigid Compliance and Bureaucracy:** Complex donor systems, digital funding platforms, lengthy application requirements, inflexible reporting systems, and lack of indirect cost-sharing continue to disadvantage local organisations, particularly those with limited administrative infrastructure.

- **Fragmented Tools and Reporting Requirements:** Most INGOs and UN agencies require partners to use their own templates and policies for assessments and reporting, forcing national organisations to adapt to multiple, often inconsistent, standards—creating administrative burdens and reducing efficiency.

- **Assessment Tools as Gatekeeping Mechanisms:** Capacity assessments are often used to disqualify local organisations rather than identify support needs. This limits opportunities for capacity strengthening and reinforces exclusionary dynamics.

- **Restrictive and Non-Contextual Partner Selection:** Current practices often prioritise pre-identified or larger NNGOs with a history of partnerships or MoUs, while selection tools focus on technical audit metrics rather than community credibility. This marginalises grassroots, women-led, and emerging organisations, and entrenches a narrow, risk-averse partner pool. Rigid criteria and due diligence mechanisms prioritise donor risk management over trust-building and inclusivity.

2.1.4   Mindsets and Visibility Gaps

- **Resistance to Shifting Power:** Despite commitments to localisation, some INGOs and UN agencies remain reluctant to transfer leadership roles or visibility to Afghan actors, fearing a loss of control, institutional relevance and/or funding access.

- **Undervaluing Local Contributions:** The contributions of local actors often go un- or under-recognised in donor reports, coordination outputs, and communication materials. This diminishes their perceived credibility and restricts future funding opportunities due to and insufficiently visible track record.

2.1.5   Funding Gaps and Unsustainable Models

- **Short-Term, Project-Based Funding:** The majority of funding remains short-cycle and activity-oriented, with few mechanisms to support institutional sustainability, staff wellbeing, or core operational capacity. NNGOs are frequently excluded from overhead or indirect cost recovery, while INGOs retain those costs—often citing donor rules.

- **Resource Inequity and Dependency Risks**: This funding asymmetry increases burnout, reinforces dependency, and undermines the long-term goals of localisation. Afghan

organisations face growing pressure to deliver, with few opportunities to invest in their own institutional development.

- **Limited Mentorship and Feedback Mechanisms:** NNGOs are often subject to assessments or performance reviews without adequate follow-up support, coaching, or engagement. This diminishes opportunities for mutual learning, growth, and sustained eligibility.

2.1.6 Inflexibility in a Rapidly Changing Context

- **Insufficient Contextual Adaptability:** Despite Afghanistan's volatility, many partnership models remain rigid, offering limited flexibility for budget revision, shifts in implementation approach and activities, or adaptive strategies. This restricts innovation and responsiveness hampering the ability to respond to emerging needs and/or changing realities.
- **Lack of Context-Sensitive Support Systems:** Compliance, monitoring, and capacity-strengthening systems are often not tailored to Afghanistan's evolving operating environment. This disconnect limits the effectiveness of partnerships and erodes trust.

2.2 Transactional vs. Transformative Partnerships: Spot the Difference

While funding modalities in Afghanistan vary in structure and accessibility, many still reinforce transactional relationships between international and local actors, largely due to the structural and operational barriers outlined in the previous section. These transactional approaches often prioritise short-term project delivery over long-term institutional strengthening, shared decision-making, and sustainable impact. Advancing meaningful localisation will require not only changes in funding mechanisms, but also a shift toward more **transformative, equitable partnerships**. The table below contrasts these two models, highlighting the structural and relational changes needed to foster more resilient, inclusive collaboration with Afghan actors.

Dimension	Transactional Partnership	Transformative Partnership
Purpose	Project delivery or service outsourcing	Long-term change, mutual growth, and shared goals
Engagement	Short-term, contractual	Long-term, relational
Power Dynamics	Donor or INGO retains control; decision-making is top-down	Power and leadership is shared; decision-making is joint and inclusive
Funding Model	Project-based, restricted, contractual	Core or flexible funding aligned with partner priorities
Local Actor Role	Implementer/sub-contractor	Co-creator, leader, and equal partner
Accountability	Upward to donor or lead agency	Mutual and downward to affected communities
Recognition of Local Knowledge	Often overlooked or undervalued; minimal local voice	Valued as central to programme design and adaptation; community-rooted decisions
Risk Management	Risk transferred to local partner	Risk shared and jointly mitigated
Capacity Building	Focus on meeting compliance standards	Strengthening institutions and local systems
Monitoring & Evaluation	Driven by donor reporting needs	Joint learning and adaptation with community feedback
Outcome	Deliverables met, but power imbalance persists	Equitable, sustainable impact and strengthened local leadership

3 Afghanistan - Partnership Principles

This section outlines the foundational principles that underpin equitable and sustainable partnerships in Afghanistan. It builds on reflections shared by local and international organisations in response to the question: *"What makes a good partnership?"* Consultations consistently emphasised the need to move beyond short-term, transactional arrangements toward long-term, trust-based partnerships grounded in mutual respect, joint accountability, and shared purpose.

These locally informed insights echo the spirit of the *2007 Principles of Partnership*, which call for **equality, transparency, results-oriented approaches, responsibility**, and **complementarity**. In the Afghan context, this means centring local leadership, responding to community-defined priorities, and ensuring the meaningful inclusion of women-led and grassroots organisations.

Together, these principles offer a practical and values-based compass for shaping partnerships that are not only effective but transformative in advancing locally led solutions.

3.1   Foundations

(1) Mutual Trust and Respect: Trust is the foundation of meaningful partnership—and in a high trust-deficit context such as Afghanistan, it must be earned through more than aligned objectives.
➔ Trust must be built over time through respectful engagement, recognition of local expertise, and cultural humility.
➔ Respect means engaging as equals and acknowledging the constraints Afghan as well as international organisations face. It involves recognising the difficult trade-offs all actors must navigate when working in Afghanistan and respecting their organisational identities and cultural norms. At its core, this principle affirms that effective partnerships are rooted in mutual accountability, cultural humility, and the courage to engage across difference.

(2) Transparency: Cross-cutting principle essential to building trust, accountability, and more balanced partnerships. Also serves as a protective measure in Afghanistan's politicised and high-risk environment—flattening hierarchies, strengthening collaboration, and sustaining trust even in times of uncertainty.
➔ Transparency must be embedded in all aspects of partnership and everyday organisational practices and go beyond reporting to include shared data access, joint decision-making, and regular updates on evolving challenges and priorities.
➔ Open, honest communication about funding, risks, decisions, and priorities is critical.

3.2   Power-sharing and Practice

(3) Inclusive Decision-Making: Genuine partnerships require a shift from extractive consultations to shared decision-making/leadership structures to ensure relevance, responsiveness, and resilience.
➔ Afghan organisations should be co-creators in programme design, not just implementers, to help navigate the complex and fast-changing Afghan context.

(4) Mutual Accountability: Accountability must be reciprocal.
➔ International partners should uphold the same standards of transparency and responsiveness they expect from local actors. his includes clarity on funding decisions, openly sharing constraints, and providing clear evidence of how local feedback informs strategic and operational choices.
➔ Regularly assessing and adapting partnership practices—with a willingness to confront power imbalances and adjust behaviours—is essential for moving localisation beyond rhetoric and towards meaningful, transformative change.

(5) Contextual Sensitivity and Adaptability: Effective partnerships in Afghanistan must be grounded in deep contextual understanding and a readiness to adapt to rapidly changing conditions.
➔ This includes recognising regional and political diversity, respecting local ways of working, and maintaining flexibility in programme delivery, funding arrangements, and coordination structures. Adaptability is not a reactive stance—it is a strategic necessity for principled, locally led engagement.

(6) Effective Communication. Effective partnerships rely on consistent, open and purposeful communication.
➔ Shared platforms, structured feedback loops, and clarity on roles and expectations help foster alignment, cohesion, and trust-especially in high-pressure environments.

(7) Transparent **Coordination:** In Afghanistan's rapidly changing and high-stakes environment, robust coordination mechanisms are crucial for ensuring alignment, managing risks, and adapting to evolving circumstances.

→ Clearly defined roles, responsibilities, and information-sharing processes support joint ownership, reduce duplication, and enable timely adaptation to emerging risks and opportunities.

3.3 Resourcing and Recognition

(8) Equitable Resource Sharing: Sustainable partnerships depend on fair, transparent resource allocation that reflects the true cost of principled work in Afghanistan.

→ Resources should go beyond activity funding to support local actors' autonomy, stability, and institutional resilience.

→ This includes access to indirect costs, flexible funding, and investment in staff and systems.

(9) Visibility **and Recognition:** Equitable partnerships include shared credit and leadership visibility.

→ Contributions by local partners must be acknowledged in reports, media, and donor engagement.

(10) Mutual Capacity Strengthening: Capacity building is a two-way process.

→ Afghan organisations offer contextual insight and innovation. Strong partnerships invest in shared learning and co-creation.

4 Recommendations to Strengthen Equitable Partnerships in Afghanistan

Based on consultations with Afghan and international stakeholders, the following recommendations aim to support donors, INGOs, and UN agencies in building more principled, inclusive, and sustainable partnerships with Afghan actors.

4.1 Power-Sharing and Inclusive Governance

- **Promote Mutual Respect and Inclusion:** Recognise local organisations as strategic partners—not just implementers—by involving them meaningfully in governance, strategy development, and evaluation processes.

- **Promote Co-Leadership Models:** Pilot co-leadership approaches in different regions where responsibilities for programme design, implementation, and oversight are genuinely shared between international and national/local actors. These initiatives should be contextually adapted, documented, and evaluated to inform scalable localisation models.

- **Facilitate Internal Mindset Shifts:** Encourage dialogue within donor agencies, INGOs, and UN bodies to address power-sharing concerns. Highlight success stories and support champions of localisation to foster institutional buy-in.

4.2 Fair and Transparent Partnering Processes

- **Ensure Transparent and Inclusive Partner Selection**
  - Publicly share clear selection criteria and procedures
  - Establish multi-stakeholder selection panels that include local actors
  - Publish transparent criteria and scoring methods
  - Introduce feedback or appeals mechanisms to ensure fairness
  - Accept alternative compliance pathways (e.g., peer endorsements)
  - Offer mentorship for new partners

- **Establish Shared Accountability Mechanisms:** Enable local partners to provide critical feedback through joint planning, monitoring, and peer assessment processes. Create inclusive feedback loops to ensure mutual accountability.

4.3 Flexible and Accessible Funding

- **Simplify and Standardise Funding Procedures:** Streamline due diligence, application, and reporting processes across donors. Introduce mentorship-based vetting and alternative compliance pathways tailored to local contexts.

- **Increase Access to Core and Flexible Funding:** Support indirect costs, provide longer-term grants, and offer flexible budgets that enable local organisations to build institutional resilience and adapt to changing conditions.
  - Embed indirect cost support for local partners (e.g., 10–15%)
  - Share overheads proportionally between partners
  - Provide unrestricted, multi-year funding
  - Recognise staff wellbeing as a legitimate cost
  - Pilot co-leadership in financial management

- **Encourage Adaptive Donor Policies:** Promote donor frameworks that allow equitable cost-sharing, flexible reporting requirements, and increased delegation of decision-making to national partners, including NNGOs.

4.4 Capacity Strengthening and Shared Learning

- **Bridge Capacity and Compliance Gaps**
  - Conduct joint capacity assessments to inform targeted, tailored support.
  - Enable INGOs to provide context-sensitive compliance guidance and adjust expectations where appropriate.

- **Reframe Monitoring as a Learning-Oriented Practice:**
  - Shift from punitive, compliance-focused monitoring to an approach that identifies opportunities for joint reflection, learning and improvement.
  - Use implementation oversight to strengthen partner systems and processes—not only to detect breaches or disallowed costs.
  - Integrate mentorship and coaching into partnership agreements.

- **Working Together to Build Ownership:**
  - Co-create proposals and work plans.
  - Use mutual assessments to foster joint accountability.
  - Institutionalise joint learning and review processes.
  - Promote shared visibility through co-branding and advocacy.
  - Encourage strategic, long-term partnerships rather than transactional arrangements.
  - Position INGOs as enablers, not gatekeepers.

- **Reduce Fragmentation in Policy and Tool Use:**
  - Encourage INGOs/UN agencies to adopt harmonised templates or allow the use of partner systems where appropriate.
  - Avoid requiring national partners to conform to multiple, conflicting formats, which increases burden and reduces efficiency.

4.5 Visibility, Access, and Influence

- **Enable Direct Engagement Between Donors and Local Actors:** Create spaces for NNGOs and local partners to engage directly with donors, reducing reliance on intermediaries and promoting equitable dialogue.

- **Build Systems for Recognition and Visibility:** Acknowledge the contributions of local partners in donor reporting, coordination meetings, and public communications. Promote co-branding and shared advocacy platforms that elevate local voices and leadership.

Selected Guidance Documents / Resources

Humanitarian Outcomes/Interaction/USAID (2019). *NGOs and Risk: Managing uncertainty in local-international partnerships (Global report); https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/document/ngos-and-risk-managing-uncertainty-local-international-partnerships-global-report*

ICVA (2025): Equitable Partnerships and Localisation 'Grab and Go' Pocket Guide; https://www.icvanetwork.org/uploads/2025/04/ICVA-HF-Pocket-Guide-Equitable-Partnerships-Localisation_250410.pdf

Peace Direct (2023): **Transforming Partnerships in International Cooperation** offers a suite of tools and guidance designed to help both local and international organisations examine their values, practices, and power dynamics in partnership settings; https://www.peacedirect.org/transforming-partnerships/

Centre for Humanitarian Action / CHA (2023): Localisation in Practice: Facilitating Equitable Partnership in Humanitarian Project management; https://www.chaberlin.org/en/publications/localisation-in-practice/

European Commission (2023): Promoting Equitable Partnerships with Local Responders in Humanitarian Settings; DG ECHO guidance note; https://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/dg%20echo%20guidance%20note%20%20promoting%20equitable%20partnerships%20with%20local%20responders%20in%20humanitarian%20settings.pdf

Plan International and Social Development Direct (2021): Building Equitable Partnerships: Tools with Guidance; https://www.sddirect.org.uk/sites/default/files/2025-04/Building%20Equitable%20Partnerships%20Tools%20Pack%20March%202025.pdf

Safe the Children (2013) Partnership Engagement Guide; https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/document/save-children-partnership-engagement-guide

Safe the Childre Resource Centre: Various resources on partnerships and localisation https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/collection/localisation

Saferworld (2021) Working in Solidarity for a Safer World; https://www.saferworld-global.org/resources/publications/1369-working-in-solidarity-for-a-safer-world

Selected Good Practice Examples / Lessons Learned

Caritas (2017): Partnership Guiding Principles emphasize values such as mutual respect, shared responsibility, transparency, and solidarity.
https://www.caritas.org/wordpress/wpcontent/uploads/2017/06/partnershipGuidingPrinciples.pdf; These principles are operationalized through:
- **Joint Planning and Decision-Making**: Local partners are actively involved in the design and implementation of programs, ensuring that their insights and contextual knowledge shape outcomes.
- **Participatory Budgeting**: Financial planning is conducted collaboratively, allowing for equitable resource allocation that reflects the needs and capacities of all partners.
- **Direct Engagement with Donors**: National partners are included in dialogues with donors, fostering transparency and mutual accountability

Danish Refugee Council/DRC (2021): Case Study: Equitable & Strategic Partnerships In Entry and Exit Approaches; https://drc.ngo/media/ihgdnkg5/drc-case-study-2-equitable-and-strategic-partnerships.pdf

International Institute for Environment and Development / IIED (2023): Exploring equity in partnerships: Lessons from five case studies; https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/document/exploring-equity-in-partnerships-lessons-from-five-case-studies