



LEGS

Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards

Putting the best foot forward: Localisation, Contextualisation and Institutionalisation

A Discussion Paper for the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)

Andy Featherstone



CONTENTS

Abbreviations, acronyms and glossary of terms	3
1. Background to the Discussion Paper	4
2. Localisation, institutionalisation and contextualisation	4
2.1 A summary of the terms and their importance	4
2.2 LEGS and Localisation	5
2.3 What lessons can be learnt from other standards bodies?	7
3. Recommendations	10
3.1 Decentralise control	10
3.2 Democratise and localise the standards	11
3.3 Diversify training opportunities	11
3.4 Document the evidence	12

ABBREVIATIONS

ADCAP	Age And Disability Capacity Programme	NEMA	National Emergency Management Agency
AoR	Area of Responsibility	NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
BLAC	Brooke Latin America and Caribbean	OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
CHS	Core Humanitarian Standard		
CaLP	Cash Learning Partnership	PRIM	Participatory Response Identification Matrix
CPMS	Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action	SEEP	Small Enterprise Evaluation Project
DPP	Disaster Preparedness Plans	SINAPRED	Sistema Nacional de Prevención, Mitigación y Atención a Desastres
HSP	Humanitarian Standards Partnership		
INEE	Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies	TOT	Training of Trainers
LEGS	Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards	UN	United Nations
MERS	Minimum Economic Recovery Standards	UNHRC	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
NDMA	National Disaster Management Authority	WHS	World Humanitarian Summit

Term	Description
Contextualisation	Contextualisation is one aspect of localisation and is the process of taking into consideration the local situation in order to interpret existing standards and adapt indicators for meaningful application. Its importance lies in the fact that it increases the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance and helps practitioners maximise local opportunities and minimise errors ¹ .
Institutionalisation	Actions taken to embed a concept or approach within an organisation.
Grand Bargain	The Grand Bargain, launched during the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul in May 2016, is an agreement between donors and humanitarian organisations which have committed to get more means into the hands of people in need and to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian action ² .
Localisation	A humanitarian response is considered localised when a local humanitarian responder is involved in the entire programme cycle - needs assessments, programme design and delivery and final review and evaluation (OECD 2017)
World Humanitarian Summit (WHS)	The WHS was a global call to action by former United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. The Summit had three main goals: (i) To re-inspire and reinvigorate a commitment to humanity and to the universality of humanitarian principles; (ii) to initiate a set of concrete actions and commitments aimed at enabling countries and communities to better prepare for and respond to crises, and be resilient to shocks; (iii) to share best practices which can help save lives around the world, put affected people at the centre of humanitarian action, and alleviate suffering.

¹ Sphere, working with universal standards in local contexts, 16 September 2016. Available at <https://www.spherestandards.org/working-with-universal-standards-in-local-contexts/>.

² See <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/about-the-grand-bargain>.

I. Background to the Discussion Paper

The current LEGS strategy contains a commitment to increased localisation of the LEGS Approach among stakeholders and the LEGS Community of Practice. This encompasses issues of ownership and control of processes as well as supporting local actors to contextualise LEGS in their own situation. Linked to this, a key aspect of the LEGS strategic plan is the recognition of the need for greater uptake and institutionalisation of the LEGS Approach at individual country and local level, as well as globally (LEGS 2018).

The purpose of the discussion paper is to summarise the issues of institutionalisation and localisation with the objective of providing recommendations for the LEGS Trustees and Advisory Committee on how these issues can be incorporated into LEGS future strategy and better represented in the next edition of the LEGS Handbook. The methodology involved a review of relevant literature and semi-structured interviews with key informants including LEGS staff, Board members and Advisory Committee members, informants from the LEGS community of practice, and members of the Humanitarian Standards Partnership (HSP). This Summary Paper presents the key issues and recommendations from the full discussion paper:

2. Localisation, Institutionalisation and Contextualisation

2.1 A summary of the terms and their importance.

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) describes the process of localising humanitarian response as recognising, respecting and strengthening the leadership by local authorities and the capacity of local civil society in humanitarian action, in order to better address the needs of affected populations and to prepare national actors for future humanitarian responses. Specifically, it considers a humanitarian response to be localised when a local humanitarian responder is involved in the entire programme cycle: needs assessments, programme design and delivery and final review and evaluation (OECD 2017).

For the purpose of this briefing paper, institutionalisation is considered to be actions taken to embed a concept or approach within an organisation. A recent study by London School of Economics and Sphere offers a simple model to determine and practically understand the process of institutionalisation in relation to humanitarian standards (see Figure 1).



Figure 1: Levels of adoption of standards and principles by local and national authorities (adapted from Giles et al 2019)

Contextualisation is one aspect of localisation and is the process of taking into consideration the local situation in order to interpret existing standards and adapt indicators for meaningful application. Its importance lies in the fact that it increases the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance and helps practitioners maximise local opportunities and minimise errors³. It plays an important role in institutionalisation as it is through contextualising guidelines and standards that they can be of most relevance to local and national authorities, and actors tasked with leading preparedness and responding to disasters and crises. When conducted in an inclusive and formalised manner, with strong participation, the process of contextualisation can also be used as an opportunity during which local actors gain a greater sense of ownership over guidelines and standards (see Giles et al. 2019). In this way, contextualisation may be considered to be an important driver of institutionalisation.

2.2 LEGS and Localisation

2.2.1 The LEGS Handbook

A review of the LEGS Handbook against the definition of localisation above revealed the following key findings:

- 'Localisation' is not explicitly referred to, but the basic tenets are evident in the Handbook
- Participation is a foundation of LEGS but there is no explicit reference made to broader issues of Accountability to Affected People
- Reference is made to the importance of working with governmental/non-governmental institutions but there are no accompanying tools to guide contextualisation of the technical standards
- There is scope to ensure that the language of localisation is more evident across the technical chapters

2.2.2 LEGS Training

Interviews with LEGS trainers and practitioners revealed mixed evidence on the contribution of LEGS training to strengthening localisation and institutionalisation. From a technical standpoint, there was significant praise for the training; however, it was in ensuring that the outcomes were locally-owned and that knowledge transfer could be effectively sustained that there was considered to be scope for reflection, as follows:

- The importance of local adaptation of the training programme, in particular contextualisation of the training material, although there are positive examples from Mongolia and elsewhere
- The value of supporting local action planning as part of the training, as demonstrated by the Brooke in Latin America amongst others
- Decentralising training and trainers as a means of strengthening ownership and sustainability
- The challenge to sustain the benefit and utility of training

³ Sphere, working with universal standards in local contexts, 16 September 2016. Available at <https://www.spherestandards.org/working-with-universal-standards-in-local-contexts/>.

2.2.3 From practice into policy – examples of institutionalisation of LEGS

Interviews with LEGS community of practice members and the review of case study material revealed mixed findings on efforts to institutionalise LEGS, with some significant successes, but also challenges in sustaining these, and in replicating progress across LEGS pilot countries.

In Ethiopia, LEGS is referred to in the National Guidelines (NG) for Livestock Relief Interventions in Pastoralist Areas of Ethiopia (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development 2008) and has been translated into practice. A 2017 rapid assessment found that in the pastoral focus areas, there are high levels of awareness and understanding of LEGS and the NG among both government and non-government actors, largely due to training, although this knowledge is not comprehensive, and generally decreases from regional to district level and over time. (Watson et al. 2016; see also No author 2017). The failure in some cases to put knowledge into practice is considered to be the result of a number of factors: lack of confidence, the passage of time since training, changes in personnel and the lack of technical capacity in emergency livestock interventions. The role of donors in supporting the incorporation of LEGS/NG into the design and approval stage of programmes was considered to be an important prerequisite for effective practice.

Good practice was highlighted in Kenya where District Technical staff had mainstreamed the use of LEGS into their cycle of activities and a review of practice reported strong coordination with non governmental organisations (NGOs) in the use of the guidelines. As a result of LEGS, government staff were able to assess the situation, plan earlier for cyclical drought occurrence and make bids for funds based on Early Warning information (Coupe and Kisiangani 2013).

Interviews with agency staff in Kenya also highlighted that LEGS had been adopted by the National Drought Management Authority and the Handbook was currently being used as a reference point for preparedness and response. As a consequence, LEGS had been able to influence practice, as an important reference document, but it had not had influence at the policy-level. Concern was raised that government staff lacked a thorough understanding of LEGS-related guidelines and standards, and that the high turnover rate in the staffing of key departments and ministries contributed to this issue.

It was also generally felt that central government was slow to learn from past experience and incorporate lessons into their implementation systems, and that in particular it was difficult to channel lessons upwards within government institutions.

Mongolia is another example where LEGS has had significant influence with national and provincial authorities. Through the work of Mercy Corps, LEGS has been adopted by the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and has been applied to Disaster Protection Plans (DPP) which have been rolled out across the country to prevent, respond to and mitigate negative effects of natural disasters. Emergency Management Agencies across all districts use LEGS tools to improve their existing DPPs. The tools were considered to be highly relevant to the context in Mongolia.

The work of Brooke Latin America and Caribbean (BLAC) in Nicaragua offers an example of a holistic approach to engaging with governmental bodies, and in particular, the National System for Disaster Prevention, Mitigation and Disaster Relief (SINAPRED, Sistema Nacional de Prevención, Mitigación y Atención a Desastres). Since 2018, BLAC has been working in collaboration with SINAPRED to integrate livestock into emergency risk management. LEGS has been central to this process, both through training and by contextualising and incorporating it into Nicaragua's emergency risk management tools.

2.3 What lessons can be learnt from other standards bodies ?

This section uses practice from other members of the HSP and key informant interviews to examine how others have sought to strengthen localisation and institutionalisation, and the strategies that they have pursued to achieve this.

2.3.1 Engaging with government

At the institutional level, having a consistent contact within a National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), government ministry or local authority greatly facilitates discussions and allows both parties to engage in open discussion, opening the door for trainings, workshops and broader institutionalisation. Sphere has achieved this by using Country Focal Points which may be individuals, organisations or coalitions. While the aspiration is for these people to engage with government, evidence suggests that there has been a tendency for them to focus on humanitarian agencies rather than with government more broadly (Giles et al. 2019).

There was broad acknowledgement during interviews that engaging with governmental institutions was hampered by a lack of clarity about which parts of government to engage with. This was further confounded in countries which had devolved or decentralised systems of government. For sector-based standards such as LEGS, the strongest alliances may exist in a line ministry or government department, while the most significant decision-makers are located elsewhere. In Kenya, where there has been some success in institutionalising LEGS within the National Drought Management Authority the devolution of government which occurred in 2013 has made it necessary for engagement at County level, which has been far more challenging given the large number (47).

Moreover, rather than target sector specialists alone, in order to influence budgetary allocations in Kenya there is also a need to engage with County Governors, in addition to the Directors of Veterinary Services. Time and again, the importance of understanding power dynamics and the structure of government decision-making was considered essential, and linked to this a focal point or 'champion' who had influence was required for successful and sustained engagement.

Joint action planning by focal points, agencies and allies in government was considered to be an essential

ingredient for success, but is also acknowledged to be all too rare. This approach has the potential to build an understanding of power and influence in addition to allowing scope to develop tactics for engagement with influential government members. However, there was also concern about the time and resource requirements of this. At least one HSP member, the Minimum Economic Recovery Standards (MERS) has sought to re-balance the costs and benefits of the relationship by offering explicit support to focal point-hosting organisations through a mutual commitment which designates individuals to serve as a voluntary focal point and a MERS resource person for staff and partners, with training, technical support and travel costs provided by the SEEP Network.

2.3.2 Strengthening the relevance of standards through contextualisation

Contextualising standards is important not only because of the final result (adapted standards that are widely used in country to inform and guide policy, practice, contingency planning, strategy etc.) but as a process as and of itself, as it helps build a strong community of practitioners and policymakers who are vested in the development and delivery of quality and accountable programming.

The adaptation of indicators to ensure their relevance to diverse contexts is hardwired into the Sphere standards, but it is also an aspect which is often misunderstood, or poorly executed. The experience of Sphere is that governments have chosen very different approaches to this; some have adopted the indicators as they are, others have adapted them to suit their specific circumstances or as a starting point to develop national standards themselves. To assist this process, Sphere has developed a number of tools for contextualising the standards (for example, Sphere for Assessments, Sphere for Monitoring and Evaluation and Sphere for Urban Responses).

There are many examples of contextualised, or adapted standards; the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), Sphere and the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (CPMS) have developed a range of case studies. INEE and CPMS have both developed packages to guide contextualisation of the standards (The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action 2019; INEE 2019).

In addition to ensuring relevance of indicators, a second benefit of the contextualisation of standards is to address negative perceptions about them being foreign or international. Prior to the national consultation process in Indonesia, there was great resistance from NDMA officials to use the Sphere Handbook, as it was thought that Indonesia should determine its own standards (Giles et al. 2019). Translation of standards into the local language is an important means to assist in overcoming this and other misconceptions. It also makes the standards far easier to adopt into national policies and practices. The use of translated handbooks in trainings and the distribution of the same facilitates the promotion of standards.

2.3.3 Fostering uptake of standards by forging partnerships

Partnership is a means used by many standards initiatives to strengthen engagement, promote uptake of the standards and to promote institutionalisation. Interviews with HSP members and a review of the literature offered a range of approaches that have been adopted, and outcomes that these have achieved.

Partnership with UN agencies and international organisations

Most standards initiatives have sought to partner with UN agencies or international NGOs. This is an important vehicle for implementing standards, and the geographic reach of many international organisations can achieve significant scale. Linked to this, a secondary motivation for engagement is for purposes of endorsement and promotion of the standards, although different HSP members have achieved varying levels of engagement – for some members, engaged agencies may make an informal commitment to recognise and promote the standards internally which is beneficial, but means that they may exist alongside competing internal and external standards. For others, expectations are far greater. One example is the partnership between the Age and Disability Capacity Programme consortium (ADCAP – which participated in the development of the age and disability standards) with organisations in the UK, Kenya and Pakistan to implement inclusion initiatives within their organisations. ADCAP and its partners, through a formal agreement, recruited one inclusion officer within each implementing organisations who were supported through training and learning initiatives to lead the learning and change process within their own and partner organisations.

A second example is MERS which articulate the minimum level of activities required to support the economic recovery of vulnerable populations in the wake of crises. While MERS has pursued a range of approaches to strengthen institutionalisation, the focus of one of these has been to integrate the standard into the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' (UNHCR) economic inclusion strategy. This has been developed over a four-year period and has included training, policy development and support (UNHCR 2019). The institutionalisation of MERS in UNHCR's approach is tacit recognition of the utility of the standards, but also provides MERS with a strong advocate to leverage support and engagement elsewhere.

Embedding standards initiatives in Clusters⁴, Areas of Responsibility (AoR) and Working Groups

Several of the HSP members have direct linkages to the clusters; included in this number are INEE (linked with the Education Cluster), CPMS (linked with the child protection AoR), MERS (linked with cash working groups) and CaLP (also linked with cash working groups). The advantage of a standards initiative being embedded within a cluster is that it has immediate access to a country-level structure (in countries where clusters have been rolled out) which frequently includes local and national government and non-governmental agencies. As a consequence, it has an opportunity to influence and advocate for engagement and institutionalisation. It also has a coordination platform which is mandated to strengthen quality and support learning, which would be consistent with LEGS country-level objectives.

A good example of cluster engagement is MERS which uses the opportunity to engage with local and national partners. It recognises that smaller organisations working in crisis zones have limited time and resources to dedicate to staff development and programme quality improvements. Finding these organisations and reaching out to them through regional cluster networks is an important first step when adopting the MERS.

4 Clusters: groups of humanitarian organizations, both UN and non-UN, in each of the main sectors of humanitarian action, e.g. water, health and logistics. They are designated by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) and have clear responsibilities for coordination.

Delivering training through clusters or working groups also allows for a common understanding about programme quality to be developed within peer groups working in the same locations. Consequently, a greater appreciation of the challenges and changes required for interventions can be sought across peer groups and greater collaboration on intervention design and delivery can be discussed. This ensures that crisis-affected populations are receiving the same quality interventions from different organisations working in the same area and mitigates against the risk of interventions undermining each other.

Engagement with academia

The value of promoting Sphere in universities and with academia has been widely recognised; in countries where the Sphere standards and principles have been widely adopted, Sphere Focal Points have been proactive in ensuring that Sphere is on the curriculum at universities (Giles et al. 2019). Through integration into curricula and involvement in practical workshops there is considerable potential to increase recognition and knowledge of standards, as well as bringing further behavioural changes among aspiring decision makers and future government officials.

2.3.4 Supporting institutionalisation through the development of guidelines

A small number of HSP members have developed specific guidance on institutionalisation of the standards. This has particularly been the case where the standards are cross-cutting and have broad relevance across organisations, such as for the Humanitarian Inclusion Standards for Older People and People with Disabilities which has developed a Good Practice Guide for embedding inclusion into humanitarian policy and practice (Akerkar and Bhardwaj 2018).

2.3.5 The challenge of ‘letting go’ of the standards – a lack of quality assurance but greater uptake

Several HSP members spoke about the need to ‘let go’ of the standards in order to permit them to have life and be contextualised. There was an acceptance that this may result in difficulties with quality control, but it was felt that there were also considerable benefits to be gained, particularly in terms of understanding, engagement and ownership. The challenge was posed by several interviewees that there was little to be gained from having a perfect set of standards that

received limited uptake as a consequence of how tightly it was controlled and managed. One of the HSP members had no knowledge of the translation of their standards into Russian and Ukrainian, but there was an acceptance that local ownership and innovation was driving up the circulation of the standards, and their use.

2.3.6 Beyond training – broadening out processes to facilitate greater engagement

Training is a core part of all HSP members’ strategies and a range of approaches have been adopted. The approach taken by LEGS to-date, of only using certified training and not sharing the training curriculum was at one end of the spectrum, with others ceding far more control to member agencies and training providers with a view to strengthening promotion. This latter approach is partnered by the publication of comprehensive training packages which include detailed instructor and course notes, handouts and other supporting materials. Some HSP members support a broad range of training approaches. A good example of this is CaLP, which has a menu of approaches which includes e-learning modules⁵, in addition to courses delivered by training partner organisations and CaLP-certified trainers⁶. As a result of the recent Training Programme Review, LEGS plans to revise its approach and to release the 3-day training curriculum into the public domain, whilst retaining control of the Training of Trainers (TOT) process and continuing to certify LEGS Trainers.

Lessons from the delivery of Sphere TOT courses highlight the importance that the focus of the training should be about learning how to apply the Handbook, in the most appropriate way, rather than focus on a pre-determined training programme. One of the implications of this is that formal training may not always be the most relevant means of engaging stakeholders. Feedback from interviews conducted during the research for this discussion paper echoes this sentiment; that additional activities such as reviews or simulations can play an important role in engaging stakeholders.

5 <https://www.calpnetwork.org/learning-tools/e-learning/>.

6 <https://www.calpnetwork.org/learning-tools/trainers-and-training-partners/>.

2.3.7 Strengthening engagement through a community of practice and evidence creation

CaLP offers a particularly good example of a vibrant community of practice, and one which is linked to the development, collection and dissemination of significant research and evidence. Formed of over 150 organisations and more than 5,000 individuals in the humanitarian sector, CaLP is based on learning, knowledge sharing, networking and coordination around the appropriate and timely use of cash and vouchers in humanitarian response. This 'community' approach is evident in how CaLP seeks to engage its members through a range of interactive forums, including discussion groups (DGroups⁷) and activities which are hosted in different regions. It can also draw upon the existence of Cash Working Groups which are embedded within the humanitarian architecture that exists in many countries. Of importance to CaLP and its members are the broad range of documents that are accessible via the website⁸. It is the development and promotion of evidence-based learning that has played an important role in building and sustaining the community of practice.

7 CaLP Dgroups is an online platform for discussion and information sharing which connects users with a community of more than 1000 individuals working in cash and voucher assistance around the world. The forum provides an informal space for those involved in cash voucher assistance to ask questions and share expertise, resources and learning. There are separate discussion groups in English, French and Spanish.

8 <https://www.calpnetwork.org/library/>.

3. Recommendations

The transformation that has been made by LEGS from a Project in 2009, to an independent organisation today has been based on the merit and utility of its core product, the Handbook. The widespread and enthusiastic use of the guidelines and standards that it contains are testament to their relevance and effectiveness in responding to humanitarian need. What has been harder to achieve is a level of sustained engagement and ownership from those who have the potential to benefit most from them – government, local authorities, national and local organisations, i.e. the incorporation of LEGS standards and guidelines into policy not just practice.

The following recommendations draw on the findings and conclusions of this study. Recommendations from a recent LEGS training review are being considered by LEGS management alongside the recommendations from this study.

3.1 Decentralise control

The ceding of a level of control of training and training materials by some HSP members is considered to have strengthened inclusion and ownership. While this shift may have implications for quality control, the evidence (from this research at least) suggests that it is important to shift power and responsibility closer to those who are implementing and benefiting from the standards.

Given resource constraints, the current approach that has been adopted by LEGS of working with a small number of pilot countries appears to be both prudent and necessary, and there is also a strong argument for the actions in the pilot countries to be accompanied by a 'country engagement strategy' which is distinct from, but nests within the broader LEGS strategy. A central part of these strategies should be an approach which seeks to institutionalise contextually-relevant guidelines and standards within government and non-governmental agencies. This would serve as a means of ensuring relevance and effectiveness, and also for purposes of strengthening engagement and ownership. In support of this, the research found significant value in the development of specific guidance on how to contextualise the standards, with a view to framing this process and promoting a level of consistency in how the process is undertaken.

3.2 Democratise and localise the standards

3.2.1 At community-level

With participation hard-wired into LEGS as a core standard, and with the Participatory Response Identification Matrix (PRIM) tool used as the basis for the initial assessment and to identify the response, the basic tenets of community participation are in place. The inclusion of gender and social equity as a cross-cutting issue serves to underline the importance of understanding the differential impact of crises on different members of the community based on an analysis of roles, rights and responsibilities. The aspect that receives less attention in the guidance is the responsibility to elicit feedback and complaints throughout all aspects of the project cycle, which is a core component of accountability to affected people. While this may be considered an implicit part of community participation, there is value to it being explicitly articulated. This responsibility is a core part of the Core Humanitarian Standard (CHS) which is increasingly being incorporated into humanitarian standards and has already replaced the previous 'core standards' in Sphere. The plan, by LEGS, to incorporate a summary of the CHS into the Handbook during the next revision, offers consistency with other HSP members, in addition to more clearly articulating the key rights and responsibilities of affected communities.

3.2.2 At local and national-level in pilot countries

Consistent with the decentralisation of LEGS is the need to ensure consultation with a diverse stakeholder group for purposes of revising the Handbook. The basic tenet of localisation dictates that LEGS will be best served by eliciting more detailed input from those it is seeking to engage at national and local levels. Given these benefits, LEGS membership of the newly formed Agriculture Working Group within the Food Security Cluster offers significant potential.

3.2.3 Beyond the pilot countries

Acknowledging the high regard in which LEGS is held and its use in countries beyond the pilot countries, there would also be significant value in having a complementary approach which can be used to engage with these countries. This could have a similar focus on selecting a lead agency, embedding LEGS at cluster-level (in countries which have a cluster system) and using this platform to engage with local and national governmental and non-governmental partners.

3.2.4 In the LEGS Handbook

Drawing on the suggestions outlined above, there is an important need to make a strategic decision about how localisation should feature in the Handbook. Handbook changes could include explicit reference to localisation, the promotion of a far stronger position on the delivery of response under the leadership of national and local authorities, and the delivery of response by national, local and community-based organisations in the first instance. Findings outlined in this discussion paper suggest that all the chapters of the Handbook should be reviewed for substantive changes whilst ensuring that the more nuanced shifts in power, that are required to deliver against WHS localisation commitments, are adequately reflected.

3.3 Diversify training opportunities

The training programme has been instrumental in imparting a greater appreciation of LEGS. However, given that the reach of the existing TOT programme is limited, LEGS should consider ways to increase access to training opportunities. This could be through formal TOT training by local accredited trainers, delivery of refresher training for those that have been trained in the past, through the broader use of the half-day awareness raising session, or the development and promotion of e-learning methods.

There was significant feedback on the importance of ensuring that training is contextualised to reflect the situation and to suit the specific needs of the trainees. It was also considered important to ensure that a follow-up can accompany the training, with a view to promoting greater accountability for, and use of, the knowledge.

In addition to increasing access to its formal training programme, there is a demand for LEGS to explore ways to adopt and promote e-learning methods. Self-instructional web-based training offers an alternative means of building capacity that would be more accessible to national and local partners who may not be selected for formal training. Electronic versions of training materials could be accompanied by a wider database of examples and case studies to support contextualisation of training, for example, in pastoralist or agro-pastoralist zones. While this represents a shift from the current approach, it recognises the important potential that this has for strengthening engagement, uptake and ownership.

3.4 Document the evidence

Some of the Standards Initiatives with a highly engaged membership or community of practice considered that collection and dissemination of evidence played a key part in garnering and maintaining interest, in addition to playing a very practical role in supporting the use of the standards and allowing lessons to be learnt through the promotion of good practice, programme reviews and evaluations. It was felt that these were particularly useful for lower capacity members, such as local and national organisations that did not have access to the same resources as their international partners. The standards initiatives that had the most effective document repositories (with the most powerful search tools) tended to have significant engagement from outside the immediate membership from humanitarian generalists, consultants and evaluators. There is considerable scope to promote an approach that seeks to generate and document practice with a view to LEGS expanding its role in holding and disseminating evidence on different aspects of the guidelines and standards. The newly revised impact database that is available via the LEGS website⁹ is an important contribution to this.

Bibliography

Akerkar, S. & Bhardwaj, R. (2018). Good practice guide: embedding inclusion of older people and people with disabilities in humanitarian policy and practice. ADCAP, 2018.

The Alliance for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action (2019). Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action

Brooke (2020). Key Learnings, Reflections and Actions Gleaned from LEGS Workshop.

Coupe, S. and Kisiangani, E. (2013). Study report on the effectiveness of the livestock emergency guidelines and standards (LEGS) in Ethiopia and Kenya. ECHO, Vetwork UK and FAO, August 2013.

Featherstone, A. (2019). Localisation Performance Monitoring Framework. NEAR Network.

Giles, M., Power, J., Meeuwissen, T. and Okawa, S. (2019). What makes international standards interesting for National Disaster Management Authorities? Opportunities and challenges of engaging with NDMA's. Sphere and the London School of Economics and Political Science, March 2019.

Global Food Security Cluster (2016). 2017-2019 Strategic Plan. WFP/FAO.

Interagency Network for Education in Emergencies - INEE (2019). Contextualising the minimum standards.

LEGS (2018), LEGS Phase IV: Institutionalising and Localising LEGS Globally and Nationally, Summary of LEGS Strategy 2017-2022, revised June 2018.

Mercy Corps Mongolia (2019). Annual Report, January – December 2018 & Mercy Corps Mongolia (2020) Annual Report, January – December 2019.

Minimum Economic Recovery Standards (2018). Mainstreaming MERS within smaller organisations – A regional peer-to-peer approach, Gaziantep, Turkey.

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2008). National Guidelines for Livestock Relief Interventions in Pastoral Areas of Ethiopia. Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Addis Ababa.

No author (2017). LEGS in Ethiopia – from walking to running: implementation plan for phase I, 2017 – 2019.

OECD (2017). Localising the response: World Humanitarian Summit - Putting Policy Into Practice. The Commitments into Action Series.

UNHCR (2019) Refugee Livelihoods and Economic Inclusion, 2019-2023 Global Strategy Concept Note.

Watson C., Regassa G., and Kassie K. (2016). Rapid Assessment of Organisational Capacity for the Application of LEGS and the 'National Guidelines for Livestock Relief Interventions in Pastoralist Areas of Ethiopia' to Inform the El Niño Response. USAID Feed the Future/ Agricultural Knowledge, Learning, Documentation and Policy Project (AKLDP Ethiopia) and Trócaire.



LEGS

Vesey Farm

Little Clacton Road

Great Holland

Essex CO13 0EX

United Kingdom

✉ coordinator@livestock-emergency.net

🌐 www.livestock-emergency.net

🐦 [@TheLEGSPROject](https://twitter.com/TheLEGSPROject)

Featherstone, A. (2020). Putting the best foot forward: localisation, contextualisation and institutionalisation. A discussion paper for the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards. Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards, UK.

© Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) 2020

Disclaimer: This publication was commissioned by LEGS and produced independently by the author. The views expressed in the paper are not necessarily endorsed by LEGS.

Cover photo: Tim Leyland