Decolonisation & Locally Led Development

Discussion Paper

Peni Tawake
Mereani Rokotuibau
Jennifer Kalpokas-Doan
Allan Mua Illingworth
Anna Gibert
Yeshe Smith

LA TROBE UNIVERSITY

Institute for Human Security and Social Change

AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Acknowledgements

PENI TAWAKE is a development practitioner and accredited partnership broker and has over 15 years of development sector experience with a particular focus on Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu. Peni has brokered, managed and supported bilateral and multilateral partnerships at national, local and regional levels; he has extensive experience using Political Economy Analysis (PEA), Thinking and Working Politically (TWP), Partnership Brokering, Adaptive Leadership Training to inform and guide programmatic ways of working.

MEREANI ROKOTUIBAU is a development practitioner with over 12 years of experience working across a number of Pacific Island countries. She is currently the Executive Director of the regional Balance of Power initiative, which aims to increase women's leadership in all decision-making spheres, and is funded by DFAT. Mereani previously worked with the Pacific Leadership Program, working to strengthen local coalitions across Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu, and also with the Solomon Islands Resource Facility.

JENNIFER KALPOKAS-DOAN is the Director, Strategy and Programs for the Balance of Power initiative in the Pacific. Based in Vanuatu, Jennifer is an advocate for inclusive leadership. She has over 14 years' experience in the field of development, from working in government; from a strategic donor perspective, and from implementation of development programs.

ALLAN MUA ILLINGWORTH is a Pacific Islander of Fijian heritage who is currently working with the Institute for Human Security and Social Change at La Trobe University. He has over 15 years' experience in supporting development in the Pacific Islands. He specialises in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and program management across a wide range of areas but has particular interest in Pacific Islands leadership, governance and regionalism.

ANNA GIBERT is an independent development practitioner with over 20 years' experience working on Australian aid investments in the Pacific. She is the strategic adviser to the locally-led Vanuatu Skills Partnership and Balance of Power regional initiative. Anna has been a long-term advocate for localisation of aid in the Pacific, and politically-informed approaches that foster developmental leadership and coalitions for social change.

YESHE SMITH has been working as a Partnership Broker since 2008, in both internal and external roles, and as an Authorised Practitioner Trainer since 2012, for the Partnership Brokers Training course and shorter programs. Most of her working life has been in international development, working across a wide range of areas including governance, civil society, private sector engagement, youth, education, and health. She has lived and worked long-term in Papua New Guinea, Ghana and Fiji. She currently has a part-time role as a partnership manager at a research Institute at La Trobe University, and a portfolio of partnership consulting work.

Contents

> *On behalf of my Pacific colleagues we welcome this conversation. It is well overdue. We've tried to find opportunities and entry points to bring it to the forefront so we are ready to continue this conversation with ACFID and any other individual or community of people to take this forward, to self-reflect and also to be open and most of all to be willing to make that requested change. Let's continue this, however difficult the tone and frank the voices and honest and sincere the intention*
> - Toleafoa Alfred Schuster

Introduction

This paper has been commissioned by the Australian Council for International Development's (ACFID) Development Practice Committee. It was commissioned over a short period in the lead up to ACFID's 2021 conference, and because of the timeframe it is not a comprehensive review of the international literature and practice of decolonisation and locally led work. Rather, it presents a set of practical options for furthering the decolonisation and locally led agendas in shared development work in the Pacific. It includes a question set for individuals to work through to reflect on their personal positioning on these issues, a set of practical proposals for trialling at individual and organisational levels, and a set of more broad-brush proposals for systemic interventions. The paper provides a range of possible actions for individuals and organisations to consider. They are intended for consideration by whole-of-organisation, not just program staff. People may choose to take up one, five or ten suggestions, combine and adapt them, and share their learning on how well they worked (or didn't). We are not suggesting that all these suggestions should be acted on by all organisations/individuals. The suggestions in the paper are specific to development work in the Pacific, but we hope they will be adaptable and useful for work in other geographies.

The paper has been prepared by our project group of four Pacific Islander and two Australian development professionals who have been working together, in different combinations, across a range of

Pacific development programs over 15 years and have built a high degree of trust and confidence in our shared approaches to working in development in the Pacific. This allows us to have challenging and robust discussion around issues central to decolonisation and power analysis. As a team, we are excited by the 'moment' that COVID/global pandemic offers as a disruptor. As Arundhati Roy has said 'Historically, pandemics have forced humans to break with the past and imagine their world anew. This one is no different. It is a portal, a gateway between one world and the next.'[1] The last eighteen months has been a forced experiment in locally led programming, and we have an opportunity to acknowledge and maintain successes and gains made. The Institute for Human Security and Social Change (the Institute) is hosting this project and has provided additional staff time and advisory support on the development of the document.

After production of a first draft, the paper was taken to two consultation forums, one of Pacific Islander development professionals and one of Australian/NZ INGOs, for review and further development. These forums provided new insights and additional information for the development of the paper. The most significant recommendation made by the Pacific group was that systemic racism should be highlighted in the paper as central to any discussion of decolonisation and locally led processes. The INGO forum supported this call, and asked that the language of the paper be adjusted to reinforce the need to courageously address the issue of

race throughout the paper. As a result, the paper generally uses the terms 'white' and 'black and brown' rather than Australians and Pacific Islanders. The project team acknowledges that many different forms of identity, power and markers of privilege/disenfranchisement intersect in the discussion and practice of decolonisation, and race is never a sole factor. We have chosen to emphasise race here as it is still largely a silent issue in development spaces in the Pacific, and Pacific Islander colleagues see it as central to a meaningful

discussion. The forums also recognised that although the paper is focused on the shared space of decolonisation practice in the Pacific, it is being commissioned by an Australian organisation, and must acknowledge the deep and painful history of racism in Australia that stems from colonisation and continues to thrive in our institutions and communities today.

> From the white members of the project team: we acknowledge that our use of the term 'white' is reductive, uncomfortable, and not nuanced enough for the system we are describing. There are many people of colour working for Australian and other international development bodies. However, many of these people of colour within the system are already hyper aware of their racial identity, and the part it plays in their professional lives, because of living in Australia or other western nations as a minority. One of the inherent challenges we are identifying is the dominant white majority's limited ability to appreciate the racialized personal and professional experience of black and brown (in this case Pacific Islander) colleagues because typically, we (white people) do not live a racialized existence. Our race is not a dominant factor in determining our identity, it is not an issue in most of our day to day lives. We just don't have to think about it[2]. To seriously address systemic racism in international development, it would help if we could get more comfortable with our racialized identity, and the implications of that racialized identity for the professional choices we make. "Until white development workers and scholars confront how they benefit from the racial hierarchies that underpin this field, and actively work to upend their unearned privilege, development will always suffer from a 'white gaze' problem."[3]

> From the black and brown members of the project team: The terms 'expatriate' and 'international' are also not appropriate for this article as there are many expatriate/international Pacific Islanders working in countries not their own, including members of this project team. So, with an acknowledgement of the limitations of the language, and an expectation that some readers will not agree with or will feel excluded by the choice, we will use the term 'white' throughout the paper to describe individuals from Western countries working internationally in the Pacific, within the development ecosystem, and 'black and brown' people to describe the Pacific Islanders working in the same system. We acknowledge that in doing this, we run the risk of reinforcing a false binary, that implies simplistic biological or cultural differences. That is not our intention. Rather, as Sarah White suggests, we seek to highlight how the imagery and practice of race contributes to the geopolitical interests of international development,[4] and the inter-personal and professional relationships between individuals working within international development. We also acknowledge that there are Pacific Islanders who benefit from the status quo in the development industry, and who display what might be colloquially called 'white' behaviours to maintain that status quo.

The last eighteen months has been a forced experiment in locally led programming, and we have an opportunity to acknowledge and maintain successes and gains made.

Background

The document draws on a wide range of sources, including the work of three of the Institute's post-graduate students. But it is primarily a document created by practitioners for practitioners. It does not present tried and tested strategies for 'doing' decolonisation or creating genuinely locally led organisations and programs. When the team looked for this kind of guidance in the literature, we found that most of the documents focusing on decolonisation and the locally led agenda (outside of Humanitarian sector-specific guidance) are often pitched at high-level policy and strategy guidance, or presentation of aspirational, broad-brush statements like 'check your privilege' and 'centre local people's knowledge and experience' rather than practical, 'how to' type guidance. The bulk of the guidance in this paper is focused on change which can be made at individual and organisational level within the existing system. The team recognises that systemic change is necessary for deep decolonisation within the development industry to take place, and to authentically enable locally led programs and organisations, but that is not the primary focus of this piece of work. The intention here is to focus on change that is within the power of individuals and organisations to make.

There are ACFID members and Pacific groups and organisations already doing significant work in this space. The Pacific Theological College's (PTC) 'Reweaving the Ecological Map' project is providing a basis for collaboration between PTC, the Pacific Conference of Churches, and UnitingWorld on the practice of decolonisation. The International Women's Development Agency (IWDA) has designed its new strategic plan around a 'Step Up, Stand With, Step Back' framework, an adaptation of the framework proposed by Shirley Walters and Shauna Butterwick in their 2017 publication, Moves to Decolonise Solidarity Through Feminist Population Education. IWDA is also actively pursuing diversification of its Board and staff profile, and last year commissioned 'Ofa Ki-Levuka Guttenbeil-Likiliki to produce Creating Equitable South North Partnerships: Nurturing the Vā and Voyaging the Audacious Ocean Together. Organisations like CARE Australia and Tearfund Australia are holding internal staff processes to discuss and actively address decolonisation. The NZ-based Kiribati Working Group and the NZ Ministry of Social Development have produced Boutokaan te mweeraoi. A conceptual framework for enhancing I-Kiribati wellbeing. Oxfam Aotearoa are pursuing widespread organisational change which sees Māori cultural values and norms being placed at the centre of the operations of the organisation. There is no doubt many other organisations and individuals also actively pursuing decolonisation and locally led work. We hope that this paper will contribute to the growing body of writing and action on decolonisation in the Pacific, and the project team hopes to engage widely in the future with others engaged in similar work across the Pacific.

We take as our starting point a recognition that the ecosystem of international development is premised on a historical and racialized system, structure, and assumption, i.e., the ability of the developed (largely white) world to positively influence and guide the trajectory and future of the developing (largely black and brown) world[5]. In this way, the development industry is systemically flawed along colonial and neo-colonial lines. Accepting this is the starting point for individuals and organisations to make the kind of changes proposed in this paper. We are referring to 'locally led' processes, rather than 'localisation,' which is more specific to the Humanitarian sector since the establishment of the Grand Bargain[6]. The Humanitarian sector is producing significant sector-specific guidance on localisation which is valuable to everyone working in international development. However, we are not replicating or including that guidance here, rather seeking to provide more generic guidance applicable to anyone or any organisation working in aid and development, and particularly to INGOs.

It is not our intention to suggest that any local individual, organisation, or process is automatically benevolent or effective by virtue of being local. We also recognise that the term 'local' is itself difficult. "The concept of locally-led; cannot be reduced to nationality or geographical location. Local actors operate on a range of levels – community, sub-national and national … Supporting locally-led approaches means acknowledging that local communities are never homogenous, often espouse divergent views and are centrally involved in local politics. But while local approaches may have their limitations, they are often dismissed or sidelined in favour of international (and predominantly white) responses due to factors such as risk aversion, concerns about scale and capacity, along with power structures based on neo-colonialism, prejudice and racism."[7] For the team, decolonisation does not simply mean diversity and inclusion and will not only be addressed by only hiring more people of colour, or people from diverse groups. Some of the hardest work is work that white organisations and staff need to do internally, with and for themselves, to consider their own historical, positional, and racial power. All this work will be more effective with greater involvement of, and centrality given to different voices, but greater diversity and inclusion isn't enough alone.

The proposals outlined in this paper are presented as a two-handed pathway to change – with change proposed for white individuals and organisations to tackle, and corresponding changes for black and brown people working with these individuals and organisations to consider. The project team sees this project of change as a shared process, with challenging discussions being had and questions being asked within and between both groups, including discussions which are usually only had within racial groups being shared across racial lines. We use the language of 'yielding and wielding' with white organisations and individuals learning to yield power, and their black and brown counterparts stepping into wielding power. We do not wish to imply that the black and brown side of this equation is powerless, rather that the sources of their power, their deep cultural, contextual, and political understanding, and long-term commitment to the development of their communities, nations, and region, is often unacknowledged or not respected.

Note: We recognise that none of the suggestions outlined below are easy. For black and brown practitioners, stepping into wielding power may require having uncomfortable conversations, breaking cultural protocols, being vulnerable in new ways, and working on painful decolonisation of the mind processes. For white practitioners, yielding power may involve loss of professional identity, reckoning with the deep discomfort of being part of and representative of a neo-colonial system which individuals do not personally subscribe to, and losing power, control, and authority. Engaging in a decolonisation process, and supporting genuinely locally led organisation and programs requires us all to be courageous and bear the discomforts and pain associated with the process, with particular regard for the discomfort and pain of black and brown colleagues who have suffered and lost most through colonisation and the neo-colonialisation of the aid industry.

Reflection Questions for Development Practitioners

self-positioning in the process of decolonisation

YIELDING
(white practitioners)

WIELDING
(black & brown practitioners)

SYSTEMIC

YIELDING

- What do I think 'development' is?
- What are the qualities, attributes, skills, knowledge required for a person to contribute to this process?
- How do I think these qualities, attributes, skills, knowledge are reflected in development industry priorities, systems, and processes?
- Has colonisation informed the development industry?
- What do I think the role of external actors is in this process of 'development'?
- In my area of work, how do I think non-local organisations supporting local development are perceived?
- What are the factors that influence whether they are perceived negatively or positively?

WIELDING

- What do I think 'development' is?
- What are the qualities, attributes, skills, knowledge required for a person to contribute to this process?
- How do I think these qualities, attributes, skills, knowledge are reflected in development industry priorities, systems, and processes?
- Has colonisation informed the development industry?
- What do I think the role of Pacific Islanders is in this process of 'development'?
- In my area of work, how do I think Pacific Islander staff working for international organisations/programs are perceived?
- What are the factors that influence whether Pacific Islander staff are perceived positively or negatively?

ORGANISATIONAL

YIELDING

- How is my organisation perceived within the colonial legacy of development?
- Who holds decision-making power in the operations of my organisation in-country?
- Is there a power differential between locals and non-locals in the operations of my organisation in-country? If yes,

WIELDING

- What are the avenues for directly and indirectly accessing power/decision-making in my organisation? Which avenues am I more comfortable with?
- Is there a power differential between locals and non-locals in the operations of my organisation in-country? If yes, how is this manifested?

how is this manifested? And what is its impact?
- How could my organisation redesign processes and systems to shift leadership and decision-making power to local staff?
- How could my organisation address the perception that 'locally led' could mean a reduction in quality of the managerial work required by the industry?
- How does my organisation incentivise and reward acts and behaviours that enable localisation and decolonisation?
- Has my organisation explored, in a structured way, Pacific ways of thinking and working?

- How could my organisation redesign processes and systems to shift leadership and decision-making power to local staff?
- How could my organisation address the perception that 'locally led' could mean a reduction in quality of the managerial work required by the industry?
- Does my organisation incentivise and reward Pacific Islander staff to step into leadership and engaging robustly? How could it do this more effectively?
- Has my organisation explored, in a structured way, Pacific ways of thinking and working?

INDIVIDUAL

YIELDING

- Do I see my race as a factor in my personal and professional life, and my personal and professional achievements?
- Has my race privileged me in my profession and in my organisation vis-à-vis local colleagues?
- Where do I get my sense of professional value/identity/contribution? Can I genuinely be satisfied and rewarded by playing a less recognised, prestigious, visible role, in support of local colleagues, potentially without credit?
- What are ways that I can yield power in the operations of my organisation? What are ways that my local colleagues can wield power?
- For social change to happen in my area of work and in my country of work, who needs to be wielding power and influence?
- What are ways that I can yield my power?
- What personal gains might this yielding of power generate for me?
- As a manager how do I recruit, incentivise, and reward personnel with values and drivers that support localisation and decolonisation?

WIELDING

- Do I see my race as a factor in my personal and professional life, and my personal and professional achievements?
- What was my early exposure to white authority and expertise/knowledge, and how have I internalised this?
- Do I feel that I can be 'myself' in a mixed professional environment?
- How will I be perceived by Australian/international staff if I challenge the existing system?
- How will I be perceived by Pacific Islander colleagues and peers if I challenge the existing system? Will I be perceived as 'trying to be white,' or rude, if I engage in a pushing/robust way? Could I provide an example for colleagues in changing the way Pacific Islanders engage with the existing system?
- How does my cultural background in the practice of leadership, and how a leader carries themselves, inform my ability to exercise leadership in an Australian dominated professional environment?

Practical Ideas for Action at an Individual Level

Changing not just structures and practices but mental models that shape policies and practices, by changing relationships and connections and tackling unequal power dynamics.[8]

YIELDING	WIELDING
Have honest conversations and make yourself vulnerable	**Have honest conversations and make yourself vulnerable**
Have explicit one-to-one conversations with your black and brown colleagues about their experience working with white people. Don't have these conversations unless you are genuinely prepared to make changes as a result. Don't have these conversations if you are not genuinely curious about the answers, as black and brown colleagues will know if the interest/intent is genuine. Start by saying: "I'm trying to work out how I can do better, as an individual and a colleague, to think about decolonisation and supporting genuinely locally-led work." Ask: "Would you be willing to help me work through this? I know this conversation might be difficult, and we might both be a bit uncomfortable, but I'd really like to understand these issues from your perspective and learn from your experience. I completely understand if you don't want to, or don't feel comfortable to have this conversation. NOTE: recognise that a power differential may make black and brown colleagues feel that they must have this conversation, even if they are not comfortable to do so.	Share information with your white colleagues about the lived experience of colonialism in your family and community, your experiences of working with the effects of neo-colonialism in the development industry, and this impact this has had on you. Reflect on your personal history and your formative experiences of white authority and control. Think about how those feeds into the way you interact with white colleagues.

What has been your experience working with white people? What has made it easier for you to work with white people? What has made it harder? What could I do differently to better support locally led processes in our organisation? Do you think my race gives me privileges in our work together? What do you think I could do differently, in terms of the way I work, or the processes I manage, to share that privilege?	How was leadership practiced culturally in your world when you grew up, and to date? Was leadership passed on through generally recognised lines and processes? Did leaders have to continually prove themselves as worthy of their leadership position (as is required in a western working environment)? How does your formative experience of leadership fit into the way you engage with leadership in your working environment with white people, or in international organisations? What excites you about the possibilities for more local leadership in the decolonisation and locally led agendas?
Create spaces where you can be open and vulnerable with other white colleagues to unpack colonisation in your industry and your own personal relationship with this.	Reflect on these issues with black and brown colleagues to support your process as you think through what engagement in decolonisation and building locally led organisations and programs means for you personally.
Black and brown colleagues need to understand you as a person who is part of a family and a community[9]. Introduce your family to colleagues, if possible, and discuss your background, extended family, beliefs, what you love doing, even if you are not used to bringing so much of the personal into your professional life. Spend time with black and brown colleagues out of the office.	Be as you are with your black and brown colleagues. Black and brown staff usually do not expect to share personal space with white colleagues in the same way as they do with their black and brown colleagues, who are 'family.' Consider how you might bring a white colleague closer, and not keep them at an arm's length for fear of greater closeness being exploited.

YIELDING

WIELDING

Decolonise meetings and workspaces	Proactively express your language and customs in workspaces and explain/ interpret for your white colleagues
Historically English has been the language of instruction and authority, and the use of indigenous languages has been discouraged in professional and educational spaces. There is a huge benefit to decolonisation processes if this can be reversed.	
Encourage black and brown colleagues to run meetings/processes internally and with stakeholders in their own language, and reassure them that you are happy to be supported with someone to translate for you. Check with partners to see if translation of key documents into local languages is required/preferred. Take translation and interpretation costs into account when designing and budgeting programs. Build resilience to not knowing everything that's going on, and the possibility that people are discussing you without you knowing. The empowerment benefits of people using their own language, and the improved programmatic outcomes of people having more honest conversations	Explain to white management/colleagues why using your own language is important in the office space, and in implementing programs with stakeholders. Build some skills in translating and interpreting, so your white colleagues will feel sure that they can relax and know that you will be providing them with the information they need from processes which are not run in English.
Ensure sufficient time is available for meals, socialising and 'fellowship' during meetings and workshops.	Guide the development of the schedules of meetings and workshops to ensure Pacific Islander priorities are reflected.
Assume all meetings/workshops etc will be opened with a prayer, even if the processes are hosted in Australia for an Australian group. This will demonstrate willingness from the white team to give up the primacy of their cultural environment.	Offer to provide an opening prayer if it seems that white colleagues are not going to structure that into a meeting/process. Demonstrate inclusivity by acknowledging other faiths represented in the room and inviting them to give a prayer/meditation/ devotion.

Deconstruct any meeting spaces which implicitly or explicitly establish you or your white colleagues as superior – e.g.: seated at the head of the table, seated on a chair and not on a mat, etc.	Accept sitting at the head in positions of 'spatial power' in meetings and encourage your colleagues to do likewise.
Learn to be comfortable with silence. If there is silence in a meeting, don't feel you need to fill it. Count to 10, then count to 10 again.	Express your views in meetings, even if this makes you feel uncomfortable.
Foster spaces where black and brown colleagues feel comfortable expressing the intersect between their beliefs and work, especially belief in God and Christian worldviews.	Do not self-censor and remove reference to your beliefs from your discourse.
Hold discussions about the professional cultural environment of office space. Does the office feel like it is dominated by white professional cultural expectations? How is this reflected in terms of dress, meals and eating, expectations around things like noise/laughter/presence of children after school, hours of operation, acceptance of cultural elements like drinking kava or putting biblical scriptures on the walls.	Proactively discuss with your white colleagues your family and cultural obligations, and explain that you can't always separate your communal obligations from your professional life. They may have no understanding of your obligations and the impact the office culture has on you if you don't open that conversation with them.
Observe Pacific protocols in all engagements with stakeholders. Recognise the additional burden of work on black and brown staff to educate white staff on local customs and protocols.	Take the time to discuss with managers local customs/protocols that should be observed and explain how doing so could build affinity between the program and the communities it works with. Proactively advise on formal protocols to welcome and farewell guests.
Actively break down social barriers – make sure there are not 'expatriate groups' and 'local groups' at meetings and functions.	

YIELDING

WIELDING

Step away from visible leadership	Prepare to step into visible leadership
Actively make way for a local colleague to lead processes with stakeholders, even if there is an expectation on the part of the stakeholder that the white staff member will lead. Model local leadership in meetings, events etc., even if it is not the norm and might make some people uncomfortable, for example a government official may feel insulted if the perceived senior, the white staff member, is not leading. You may need to explicitly hand-over leadership of the meeting to your back or brown colleague and validate their skills to lead the discussion. Their leadership must be genuine. The black or brown staff member needs to be in real control of the meeting/event, not looking to white staff on issues that come up, or deferring/referring discussions to them. Even if the meeting is not going the way you would have run it, or you think there are emerging issues, don't intervene, debrief afterwards. Be comfortable with being a 'participant' at events, rather than the expert.	Reflect on your preparedness and willingness to lead when a white colleague is present. Are you in some ways comfortable with avoiding the responsibility of leading challenging meetings or processes, and being able to blame the white colleague's lack of cultural skill if it doesn't go well? Prepare with your white colleague for how you will take leadership of meetings/events. Discuss an agreed process for a constructive debriefing afterwards.

YIELDING

WIELDING

Recognise your black and brown colleagues' superior expertise in fundamental areas and use your power to amplify these	Recognise your superior expertise in fundamental areas and actively foster these
Be aware that black and brown colleagues have a long experience of white colleagues extracting their knowledge and experience, and leveraging that to build their own careers. Also, of being made junior to younger and much less experienced white colleagues. Demonstrate that you understand and appreciate that your black and brown colleagues' knowledge of the Pacific operating environment far outstrips yours, and that your desire is to learn from them.	Open to managing the risk of letting the camel's head into the tent (if you let it put its head inside, it will quickly wriggle in and squeeze you out). Take ownership of the work by showing that you have superior knowledge of the context. Correct your white colleagues if their analysis or assumptions are incorrect, particularly as they relate to the context and local actors. Challenge instances where international examples are validated over local political/cultural/contextual understanding. i.e., this worked in Afghanistan, so it should work in Samoa. Be confident in your contextual expertise.
Operate 'behind the scenes' to use your power, skills, networks and influence to amplify the leadership of black and brown staff. Ensure black and brown staff lead and represent the organisation at high-level meetings, public events and on public/media platforms, with white personnel providing support. A useful descriptor to assist the white personnel to yield power in this way is to see themselves as 'secretaries' whose role is to confer the power of the written word to local leaders who do not have English as their first language and who have not had the privilege of using English to navigate power dynamics of donor, contractor and INGO political economies. For example, preparing draft emails/briefings/speeches for the local leaders' consideration and sign-off, or converting the local leader's strategic and management ideas expressed in brief dot-points into the full documentation required. In this way, direction-setting and decision-making is coming from the local leaders, facilitated by the English writing skills of the white personnel.[10]	Recognise what your particular skill sets are and what you need support in. Think about what 'professional' standards you have internalised. Do you judge yourself on your ability to write reports in your second language to the standard of a white manager, over your ability to provide nuanced and informed contextual analysis?

YIELDING   WIELDING

Continued	
Recognise your black and brown colleagues' superior expertise in fundamental areas and use your power to amplify these	**Recognise your superior expertise in fundamental areas and actively foster these**
This is also critical for 'protecting' local leaders against the judgements and leadership success criteria of the donor and/or white organisation, where the definition of results may be quite different from the slow-burn social change processes being driven by the local leaders. The white personnel, who are culturally trained and skilled in framing that resonates with the incentives of donors' political economies, ensure these Australia-facing reporting and public diplomacy needs are met, thereby 'providing cover' for the local leaders to focus on the real, substantive work of bringing about developmental change. Social media in the Pacific, particularly Facebook, are platforms with significant reach and influence. Often, aid projects use marketing and promotional opportunities to increase visibility of the brand of the Australian organisation and their conventional (usually white) leaders. Use social media platforms and others such as regional conferences and high-profile discussion forums and blogs (e.g: Devpol Blog, Good Will Hunters Podcast, ANU/USP Pacific Update, Australian Aid Conference, RDI Conference, etc.) to amplify the legitimacy and power of the programs' local leaders. This involves the white personnel doing the 'secretarial work' to make this happen: drafting the abstract, liaising with the organisers, supporting the development of power-point slides etc. The useful descriptor to reinforce this dual 'yielding and wielding' transition is that of the white staff member as a 'campaign manager'.	Seek out opportunities to represent your organisation in public forums, with the confidence of your Pacific knowledge and skill set. This sets an example for other black and brown professionals, even if it is uncomfortable for you. It's important for the international development community to hear from authoritative, confident black and brown development professionals. This pushes the locally led agenda.

YIELDING   WIELDING

Have a local leadership plan from the outset and foster local leadership in flexible ways	Identify the skills and experiences you need to lead
Actively identify and mentor black and brown personnel to wield the power of leadership. Develop KPIs for white team leaders/senior staff which show developing a black or brown colleague as their replacement (and supporting them into success) as a key performance indicator, throughout their tenure, not as a consideration at the end of their role. Consider job-shares or joint appointments with local personnel. Hold discussions with that identified black or brown staff member about what they need, over what time frame, to develop comfort to move into that leadership role. Monitor this succession plan. Create spaces – formal and informal - that enable nascent and different forms and models of leadership to emerge, including in unexpected and unplanned ways. Recognise that developmental leadership will often not present with the qualities of conventional Western models of leadership of self-promotion and performative confidence.	If you are being supported to move into a leadership role, be open and clear with your white colleague/manager about the support you need to move into that role and take increasing responsibility for decision making. Plan together for building the skill set you need. As your career progresses, think about making space to mentor and support younger or less experienced black and brown colleagues, particularly in the art and skill of working with white colleagues. Find a mentor yourself. Some black and brown professionals have participated in mentoring programs, and have found this to be useful in both their professional and personal development. Being mentored has allowed for a shift in ways of working and thinking, for helping mentee step back to consider and valuing own capacity. Mentoring has also been useful in supporting staff through particularly challenging workplace crises, to support a reflection process, an understanding of the mentees' own perspectives, assumptions etc and how these play a role in their decision making. While identifying your leadership skill gaps, simultaneously recognise black and brown models of leadership as legitimate, including collective leadership and servant leadership models, and promote these.

YIELDING

Remove implicit white superiority from your language

Intentionally use language that aims to 'undo' the entrenched perceptions of white superiority and the infallibility of white expertise. Understand that the tone and words of communications – in both written and oral form – can perpetuate the wielding of their power and at times constitute microaggressions against the agency of local personnel – e.g.: "I think it would be really good if we did this". Ask for your partners' opinions first and listen deeply to what they are saying and not saying, rather than share your own ideas first.

White personnel to carefully use words and communication tone that reinforce the superiority of the contextual/cultural/political economy knowledge of the local leaders, and position their own technical ideas and suggestions as subordinate to this superior understanding. Find and identify phrases in the language of the country you are working in, such as (in Vanuatu) "be hemi jes wan tingting blo mi nomo" (this is just an idea though) to bookend your ideas/suggestions/proposals.

MAKE STRONG USE OF THE CONDITIONAL TENSE

"if you think this a good idea, we could look at …",

"but of course please disregard if you don't think this will work".

This also involves intentional admission of failure and vulnerability on the part of white personnel as a powerful way of dismantling neo-colonial perceptions of 'white saviours' with all expertise and answers. By making explicit their own failings and lack of knowledge, white personnel can assist black and brown personnel to see through this façade; through this new lens of white fallibility, black and brown personnel are able to reassess the value of their own knowledge and skills and have increased confidence in its validity – a critical step towards power wielding.

So, when it comes to the process of now wielding power, it is not as easy as turning off a switch one day in a part of my brain and start practicing more authority or control over the direction and decisions of the development programs I am now involved with
- Jennifer Kalpokas-Doan

As long as I, an expatriate Australian in Vanuatu, was leading the decision-making around strategic planning, funding allocations, personnel recruitment, all I would ever be in charge of was a superficial project that was separated from the deeply complex relationships of power, incentives and informal institutions that determine a nation's development
- Anna Gibert

Working towards decolonisation isn't just the latest trend in the development or humanitarian sectors. It's a matter of justice, sustainability and rights. It's also about relationships and how we trust and work with one another. We want to grapple with these issues not to be current, but because it's right to do so. Let's also listen: listen to our local partners, involve them in our discussions as well, and to each other
- Phil Lindsay

Practical Ideas for Action at an Organisational Level

YIELDING	WIELDING
Create mechanisms that enable black and brown colleagues to deconstruct colonialism in the organisation	**Use mechanisms that demonstrate the essential value of Pacific Islander perspectives and insights to the organisation's work**
If our organisational starting point is that the development industry is a by-product of colonialism, and is fundamentally structurally flawed along neo-colonial lines of influence, authority, and relative valuing of knowledge and expertise, then as organisations we need to explicitly acknowledge and address this, primarily by making it safe for black and brown colleagues to identify and raise issues of unseen/unexamined organisational discrimination/inequity. Without explicitly creating space for this, and making it safe for black and brown colleagues to do it, they are taking a huge career risk in identifying these issues, and may be censured by their black and brown teammates for making trouble, or being 'rude.'	Give a senior black or brown staff member a percentage of their role allocated to building the capacity of more junior or less experienced black or brown staff to engage effectively with white colleagues. Make sure everyone in the organisation knows that this is part of that person's role, and that the organisation recognises that engaging across cultures/power structures in a way that challenges the norm is a skill set that needs to be supported. Black and brown staff are already seeking each other out for this support informally all the time. Acknowledge as an organisation that 'doing' decolonisation effectively requires supporting staff to engage differently with power structures, and provide support to them to do that.
Constitute staff associations with an explicit mandate to discuss organisational/systemic issues of unintended/unexplored discrimination, with a regular forum to raise these issues, as a group (without high risk to individuals) with management, and propose strategies for addressing these issues. These issues may include staff conditions, office arrangements, travel and health entitlements, access to learning and development, access to leadership opportunities etc.	Identify frameworks/tools for use in international development which will allow you to work in ways that progress the kind of change you are working towards, but will also provide legitimacy and authority in the international development industry. Frameworks and tools such as Political Economy Analysis, Thinking and Working Politically and a structured approach to partnership brokering will allow you to build power analysis and consciously addressing power into your professional practice. They will also give you legitimacy as a development professional. Seek out these frameworks and tools and get skilled in using them. Become an expert in using them, and position yourself as an expert in them within your organisation. Build a community of practice with other black and brown development professionals who are using these tools.

Ask for space and time for black and brown staff to engage in ongoing reflection to amplify their concerns in a constructive manner. Consider setting up regular 'health checks' to monitor the organisational environment around black and brown staff challenging organisation inequities or systemic biases/discrimination. Utilise external black and brown consultants to facilitate these sessions, using 1-2-1 discussions to prepare the broader group sessions, and allow for open sharing.

The continued demonstration of impact by locally led development programs and organizations like Vanuatu Skills Partnership, Women's Fund Fiji, The Voice Inc, PNG and the Simbo for Change in the Solomon Islands is also a powerful way of encouraging ourselves – and our allies in development assistance – that it is locally-led change processes, not outsider-led projects – that change the course of our nation-building agenda and our goals of prosperity and equality
- Jennifer Kalpokas-Doan

YIELDING & WIELDING

> ## Jointly, explicitly, and formally discuss decolonisation in your organisation

Hold organisation wide, facilitated discussions to explore what decolonisation means for your organisation, and your team. Take an approach that is part listening project and part truth and reconciliation.

Do not enter these discussions if the organisation is not willing to make changes afterwards. Creating false hope and expectations will do more harm than doing nothing at all. Work with white staff beforehand to ensure that there is not a sense of defensiveness in their engagement in the discussions. 'This is not a conversation/critique about you and your personal choices, it is a recognition that the organisation functions within a system that is fundamentally inequitable, and we are all caught up in that, whether we personally subscribe to it or not.' Work with black and brown staff beforehand to ensure that they feel safe and supported to enter what will be a vulnerable conversation for them. Consider using an external facilitator for the discussion if that will create a safer space for everyone to engage.

ASK

How is my organisation perceived within the colonial legacy of development?

How are decisions made in our organisation? How are black and brown staff contributing to decision making?

What forms of knowledge/skills are most valued in our organisation?

What is monitored and reported on in our organisation?

For black and brown staff - what makes you feel empowered as a Pacific Islander within our organisation and the way it works?

For black and brown staff - what makes you feel disempowered as a Pacific islander in our organisation and the way it works?

For white people – where do you see scope for changing the role you play to further the decolonisation agenda?

What makes you uncomfortable about this process?

What will be gained by providing greater voice, visibility, leadership, and influence of black and brown staff?

Does the organisation require black and brown staff to be adept at cultural mimicry, presenting and interacting as a white professional would, to be taken seriously and given authority or leadership?

If so, what is the organisation missing out on, in requiring black and brown staff to be cultural mimics?

What more could black and brown staff be contributing?

Do white staff have a deep enough understanding of Pacific ways of working and being to understand the potential loss of black and brown staff having to engage in cultural mimicry?

Have a staff discussion on the cultural mimicry issue.

ASK

What are the professional skills that mean staff will be taken seriously in this organisation?

What forms of communication are most effective in this organisation?

How do black and brown staff feel about the way they have to present as professionals in this organisation? Do they feel that they can be 'themselves'?

How do black and brown staff feel that they earn respect in this organisation? How do they have to construct their professional identity to earn that respect?

What would their behaviour/communication/work style/professional interactions look like if they weren't being required to mimic white professional culture?

Do white staff ever engage in cultural mimicry in their professional lives in this organisation, do they ever feel that they have to learn to 'pass' as a Pacific Islander professional?

How comfortable would the organisation be if black and brown staff were not engaging in cultural mimicry? And what would be gained?

Will the organisation appoint black and brown staff to leadership roles if they are not adept at cultural mimicry?

YIELDING & WIELDING

Continued
Jointly, explicitly, and formally discuss decolonisation in your organisation

Consider developing a partnership strategy[11]:

Build partnership design and management processes which prioritise identification of shared benefit, transparency, sharing of power and mutual accountability.

Partnerships are not a mechanism for one partner to support/guide another. They should be a mechanism which allows a partnership group to grapple with decolonisation on an immediate and practical level, as they try to do something together which they cannot do alone.

If the 'partnership' is actually a grantor-grantee relationship, structured around one organisation supporting, guiding, buying services from, or directing another, then call it a grantor-grantee relationship, not a partnership.

Build in-house skills to design and manage partnerships as an explicit part of your organisation's decolonising and locally led approach.

Provide space (and funding) for partners to create their own agendas in their own timeframe.

Be transparent about competing interests and perspectives between black/brown and white staff. Build an organisational practice of separately considering black/brown and white staff views and orientation in reference to all large issues/opportunities/challenges.

EXAMPLE
an issue has come up with a key stakeholder being unhappy with your organisation for some reason

"What do we think about this issue and how to manage it from a Pacific informed perspective," and

"What do we think about this issue and how to manage it from an Australian informed perspective."

Some may see this as divisive, but in terms of progressing the decolonisation agenda, it is explicitly recognising a dynamic which is at play anyway, and giving staff an authorising environment to recognise and grapple with different perspectives/drivers/interests.

YIELDING   WIELDING

Decolonise the organisational workspace based on black and brown staff advice	**Inform your white colleagues of ways to decolonise the organisational workspace**
Talk with black and brown colleagues about how changes might be made to the professional environment, and professional cultural expectations, to give primacy to the national professional cultural environment, rather than the white professional cultural environment. Can rooms be given local names? Can national holidays be observed? How could an explicit policy be designed around having children in the office after school? Could HR policies include broader definitions of family (in particular for bereavement leave), time off for cultural/community obligations, flexibility of hours to manage both work and family commitments? Consider that black and brown staff, and particularly black and brown women staff, who work in development "inhabit the same spaces that the projects and programmes purport to be seeking to change for the better. As such, they too are entitled to experience improved safety and security, dignified, and enabling living conditions, and the workplace flexibility that reflects the many roles they play in their families and societies."[12]	Do some personal analysis on your professional environment, don't accept the environment and its unspoken rules uncritically. Do you feel that the office is a space where you can safely do your work without feeling oppressively monitored? Do you feel that you can bring your outside life and obligations in and out of the professional environment if you must? If the answer is no to any of these, can you work with black and brown colleagues to suggest changes to the way the office environment is established, which will support decolonisation and locally led processes? If your organisation is serious about its commitment to these, use that commitment to advocate for change that allows you to be more effective. Some substantive change is needed, but are there also cosmetic changes that could send a different message about the local ownership and definition of the professional office environment. Be propositional.

YIELDING   WIELDING

Position black and brown staff expertise at the head and heart of the organisation's work	
Constitute a quality review committee of black and brown staff to explicitly review design and implementation of projects and programs through a lens of cultural/political/contextual appropriateness. Give the quality committee a formal meeting schedule and report back function, to recognise and prioritise the particular skill set of black and brown staff.	Conduct a frank and open internal review of white staff to identify whether there is a perception that moving to more locally led processes will mean a reduction in the quality and speed of work, with a range of risks associated with that. If that is the case, identify where staff believe the risks lie, and identify risk management strategies. Share this work with black and brown staff, and have a frank and open engagement on whether they agree with the risks identified, and have anything to add to the risk management strategies. Work on identifying the improvements to output and outcomes which will result from more locally led processes, and socialise that understanding with staff and donors.
Adopt an organisational policy of not having white staff working permanently in-country. Black and brown staff in leadership roles in their country or in the region want access to skilled TA, at the end of the phone, to provide technical advice and support. They also want regular team building opportunities to build and maintain the relationships required for black and brown to confidently draw on TA for support when they are unsure, which will mean admitting knowledge gaps and being vulnerable. But generally, the preference is for white staff to not be based in-country.	Be honest about where you have skills gaps, or need further development and support. At the same time, be assertive about the centrality of your political/cultural/contextual understanding to getting good results from your organisation's programming, for both stakeholders and donors. Work with black and brown colleagues to develop a clear shared position on the added value of locally led work, and a shared 'script' that allows you to advocate for this within your organisation and with stakeholders. Develop a script for explaining why building deep relationships takes time, and why it is central to getting real, sustainable outcomes for a program.
Find ways to facilitate intra-Pacific capacity building and support (rather than bringing in TA from Australia, NZ, or internationally), which can be more relevant and culturally appropriate, and is more able to contest narrow thinking or expand ideas and connections. Experienced and highly skilled Pacific Islander staff can play important intermediary roles, often as critical 'sounding boards' who introduce new ideas, question politically naive proposals or debate alternative courses of action. These external staff can enable broader connections nationally or regionally, and play the role of a trusted 'insider-outsider' who can be used to raise unwelcome issues without damaging the close relationships that local leaders are embedded in. These insider-outsiders can give permission to 'local' actors to be more ambitious in their goals and more innovative in their practice of bringing others along a path.[13]	
Nominate a national staff member as the key contact point on a program for all communications/discussion with donors and key stakeholders. Reinforce this with donors/stakeholders on an ongoing basis. This is a leadership role, not a comms/coordination role. Ensure that that national staff member has all the information and skills they need to be comfortable as the key contact point for the country program.	Proactively ensure that you have all the information, support, and resources you need to act as the contact point with donors and stakeholders for your program(s).

Reflecting on what one of our partners said to us:
"In feminist sisterhood, IWDA is constantly saying "how would you like us to support you? Is everything okay? Our relationship with IWDA has really been a model with the relationship we take with other donors, but in saying that this only came about because we have had conversations in the past that were extremely uncomfortable but that had to happen. IWDA has become more conscious because of it, you know that they are the white face in the room. But we are also careful not to do harm to each other as sisters."(Partner)
It is my hope that we can embrace the challenge, and the discomfort, to transform our practice and thereby our sector
- Tracy McDiarmid

YIELDING   WIELDING

Review recruitment strategies and criteria

Design a recruitment strategy for white staff which prioritises skills needed to support decolonisation and locally led processes (rather than technical skills), such as: [14]

- Listening.
- Waiting, stepping back, relinquishing control, not leading, understanding when to step in and offer support and when not to
- Supporting others while providing them space to develop their own ways to manage projects that fit their context and strategic direction.
- Being reflective about power and leading from behind rather than in front.
- Understanding context.
- Exercising intuition and judgement.
- Brokering and facilitating relationships.
- Courage to challenge self and the sector to think and work differently.

Design a performance management system which validates and recognises these skills, rather than valuing certainty and compliance or which values/rewards people who always lead/self-promote.

If employing a white staff member to work with a black and brown team, facilitate a process to allow the team to express their expectations for that person's professional behaviours, leadership style, and effective facilitation of decolonisation and locally led processes. Establish this set of expectations as part of the metrics for monitoring that person's performance, i.e., are they meeting the expectations established by their black and brown colleagues/team for effectively supporting decolonisation and locally led processes?

Conscious recruitment of black and brown staff with necessary relational/political economy navigation skills. Organisations could frame questions to pick up on interviewees' ability to broker sustainable, equitable, broad-based partnerships, build coalitions, display deep contextual understanding, and use this understanding to ensure the work is owned, driven, and led local stakeholders and is demand rather than supply driven.

YIELDING   WIELDING

Think about structural changes to the organisation

Board repurposing: Refocusing on the organisation's objectives and overarching purpose with the Board 2. Ensure boards are diverse and include lived experience, different approaches to risk and humility. Call for Boards to understand and address power dynamics.

Ensure governance mechanisms of Pacific Islanders having oversight on programs have real decision-making authority and are not rubber-stamp 'advisory' structures.

Actively seek partner feedback through a range of mechanisms, with more nuanced questions about what partners want to see from INGOs to progress decolonisation and support locally led work.

Testing traditional delivery assumptions and reframing as appropriate.

Hiring more diverse staff.

Align organisational systems/business processes with values. The transactional nature of funding models and traditional project management practices are a key constraint for working differently. Consider how your organisations systems/business processes might be currently entrenching power in head offices. Consider where entrenched power relations may be hidden in business processes such as design, contracting, planning, reporting, and monitoring and evaluation.

Test, learn, and monitor

Pilot changes centred on decolonisation and promoting locally led with shorter project cycles, which can then be learnt from. Focus on action learning together, with a clear process to identify and share what works. Build links with other INGOs also testing processes, to share learning. Conduct regular partnership health checks.

Conduct anonymous surveys on a regular basis within your organisation that enable all staff to provide honest feedback on the organisation's progress in facilitating decolonisation and local empowerment and link this to MEL processes.

Set up (or use existing) scale of success (scorecard) for white partners to give them feedback on their success or otherwise is promoting locally led work.

YIELDING & WIELDING

YIELDING   WIELDING

Proposals from the INGO Forum held on
Thursday September 16th 2021

- ACFID to ask organisations to report on direct support to local civil society (NOT country offices).
- Do a comprehensive review of organisational policies with an anti-racism and decolonisation lens.
- Review your funding processes to ensure you're not adding 'strings' like reporting, thematic priorities, MEL processes that aren't actually necessary. Flexible, trust-based funding.
- Formalise consistent cultural understanding workshops for Australian staff working in the Pacific (don't assume 'the Pacific' is a monolith).
- Prioritise Pacific Islander consultants when outsourcing work.
- Ensure genuine co-design of projects and proposals - grapple with the time and money this will take.
- Commitment to review of all HR practices and policies with local lens.
- Ceasing all poverty porn (creating peer pressure for others to do so too).
- Fund 'partners' strategic plans not specific programs and projects - give them the flexibility to do what they want within that mandate.
- Make a public commitment to ensure local actors are primary decision makers and resource holders and that locally led programming is prioritised, enabled, and strengthened.
- Institute formal mechanisms for reporting racism and microaggressions.
- Regular training on anti-racism, decolonisation, BIPOC power, allyship.
- Commit to providing x% of core, multiyear funding to local organisations.
- Only use strengths-based fundraising (move away from presenting local communities as helpless).
- Decolonise the lexicon.
- Succession planning and improved retention and progression, with particular focus on diverse women.
- Consider co-leadership between Australian and Pacific models on board and senior management.
- Review country presence of INGOs.
- Consider building direct feedback from Pacific stakeholders into your MEL processes on a regular basis including regular partnership health checks.
- Undertake organisational reflection of its historic role(s) over time; the systemic Truth and Reconciliation process should be undertaken at organisational level.
- Review your organisations acknowledgment of 26 January.
- Review where there is a mandate for us to 'step up' and use our power and

privilege for the benefit of Pacific people, where is there a mandate to 'stand with' Pacific people and support and enable their work, and where we should be 'stepping back' because our power and privilege is harmful.
- Undertake deeper & more nuanced conversations commencing with completing structured questionnaire asking for good and poor practice examples.
- In MEL spaces, foster better accountability and understanding of how to be an ally by triangulating perceptions of our role with partners and movement actors with the perceptions of these stakeholders themselves.
- Be careful that staff working groups of BIPOC people are not overly burdened with the work of deconstructing colonialism in your organisation, while balancing this with the awareness that BIPOC voices need be central to change processes. This is a lot of added emotional and mental labour. Consider paying staff extra for this work.
- Ask - what can my organisation do beyond the structured approach (contracts, MOU, etc), to build trust and respect?
- Ensure the highest levels of leadership are involved in conversations on decolonisation, including Board Members.
- Decolonise knowledge creation and translation practice.
- Review work contracts across staff to ensure equity – particularly in reference to pay rates and longevity of 'local staff' contracts versus Australian staff.
- We must firstly acknowledge that present-day Australia is built on a colonial legacy of oppression. As an Australian-based organisation, we acknowledge the deep and painful history of racism in Australia that stems from colonisation and continues to thrive in our institutions and communities today. We cannot talk about tackling racism without first committing to First Nations justice.
- Collective and mutual accountability (we are accountable to each other; we are accountable to a donor together).

Practical Ideas for Action at a Systemic Level

'Systems change is an intentional, collaborative process, which unearths the root causes of the problems a system is facing and acts to address them. It is essential that this process is collaborative – recognising that no single individual or actor can resolve a systems challenge alone. Systems change requires a set of different interventions, including reforming policies and services, altering the distribution of resources and changing the nature of power.'[15]

Look for ways to redefine concepts of well-being, 'progress,' and values-driven programming to reflect Pacific world views and ways of knowing, rather than assuming western models are universally applicable. If this is done in a genuine way, it may mean designing programs and approaches in ways that are fundamentally uncomfortable for white individuals and organisations, and may challenge their person values set (for example in placing Christianity at the centre of an approach to well-being).[16]

Facilitate discussions with donors on what decolonisation and locally led looks like in practice to them, and how important it is to them with regards to the risks they are managing. Ask them some 'what if' questions, hypotheticals. Work with progressive donors to test and learn from different approaches – change funding mechanisms, strengthen partnership approaches, redefine value for money and risk, approach to MEL etc so that it supports locally-led approaches[17]. Lobby for changes in donor policies and practices that incentivise different behaviours from INGO's, contractors and others.[18] These conversations should happen early with donors in negotiating support for initiatives. Local actors may need to be prepared to walk away from funding when the donor isn't committed to decolonisation. Hard choices may need to be made.

Focus on locally relevant, best fit, politically feasible approaches to change rather than 'best practice' that tend to be importing solutions from elsewhere and are not politically possible. Undertake stepwise learning.[19] Do not start with assumptions about either the problem or the solutions – which are very often based on 'best practice' from elsewhere (usually donor countries). Rather, work with local partners to understand the problem, undertaking trialling and learning together about what locally feasible change might look like that is best fit for the context.

Consider a truth and reconciliation process in the sector that acknowledges and addresses the colonial past and sets an actively anti-racist way forward.[20] Establish sectoral communities of practice to define what is meant by locally led, look at how it can be implemented in organisations, and gather evidence on how locally led approaches achieve better development impact.

Change INGO business models:[21]

- Create ten-year transition/exit strategies.
- Create an alternative roadmap and vision international organisations with a reconceptualised role and business model.
- Create a mechanism to plan the project-funding transition to local organisations.
- Move to fundraising and policy support, with clear exit strategies that support sustainable outcomes.
- Relinquish control (as per the BRAC model).[23]
- Enable local partners to take strategic decisions, design initiatives themselves and lead the implementation of interventions.
- Focus on funding, capacity development and partnership brokering rather than implementation.
- Help defend/create/expand space for NGOs in the global south.
- Support local financing and asset building of local actors.
- Change staffing, organisational and governance structures so that decision making is not centred at HG, HQ not staffed overwhelmingly by white people, HQ not the only/main contact for donors and stakeholders.[24]

Embrace arms-length aid, with development actors less 'funder of development' and more 'facilitators of change.' [22]This may include: not having pre-established influencing agendas, facilitating change to address problems identified at local level, performance monitoring that rewards learning and adjustment, being accountable to local stakeholders.

Align organisational systems/business processes with values. The transactional nature of funding models and traditional project management practices are a key constraint for working differently.

ACFID could conduct and anonymous, independently funded sector wide survey of Pacific partners asking them to rate and comment on aspects of Australian/INGO performance (akin to the Keystone Performance Surveys)[25]. Local and national actors could play a far more prominent role in holding intermediaries accountable, e.g., providing direct feedback to and assessment of international partners, allowing local actors to make more informed choices about who they work with. Publicly available scorecards, partner-led evaluations of INGOs, enabling local/national actors to provide direct feedback to donors of INGOs.[26]

References

Andrews, Matt (2013) The Limits of Institutional Reform in Development: Changing Rules for Realistic Solutions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barbelet, V., Davies, G., Flint, J. & Davey, E. (June 2021) Interrogating the evidence base on humanitarian localisation: A Literature Study. HPG, ODI and HAG.

BOND (2021) Catalysing Locally-Led Development in the UK Aid System. London: BOND and Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Booth, David and Unsworth, Sue (2014) Politically smart, locally led development. ODI Discussion Paper, London: Overseas Development Institute.

Booth, David (2013) Facilitating Development: An arms-length approach to aid. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Diangelo, Robin (2018) White Fragility. Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism. Beacon Press

Finlayson, C. (2020) Draft PhD thesis - Building an ocean-going waka: Oxfam New Zealand's journey towards transforming its development practices. An action research study. Institute for Human Security and Social Change, La Trobe University.

Gibert, Anna (2021) Useful outsiders – how can external actors support authentic locally led development. DevPolicy blog: *https://devpolicy.org/how-can-external-actors-support-authentic-locally-led-development-20210715/*

Guttenbeil-Likiliki, O (2020) Creating Equitable South North Partnerships: Nurturing the Va and Voyaging the Audacious Ocean Together. International Women's Development Agency

HAG, GLOW Consultants, CoLab (2021) Bridging the intention to action gap (BIAG): the future role of intermediaries in supporting locally led humanitarian action. Insight, June 2021.

Kapoor, Ilan (2021) The Racist Enjoyments and Fantasies of International Development. Cornell Scholarship Online

Keystone (2010) Executive Summary: NGO Partner Survey 2010. Keystone Performance Surveys, Available online at: *https://keystoneaccountability.org/wp-content/uploads/files/Keystone%20 partner%20survey%20Jan2011%20ExecSummary.pdf, Accessed 25 August 2021.*

Kiribati Working Group and NZ Ministry of Social Development (2015) Boutokaan te mweeraoi. A conceptual framework for enhancing I-Kiribati wellbeing.

Kothari, Uma (2006) Critiquing 'race' and racism in development discourse and practice. Progress in Development Studies 6,1 pp 1-7

Kothari, Uma (2006) An agenda for thinking about 'race' in development. Progress in Development Studies 6,1 pp 9-23

Pailey, Robtel Neajai (2019) De-centring the 'White 'Gaze' of Development. Development and Change 51 (3): 729 – 745

Peace Direct (2021) Time to Decolonise Aid. Insights and lessons from a global consultation.

PIANGO and Humanitarian Advisory Group (2020) Five ways to support locally led disaster response in the Pacific during COVID-19.

Rice, B. (2019) The Counterpart Perspective: Expatriate Advisers and Technical Assistance in Papua New Guinea. MA thesis. Institute for Human Security and Social Change, La Trobe University.

Roche, Chris., Cox, J., Rokotuibau, M., Tawake, P., Smith, Y., (2020) The Characteristics of Locally-Led Development in the Pacific. Politics and Governance, Volume 8, Issue 4, 136-146

Smith, Y (2017) Partnerships: handle with care. ACFID blog: *https://acfid.asn.au/blog-post/ partnerships-handle-care*

Spark, Ceridwen (2020) Two Different Worlds: Papua New Guinea Women working in Development in Port Moresby. Asia Pacific Viewpoint, Victoria University of Wellington

Weekes-Richemond, L. (2021, August 18) Dear White Women in International Development. Amplify. *https://medium.com/amplify/dear-white-women-in-international-development-4164f5f219a0*

White, Sarah (2002) Thinking race, thinking development. Third World Quarterly, 23:3, 407-419

Endnotes

1   Cited in BOND 2021: 3
2   DiAngelo, 2018:53
3   Pailey, 2019:742
4   White, 2001:408
5   Pailey, 2019 :732, Kothari, 2006:13, Kapoor,   2020:7, White, 2002:409
6   *https:// interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain*
7   Peace Direct cited in Bond 2021: 7-8
8   BOND 2021: 9
9   Rice (2019)
10   Gibert, 2021: *https://devpolicy.org/ how-can-external-actors-support-authentic-locally-led-development-20210715/*
11   Smith, 2017: *https://acfid.asn.au/blog-post/partnerships-handle-care*
12   Spark (2020): 12
13   Roche et al, 2020:142
14   Finlayson, 2020
15   BOND, 2021:8
16   Kiribati Working Group, 2015:5
17   BOND, 2021: 12-13; 20
18   BOND, 2021:16
19   Booth and Unsworth 2014: 13; Andrews 2013
20   BOND, 2021: 27
21   BOND, 2021:28
22   Booth 2013:4
23   h*ttps://www.un.org/development/ desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/ sites/22/2017/04/Lamia-Rashid-BRAC-Ultrapoor-Graduation-Paper-for-UN-Expert-Group-Meeting-May-2017-25Apr17.pdf*
24   BOND, 2021: 12, 16
25   *https://keystoneaccountability.org/ wp-content/uploads/files/Keystone%20 partner%20survey%20Jan2011_0.pdf*
26   BIAG, 2021:20-22

Written for the Australian Council for International Development

Authors:
Peni Tawake
Mereani Rokotuibau
Jennifer Kalpokas-Doan
Allan Mua Illingworth
Anna Gibert
Yeshe Smith

Project Manager:
Kate Angus

Published:
November 2021