Permanent Mission of Belgium to the Office of the United Nations
and the other International Organizations in Geneva

2015 Review of Good Humanitarian Donorship indicators
GHD work-stream 4.2

FINAL VERSION MAY 16TH 2016

In 2003 the Government of Sweden convened a meeting to discuss good humanitarian donorship, during which 23 Principles and Good Practices of Humanitarian Donorship were agreed, that provide both a framework to guide official humanitarian aid and a mechanism for greater donor accountability.

At the end of 2015, 41 donors have signed the Good Humanitarian Donor Principles.

The process of monitoring the implementation of the GHD principles is conducted on an biannual basis through a questionnaire, that mainly focuses on qualitative aspects (policies, processes and instruments) rather than quantitative elements (compliance with prescriptive allocation models or funding flows).

The goal of this process is two-fold: on the one hand, it allows GHD donors to reflect internally on their humanitarian strategies and practices in the light of the GHD principles; on the other hand, it provides the GHD community with valuable information about the interdependence between members' individual and collective decisions and responses related to humanitarian donorship.

In 2013 a first self-assessment on performance against the GHD indicators, covering the period until 31 December 2012 was realized. 27 donors responded to the questionnaire.[1]

The results of the 2013 self-assessment confirmed that the 23 GHD Principles remained at the core of humanitarian donorship, providing a useful and relevant guide for humanitarian donors as they adapt to an evolving and challenging humanitarian landscape. The results also confirmed that there is no one best model of donorship – donors are taking different approaches to implementing the Principles, based on their particular strengths, systems, funding volumes and mandates – concentrating on adding value as best they can.

---

[1] Australia, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Commission, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Republic of Korea, Slovac Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America

The good practices that were highlighted in the report – innovative and effective approaches to specific areas of humanitarian donorship – may have been useful inspiration for donors seeking to further improve their funding, advocacy and policy work.

There also were a number of areas for possible future collaboration. These areas related particularly to aspects of humanitarian donorship where individual efforts were not enough, and instead donors must work together to achieve results. GHD members identified several priority areas for collective action:

- Preparedness (*GHD 1, 8, 17 and 18*);
- Standardized reporting and improved accountability (*GHD 23*);
- Improved involvement of beneficiaries in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the humanitarian response (*GHD 7*);
- More effective engagement with operational partners to promote standards and enhanced implementation (*GHD 2, 4, 15, 16)* through the development of joint advocacy positions;
- Improved burdensharing (*GHD 11 and 14*) and predictability (*GHD 12*) by proactive co-ordination of funding intentions within the group;
- Sharing the results of monitoring and evaluation exercises (*GHD 21 and 22*), and more joint assessments of operational partners.

In 2015 a second self-assessment covering the period until 31 December 2015 was carried out and 17 donors out of 41 or 41% responded to the questionnaire.[2] Due to the fact that 27 responses were received for the 2013 survey, one could argue that the present sample is not representative enough to measure progress. The limited response could also lead to the conclusion that the questionnaire outlived its 'raison d'être'.

However the 17 members that did reply represent **79,5%** of the total OECD DAC membership ODA in 2014 or **61,3 %** of total OECD ODA in 2014. Therefore, one can conclude that, albeit to a certain degree, a valid comparison of the data is possible.

Belgium has collected and collated these responses, which can be consulted in this document of which the preliminary version was presented/ discussed during a meeting on March 31st 2016 at the Belgian Permanent Representation in Geneva and during the High Level Meeting on Good Humanitarian Donorship on April 27th 2016 in Geneva. The document itself consists of 2 parts:

a) **An indicator tracking table** at the beginning of the document, which shows progress, least or most progress, lack of progress or when data are inconclusive. The key to read the table is explained at the end of the table.

b) A **compendium of good practices and additional comments** for each question of the questionnaire, which demonstrate interesting and/or innovative and effective approaches to areas of humanitarian donorship by different GHD donors. These comments and practices were taken over in their entirety from the contributors and were not edited to avoid possible distortion. Also, general conclusions based on the collated data were added.

---

[2] Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Estonia, European Commission, Finland, Germany, Italy, Japan , Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America.

Based on the collated data, some general conclusions can be highlighted:

1/ On the subject of the abovementioned priority areas that were identified for collective action in the **2013 survey**:

1)   Preparedness: (GHD principles 1, 8, 17 and 18) ~ Q (Question)1**, Q4, Q13, Q14, Q15:** Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows an overall progress in the indicators. Contributions to UNDAC and CERFS/ERRFs and deployment of national experts and rescue teams are the preferred mechanisms to provide a fast and appropriate response, with the former making the most progress. Prepositioning of funds with NGOs made the least progress.

As far as surge capacity is concerned, support to UNDAC/ INSARAG shows most progress and is at the same time the most preferred way to contribute to international emergency response. Although deployment of USAR teams shows the least progress, it remains the 2nd most preferred surge capacity in place. Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made on secondment of national experts.

Finally, coordination through the humanitarian clusters and relying on appeals show most progress in rapid response mechanisms. The establishment of internal coordination mechanisms between the different nationals stakeholders (NGOs, army, other specialized institutions) shows least progress, but remains the preferred way to coordinate deployment of a rapid response mechanism. Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made on regional or global coordination at EU level.

2) *Standardized reporting and improved accountability (GHD 23)* ~ **Q16**: Reports focused on results, the use of external evaluations, and regular partner consultations indicate the most progress and are most widely used for partner accountability. The least progress was made with respect to the limitation of the requested number of reports.

3) *Improved involvement of beneficiaries in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the humanitarian response (GHD 7)* ~ **Q6**: Although most progress was made in the monitoring of the implementation of the IASC transformative agenda by humanitarian actors and through field visits and/ or field monitoring mechanisms, most responders verify active engagement of stakeholders through reports and evaluations.

4) *More effective engagement with operational partners to promote standards and enhanced implementation (GHD 2, 4, 15, 16)* through the development of joint advocacy positions ~ Q1, Q2, **Q3**: The selection of experienced partners and the engagement in dialogue with NGOs are considered to be the most important processes for engagement with partners. Increased attention is given to participation in governing bodies of agencies or donor support groups and to dialogue with the private sector. The organization of seminars and trainings made the least progress.

5) Improved burdensharing (*GHD 11 and 14*) ~ Q7a, Q7b, Q8, Q9, Q10, Q11, Q12 and improved predictability (*GHD 12*) ~ **Q12** by proactive co-ordination of funding intentions within the group: Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

Burdensharing: Most progress was made in local donor coordination, which is at the same time the most preferred way together with the use of information provided by FTS and GHD members. Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with respect to the use of information provided by GHD members.

Predictability: CERF contributions, the mobilization of additional funding when necessary and the allocation of funds earlier in the year are the preferred ways to provide flexibility and predictability, with most progress being made in consultation with local partners to ensure that decisions are appropriate. Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with respect to recent improved flexibility and predictability in funding mechanisms.

6) *Sharing the results of monitoring and evaluation exercises* (*GHD 21 and 22*), and more joint assessments of operational partners ~ Q16**, Q17, Q18,** Q19: Although data shows (crf. Q18 in table) progress in better sharing lessons learned with other donors, other data do not permit to conclude that progress was made in sharing the results of monitoring and evaluation exercises (cfr. Q17 in the table) nor in participating in joint evaluations (cfr. Q17 in the table).

2/ On the subject of the **2015 survey** itself (based on the discussion at the Belgian Permanent Mission on March 31st and the High Level Meeting on Good Humanitarian Donorship on April 27th 2016):

First of all, the **results of the 2013 self-assessment remain valid** today in the sense that the 23 GHD Principles remain at the core of humanitarian donorship and that there is no one best model of donorship. Even with a more limited number of responses than in the past it is clear and encouraging to note that the indicators show a **positive trend** in the adherence to and the implementation of the GHD-principles. Hence, **member states don't only ask for accountability, they show that they themselves are prepared to be accountable.**

Furthermore, this document contains a **wealth of data** that can serve as a basis for internal diagnosis for self-improvement, thereby allowing each country to distill from it what is relevant for its own situation. Some will use it as a reference document for reporting, others as a background document for improvement of future strategies, others as a tool in search for best practices, etc.

Finally, this document shows that several donors already implement some of the recommendations of the World Humanitarian Summit/ "Grand Bargain"-process. Since the "Grand Bargain"-discussion is not as widely conceived as the GHD-principles in terms of participation and scope, it isn't illogical to state that indicators of the WHS/GB-process could feed into the GHD-process in order to avoid duplication and that there is an important role to play for the GHD in the follow up of the WHS/GB-process.

#		Total 2013 (27 replies)	Total 2013 %	Total 2015 (17 replies)	Total 2015 %	AT	AU	BE	CA	CH	CZ	DE	EE	EU	FI	IT	JP	LI	LU	NL	SE	US
1	How are the GHD principles integrated into your government / institution strategy and policy framework (*GHD 1, 2, 3*)?																					
	The GHD principles are:																					
	The criteria for the analysis of humanitarian projects and programs take those principles into account	1	4%	11	65%	x		x	x		x	x		x	x	x			x		x	x
	Referenced in other guidelines	3	11%	11	65%	x	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x				x	x
	Referenced in our development strategy	3	11%	10	59%		x	x		x	x		x	x	x				x	x	x	
	Referenced in our annual planning for humanitarian aid	3	11%	10	59%		x			x	x	x		x	x			x	x	x	x	
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	9	53%		x					x		x	x	x	x			x	x	x
	Those principles are included in funding application guidelines	1	4%	8	47%	x	x	x		x	x			x	x	x						
	Referenced in law	4	15%	4	23%			x						x		x					x	
	Other			3	18%										x						x	x
2	How do you co-operate with other relevant ministries/departments to ensure that GHD principles are respected in other policies and programs (development, security, economic, etc.) (*GHD 2, 4, 19, 20*)?																					
	The service in charge of humanitarian aid regularly advocates for GHD principles	5	19%	13	75%	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x
	Formal cooperation mechanisms have been established between the relevant departments	17	63%	10	59%		x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x				x
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	9	53%		x			x		x		x	x	x		x		x		x
	We do it through civil-military coordination mechanisms	3	11%	7	41%	x		x	x	x	x			x			x					x
	We draft humanitarian strategies collectively	3	11%	5	29%	x					x		x	x								x
	Joint trainings are organized between the relevant departments	6	22%	**5**	**29%**	x			x					x		x						x
	The relevant departments have a legal obligation to cooperate and consult each other	11	41%	2	12%						x			x								
	Other			2	12%											x					x	
3	Which processes have you identified for engaging with humanitarian partner organisations in order to ensure their understanding and implementation of key humanitarian principles and codes of conduct in their programming (*GHD 2,4,15,16*)?																					
	We select only experienced partners	2	7%	13	75%	x	x	x	x			x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x
	We engage dialogue with NGOs or NGO platforms	8	30%	13	75%		x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	We do it through close scrutiny of partner documents and monitoring of their activities	9	33%	13	75%	x		x	x	x		x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Key humanitarian principles and codes of conduct are grant selection criteria : our partners must comply with them	12	44%	13	75%	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x	x	x
	We do it through participation in governing bodies of agencies or donor support groups	6	22%	12	71%		x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x			x	x	x	x
	We support initiatives like ALNAP, SPHERE, HAP or other similar networks	4	15%	10	59%	x	x	x	x			x		x			x			x	x	x
	We engage dialogue with private sector	2	7%	9	53%		x		x		x	x		x					x	x	x	x
	We do it through seminars and trainings	3	11%	7	41%				x	x	x	x		x							x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	6	35%					x		x		x		x					x	x
	Other			3	18%									x	x						x	

#		Total 2013 (27 replies)	Total 2013 %	Total 2015 (17 replies)	Total 2015 %	AT	AU	BE	CA	CH	CZ	DE	EE	EU	FI	IT	JP	LI	LU	NL	SE	US
4	How are disaster risk reduction, capacity development and crisis mitigation integrated into all relevant strategies, including development cooperation and humanitarian assistance programs, to ensure coherence between humanitarian and development aid (*GHD 8)*?																					
	We ask partners to develop programs and activities integrating those three dimensions	9	33%	11	65%	x	x	x			x	x		x	x	x	x	x				x	
	Our financing is already flexible enough to ensure this coherence	1	4%	10	59%		x		x	x	x	x				x	x				x	x
	We have established policies and mechanisms to enhance coherence between DRR , capacity dev. and crisis mitigation in the programs we support	20	74%	10	59%		x		x		x	x		x	x				x	x	x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	2	7%	8	47%		x			x		x		x		x		x			x	x
	We are increasing our financing to DRR activities	5	19%	7	41%			x		x		x		x		x	x				x	
	We are enhancing our own internal expertise and follow-up capacities in order to enhance coherence between the three dimensions	6	22%	7	41%		x		x		x			x					x		x	x
	Other			5	29%				x							x				x	x	x
	We are increasing our financing to capacity development activities			4	23%			x				x	x	x								
	We are increasing our financing to crisis mitigation activities			3	18%			x						x		x						
5	What funding instruments and mechanisms do you use to support the effective transition out of emergency into recovery, and to build co-ordination and response capacity as well as to strengthen resilience of affected states and/or communities (*GHD 9)*?																					
	We use bilateral development cooperation funding	11	41%	13	75%	x	x		x	x	x		x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	Our funding instruments are flexible enough to allow for recovery	14	52%	13	75%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x			x	x
	We use NGO funding	11	41%	12	71%	x	x		x	x		x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	We use multilateral cooperation funding			11	65%		x		x	x		x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	We mix humanitarian and development instruments	8	30%	7	41%	x	x							x		x	x	x				x
	Good practice you have adopted	2	7%	6	35%		x					x		x		x					x	x
	We have specific funding instruments for resilience activities	3	11%	6	35%			x				x		x	x				x	x		
	We participate in specific regional mechanisms focused on resilience	2	7%	3	18%										x	x				x		
	Other			2	12%																x	x
6	How do you verify that humanitarian organisations funded by you actively engage all relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries in all stages of the humanitarian response cycle (*GHD 7, 10)*?																					
	We verify it :																					
	At the hand of reports and/or evaluations	21	78%	15	88%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
	Through field visits and /or field monitoring mechanisms	9	33%	14	82%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x					x	x	x
	When we select implementing partners	9	33%	13	75%	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x
	When we select programs or projects			11	65%	x		x	x	x	x	x	x						x	x		x
	Through policy dialogue and advocacy with implementing partners	7	26%	12	71%		x		x	x	x	x	x	x					x	x	x	x

		Total 2013 (27 replies)	Total 2013 %	Total 2015 (17 replies)	Total 2015 %	AT	AU	BE	CA	CH	CZ	DE	EE	EU	FI	IT	JP	LI	LU	NL	SE	US
	Through our participation in the boards of agencies			12	71%		x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x			x	x	x	x
	Through close monitoring of the implementation of IASC transformative agenda by humanitarian actors	1	4%	9	53%		x		x	x		x		x	x					x	x	x
	Through our support to HAP or similar initiatives	1	4%	7	41%		x		x	x		x			x					x	x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	5	29%							x		x		x					x	x
	Other			1	6%																x	
7A	To what extent do you use common/multi-actor needs assessments undertaken by hum. organisations when deciding on your support to the international humanitarian response (*GHD 6, 14*)?																					
	We use information provided by UN agencies	3	11%	17	100%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	We consult with our field staff/embassies	8	30%	16	94%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	We use NGO information	5	19%	15	88%	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
	We use CAPS and flash appeals	26	96%	15	88%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	We use RC/RC appeals	9	33%	12	71%	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x
	We use ECHO reports and other EU information	14	52%	12	71%	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x
	We encourage partners to engage in common needs assessment			10	59%		x		x	x		x		x	x					x	x	x	x
	We support ACAPS, NTF, IASC to perform common needs assessments	3	11%	7	41%					x	x			x	x					x	x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	2	7%	6	35%							x		x		x			x		x	x
	Other			3	18%					x											x	x
7B	How do you use common/multi-actor needs assessments *(GHD 6, 14)* ?																					
	We refer to common needs assessments (in a way or another) in our funding decision process			15	88%	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	We use common needs assessments to develop analysis and reports	1	4%	10	59%	x			x	x	x			x	x	x				x	x	x
	We use common needs assessments to categorize countries and situations	1	4%	6	35%				x	x					x	x			x	x		
	Good practice you have adopted			3	18%										x						x	x
	Other			1	6%																x	
8	Please detail the criteria and tools you use to decide who, where and what to fund (GHD 6,14)?																					
	We base our decision on :																					
	Budget availability	5	19%	16	94%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	The needs of the affected population	12	44%	16	94%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
	The capacities of the humanitarian actors on the ground	13	48%	16	94%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
	The quality of a proposal	2	7%	15	88%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x
	The funding level of a crisis	7	26%	14	82%			x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	Geographic priorities	11	41%	12	71%	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x				x	x	x
	The possibility of being compliant with the GHD principles	1	4%	8	47%		x			x	x	x		x						x	x	x
	Thematic priorities			8	47%		x	x	x	x									x	x	x	x
	Other			7	41%					x					x	x	x			x	x	x
	The visibility of a crisis in the media	1	4%	6	35%		x		x	x						x					x	x
	Sectorial priorities	2	7%	6	35%		x			x		x							x		x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	5	29%							x			x				x		x	x

		Total 2013 (27 replies)	Total 2013 %	Total 2015 (17 replies)	Total 2015 %	AT	AU	BE	CA	CH	CZ	DE	EE	EU	FI	IT	JP	LI	LU	NL	SE	US
9	How do you address forgotten crises in your policies and programs *(GHD 6,14)*?																					
	Through our contributions to the CERF	15	56%	15	88%		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	We support NGO programs	3	11%	10	59%	x			x	x	x	x			x				x	x	x	x
	We use the EU forgotten crises assessment	7	26%	10	59%	x		x			x	x	x	x	x	x			x		x	
	Through our contributions to (local) pooled funds			9	53%		x	x	x			x			x	x			x	x	x	
	Our humanitarian strategy puts a special emphasis on forgotten crises	4	15%	7	41%					x	x	x						x	x		x	
	We analyze CAPs and other related financial Information (FTS)	8	30%	7	41%				x			x			x		x			x	x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	2	7%	5	29%							x			x	x			x			x
	Other			3	18%						x										x	x
	We use our own assessment tools	1	4%	2	12%										x							x
10	To what extent do you consider funding imbalances across sectors in your funding decisions (*GHD 6, 14*)?																					
	We provide core funding to humanitarian partners	8	30%	14	82%	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x
	We provide flexible funding to humanitarian actors	7	26%	13	75%	x	x	x	x	x		x			x		x	x	x	x	x	x
	We focus more on situations than on sectors	3	11%	12	71%	x		x	x	x	x	x			x	x			x	x	x	x
	We actively coordinate with other donors and actors	1	4%	10	59%		x		x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x			x
	We analyze CAPs and other available information to address sectorial imbalances	9	33%	8	47%				x	x		x			x				x	x	x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	2	7%	6	35%							x			x	x			x		x	x
	Other			4	23%						x					x					x	x
11	How do you integrate information on funding from other GHD members and burden-sharing considerations into your funding allocation decisions between funding channels and crises (*GHD 6,14*)?																					
	We coordinate with other donors locally	1	4%	13	75%	x	x		x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		x	x
	We use information provided by FTS	20	74%	13	75%	x		x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x		x	x	x
	We use information provided by GHD members in our allocation decisions			4	23%				x						x						x	x
	We use EU information (COHAFA , EDRIS)	11	41%	11	65%	x		x			x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
	We ask other donors to increase their contributions	1	4%	5	29%							x	x							x	x	x
	Other			4	23%						x				x	x					x	
	Good practice you have adopted	2	7%	3	18%							x		x								x
12	How do you ensure that your funding mechanisms and channels are effective in providing organisations with flexible, predictable and timely resources ? (*GHD 5, 11, 12, 13*)																					
	We contribute to CERF	11	41%	15	88%		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	We are able to mobilize additional budget when necessary	6	22%	11	65%		x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x			x
	We allocate funds earlier (in the year) than previously			11	65%		x		x	x	x	x						x	x	x	x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	10	59%		x					x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	We consult with partners to ensure our decisions are appropriate	2	7%	10	59%	x	x		x	x	x	x		x					x		x	x
	We contribute to (local) pooled funds	2	7%	9	53%		x	x	x			x			x	x			x	x	x	
	We compare our funding mechanisms with those of other donors			8	47%			x	x	x	x	x									x	x

	Total 2013 (27 replies)	Total 2013 %	Total 2015 (17 replies)	Total 2015 %	AT	AU	BE	CA	CH	CZ	DE	EE	EU	FI	IT	JP	LI	LU	NL	SE	US
We have recently brought more flexibility in our funding mechanisms	13	48%	6	35%			x	x	x						x			x	x		
We have recently improved the predictability of our funding	19	70%	5	29%			x		x		x			x					x		
We have recently simplified /streamlined our funding mechanisms			4	23%							x				x				x	x	
Other			3	18%						x										x	x
13 What kind of mechanisms do you use to provide a fast and appropriate response to new and escalating emergencies ? (GHD 17, 18)																					
We contribute to UNDAC	5	19%	14	82%	x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
We contribute to CERF and ERRFs	11	41%	14	82%		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	
We are able to deploy national experts and rescue teams	12	44%	14	82%	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x
We rely on rapid decision procedures	13	48%	14	82%	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x
We send in-kind assistance	4	15%	10	59%	x	x		x	x	x	x	x			x	x					x
We are able to provide additional funding when necessary	5	19%	10	59%		x		x	x	x	x	x	x						x	x	x
We rely on multi-annual partnership agreements	8	30%	9	53%		x	x	x	x				x	x				x	x	x	
Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	8	47%		x			x		x		x				x		x	x	x
We pre-position humanitarian supplies	4	15%	8	47%		x		x		x	x			x					x	x	x
We support regional response mechanisms	4	15%	7	41%		x				x	x	x							x	x	x
We pre-position funds with NGOs	7	26%	6	35%					x				x		x			x		x	x
We dedicate a major share of our budget to new/escalating emergencies	1	4%	5	29%	x				x		x								x	x	
We try to mobilize private sector support	2	7%	4	23%						x								x		x	x
Other			3	18%										x	x					x	
14 What surge capacity do you have in place for contributing to international emergency response (GHD17, 18)?																					
We support UNDAC /INSARAG	6	22%	14	82%	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x
We can deploy USAR teams	8	30%	10	59%		x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x				x		x
We contribute to EU response mechanisms	5	19%	9	53%	x		x			x	x	x	x	x	x				x		
We have national experts able to second partners	18	67%	8	47%		x		x	x	x			x	x						x	x
We contribute through a support to rosters (GENCAP , PROCAP)	3	11%	7	41%	x	x	x	x	x		x										x
We have in-kind stockpiles	10	37%	7	41%		x		x	x	x					x	x					x
Other			5	29%						x			x	x	x					x	
Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	4	23%						x			x	x							x
15 In case you have a rapid response mechanism , how do you coordinate its deployment with other relevant stakeholders (GHD 17,18)?																					
We have established internal coordination mechanisms between the different nationals stakeholders (NGOs , army, other specialized institutions)	16	59%	12	71%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x			x		x
We coordinate at EU level (regionally or globally)	17	63%	10	59%	x		x		x	x	x	x	x		x			x	x		
We coordinate through the humanitarian clusters	3	11%	8	47%		x		x	x	x	x	x	x								x
We rely on the appeals	2	7%	7	41%				x			x			x	x				x	x	x
We do it on ad hoc basis	1	4%	5	29%					x					x	x	x			x		

		Total 2013 (27 replies)	Total 2013 %	Total 2015 (17 replies)	Total 2015 %	AT	AU	BE	CA	CH	CZ	DE	EE	EU	FI	IT	JP	LI	LU	NL	SE	US
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	4	23%							x		x						x		x
	We rely on demand of agencies in the field	3	11%	4	23%				x	x										x		x
	Other			2	12%				x							x						
16	How do you ensure that multilateral and NGO partners are accountable for their results and that the related administrative burden does not interfere with effective and efficient humanitarian assistance (*GHD 16, 22, 23*)?																					
	We require reports focused on results	8	30%	15	88%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x		x	x
	We use external evaluation	5	19%	14	82%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x		x	x	x	x	x
	We hold regular consultations with partners	7	26%	14	82%		x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	We have a standardized reporting form for NGOs	4	15%	11	65%	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x			x		
	We do it through regular participation in the boards of agencies and donor support groups	5	19%	11	65%		x		x	x		x		x	x	x			x	x	x	x
	We limit the number of reports requested	16	59%	11	65%	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x				x		x
	We have field staff (embassies cooperation offices, ..) trained to monitor the results of humanitarian activities	1	4%	9	53%					x	x			x	x	x	x			x	x	x
	We have monitoring mechanisms in the field we can rely on	7	26%	5	29%					x				x	x						x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	4	23%							x		x			x					x
	Other			3	18%															x	x	x
17	How do you support research; policy development; evaluations and analysis of your own activities and that of other stakeholders; and sharing of good practice and lessons learnt (*GHD 21, 22*)?																					
	We do it through our participation to the GHD or similar groups	5	19%	16	94%		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	We participate to OECD/DAC peer reviews	6	22%	15	88%	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	We do it through our dialogue with NGOs	9	33%	14	82%	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	We support humanitarian training	2	7%	13	75%		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x	x	x
	We share lessons learned from monitoring and evaluations with other donors and stakeholders	20	74%	10	59%				x	x	x	x		x		x	x			x	x	x
	We cooperate with other stakeholders to produce strategy papers and /or good practice guidelines	2	7%	8	47%				x	x		x	x	x		x					x	x
	We participate in joint evaluations	11	41%	6	35%				x	x				x	x		x			x		
	We support academic research and think tanks	15	56%	6	35%		x		x	x										x	x	x
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	3	18%									x	x							x
	Other			1	6%																x	
18	What documented change in policy, practice or decision-making have you undertaken as the result of lessons learnt from evaluations, peer reviews and other forms of learning (*GHD 21, 22*)?																					
	The links between humanitarian action and resilience strengthening activities have been improved	3	11%	12	71%	x	x			x	x			x	x		x	x		x	x	x	x
	We have developed new tools/procedures/guidelines	11	41%	12	71%		x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x
	The links between humanitarian action and development have been improved	2	7%	10	59%				x			x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	Thematic issues are better mainstreamed	2	7%	7	41%	x				x	x	x		x	x							x
	We use evaluations more systematically	7	26%	7	41%	x		x				x		x			x		x			x
	We have improved our civil-military coordination	1	4%	6	35%		x		x	x							x			x		x
	The agreements with partners have been improved	3	11%	6	35%			x				x	x	x	x						x	

		Total 2013 (27 replies)	Total 2013 %	Total 2015 (17 replies)	Total 2015 %	AT	AU	BE	CA	CH	CZ	DE	EE	EU	FI	IT	JP	LI	LU	NL	SE	US
	We better share lessons learned with other donors	1	4%	5	29%					x				x		x				x		x
	Changes have been brought in the selection of partners			5	29%			x				x	x		x					x		
	Good practice you have adopted	2	7%	5	29%							x	x		x					x		x
	Our humanitarian policy has been totally reviewed and redesigned	18	67%	4	23%		x	x				x							x			
	Other			3	18%				x						x						x	
19	How do you integrate feedback from beneficiaries in your humanitarian assistance (*GHD 21, 22*)?																					
	We require partners to involve beneficiaries in the program cycle	9	33%	15	88%	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
	We review partners reports to ensure beneficiaries are actually involved	9	33%	14	82%		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
	We rely on information drawn from evaluation	6	22%	12	71%	x	x	x		x	x			x	x	x			x	x	x	x
	We rely on field monitoring	6	22%	10	59%	x			x	x	x	x		x	x		x				x	x
	We support HAP or other similar initiatives	4	15%	7	41%		x	x		x		x				x					x	x
	We fund (a) project(s) focused on beneficiary feedback	1	4%	4	23%					x				x							x	x
	Other			3	18%									x						x	x	
	Good practice you have adopted	1	4%	3	18%							x		x								x
	We use beneficiary feedback to improve the response	4	15%	3	18%					x	x											x
	We use media reports	1	4%	2	12%										x	x						
	We use information provided by a specific feedback tool	1	4%																			

Key to read the table:
• Responses are arranged according to importance in 2015
• If the number of responses out of 17 is higher than the number of responses out of 27, then we can conclude that there is progress <mark style="background:#92d050">(green background)</mark>, because even if you would have 27 responses there would still be progress if none of the 10 "missing" responses would have ticked the box.
• If the number of responses out of 17 is lower than the number of responses out of 27, there can still be progress (<mark style="background:yellow">yellow background</mark>: lower number of replies than in 2013, but still % progress in comparison to 2013) or the result is inconclusive (white background: lower number of replies and no % progress in comparison to 2013), because it is possible that all or some of the 10 "missing" responses would have ticked the box, which could still have indicated progress.
• **Response in bold: most progress in comparison to 2013**
• Response in purple: 2nd most progress in comparison to 2013
• Response in blue: 3rd most progress in comparison to 2013
• *Response in italic: least progress in comparison to 2013*

1. How are the GHD principles integrated into your government / institution strategy and policy framework (*GHD 1, 2, 3)*?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 clearly shows overall progress in the indicators.

The integration of the principles in criteria for the analysis of humanitarian projects/ programs indicates most progress and is most widely used together with references in other guidelines, development strategy and in annual planning documents.

The least progress was made with respect to references to the principles in the law.

Other specific comments:

FI : GHD Principles are a basis for Finland's Humanitarian Policy.

IT: Clear reference to core humanitarian principles is stated in the general law on international development cooperation (Law n. 125/2014). Explicit reference to GHD principles can be found in the three year programming and policy document for Development Cooperation 2015-2018. Finally, clear reference to GHD principles is also stated in the new procedures for relief and humanitarian aid initiatives carried out in partnership with civil society organizations, developed by the Office for Emergencies and Fragile States of the newly established Italian Agency for Development Cooperation.

SE : The GHD principles constitute an important basis for Sweden's humanitarian assistance. The Government's Overarching Aid Policy Framework (2014), stresses that Swedish humanitarian assistance should be based on the GHD principles. The Government's humanitarian strategy for the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), which bases its goals and perspectives on the GHD principles, further operationalizes the principles.

US: Used in internal guidance and decision-making.

Good practice you have adopted:

AU : In 2013, DFAT (then AusAID) published the Protection in Humanitarian Action Framework which guides Australia's commitment to improving the safety of people affected by natural and human-induced crises. It elaborates on commitments to protection in the current Humanitarian Action Policy and will remain current when the Humanitarian Action Policy is redeveloped. The goal of the framework is to improve the safety of people affected by natural and human-induced crises, and relates to humanitarian action provided by DFAT in developing countries. The framework has been developed through extensive consultations with governments, and humanitarian multilateral and non-government organisations. The framework guides DFAT's approach to protecting the safety, dignity and rights of populations affected by humanitarian crises. It explains what DFAT means by protection in humanitarian action, how we define our priorities in this area, and what we will do as we deliver humanitarian protection as part of our aid program.

DE: 1) Quality Profile set up as a pre-condition for funding requires sound description how the organization has incorporated these principles into the structure and work of the organization. 2) Decision making on funding is not dependent from the political division.

EU: DG ECHO's humanitarian aid mandate is embedded in Council Regulation (EC) Nº 1257/96 of 20 June 1996 concerning humanitarian aid. According to it, EU's humanitarian aid shall comprise of assistance, relief and protection operations, conducted on a non-discriminatory basis to help people in third countries and especially the most vulnerable among them. In 2007, the Council of the European Union, the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, the European Parliament and the European Commission signed the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid. Through the European Consensus, the Commission and all EU Member States committed to the GHD principles and to working together, with others, to seek to apply donor best practice. The EU also undertook to promote a substantive debate on elements of best donor practice and how this translates into better assistance for crisis-affected people. In so doing, it highlighted the need for a broader international partnership approach bringing together donors, implementing partners and other stakeholders, to build upon the existing body of standards and best practice. As defined in Article 214 TFEU (2007), the EU's operations in the field of humanitarian aid are intended to provide ad hoc assistance and relief for people in third countries who are victims of natural or man-made disasters. The framework for such operations should be, as for any other external action, the principles and objectives of the Union's external action, which includes, amongst other things, the principle of 'solidarity' and the objective of 'assist[ing] populations, countries and regions confronting natural or man-made disasters'. Article 214 TFEU moreover reiterates the principles of humanitarian aid, these being respect for international law and the principles of impartiality, neutrality and non-discrimination. Reference to these GHD Principles is also made in DG ECHO's annual operational strategy, such as in the "General Guidelines on Operational Priorities for Humanitarian Aid in 2013".

FI : Needs based approach to funding allocations. Not using humanitarian assistance as a political or crises management tool

LI : Several basic objectives of the GHD principles form part of the Law on International Humanitarian Cooperation and Development (IHCD Act) of 2007, which is the current legal basis of all forms of humanitarian and development policy of the State of Liechtenstein and of the Liechtenstein Development Service (LED). The principle of non-discrimination for example is enshrined in article 1 of the IHCD Act. Article 4 of the IHCD Act stresses explicitly that the emergency and reconstruction assistance shall reflect the needs and the urgency of the situation, without restrictions in regard to content or geography. Further reference to these principles can be found in the strategy for the emergency and reconstruction assistance, a paper adopted by the Government of Liechtenstein in 2008. This strategy is currently under revision. The urgency of the situation is the main criteria for providing assistance, and there shall be no thematic or geographic priority areas. A special focus shall be given to forgotten crises and underfunded programmes.

NL: Based on GHD principles, NL provides as much as possible unearmarked, flexible and long term funding to partners (UN funds and implementing UN agencies, Red Cross and NGO's). The evaluation department of the Ministry (IOB) recently evaluated NL humanitarian policy for the period 2009-2014 and concluded that the NL scored well on meeting GHD criteria. Adherence to GHD principles and criteria was part of the ToR of the evaluation.

SE : As the goals of the humanitarian strategy for Sida is based on the GHD principles, the annual results-report also constitutes a progress report on implementing the GHD principles. In addition to provide an update on the implementation of the principles, it also allows a reminder on what these goals are and that they are still very relevant.

US: Reporting from multilateral organizations. The USG helped draft and is a signatory to the GHD principles. The principles therefore serve as a de facto guide to the efforts of the USG's core humanitarian offices. Some non-public strategy frameworks and policy guidance reference the principles as well. Publically on the GHD website, the U.S. commits to the principles of humanity, impartiality, and universality. The USG is also developing internal guidance for its humanitarian and political staff on the humanitarian principles and why they are critical to USG humanitarian affairs. The guidance is a means to reaffirm the humanitarian principles, provide a buffer for implementing partners for political decision-making, and find ways for political leadership to consider ways to preserve humanitarian principles.

2. How do you co-operate with other relevant ministries/departments to ensure that GHD principles are respected in other policies and programs (development, security, economic, etc.) *(GHD 2, 4, 19, 20)*?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

Regular advocacy for GHD principles by the service in charge of humanitarian aid shows most progress and is by far considered the most preferred way of cooperation with other relevant ministries/ departments to ensure respect for the principles.

The least progress was made with respect to joint trainings.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with the establishment of formal cooperation mechanisms between relevant departments and the legal obligation to cooperate and consult each other.

Other specific comments:

IT: The GHD Guidelines for Humanitarian Aid – adopted in June 2012 – established that in case of major disasters institutional table are convened by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation (MFAIC) to tackle and coordinate the first phase of emergency response, in collaboration with the possible involved actors (Civil Protection, Italian Red Cross, NGOs, Regions, Military Assets).

SE : Inter-departmental policy coherence on humanitarian action hinges on the government system of Cabinet decision-making and letters of appropriation applicable to all relevant departments. Coordination between humanitarian policy and funding occurs regularly between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and Sida at the level of Head of Department in a Humanitarian Consultative Group (HUMSAM).

Good practice you have adopted:

AU : The Talisman Sabre exercise series is a bilateral United States-Australia combined exercise focused on the planning and conduct of a 'high end, mid-intensity' war fighting activity. The exercise is held every two years and is Australia's largest military exercise. DFAT civilian officers have played an increasing role in the preparation, planning and conduct of the exercise since 2011. By placing DFAT staff as active participants, both civilian and military staff are able to increase their understanding of the complexities of a crisis response and DFAT staff have been able to influence and educate their military counterparts on the importance of effective humanitarian action and recovery principles. In addition to Government agency involvement, DFAT has worked closely with the Australian Civil Military Centre to include the participation of civilian humanitarian agencies - the World Food Program, UN OCHA, the ICRC and the Australian Red Cross - in the exercise. These agencies have been involved in the Talisman Sabre series since 2009 and their involvement has also increasing over that time.

CH: Joint country cooperation strategies between development and humanitarian offices in the field, Joint missions in the field.

DE: 1) Regular meetings on relevant issues with other departments, ministries and NGOs for information exchange and discussion. 2) Formal meeting mechanism (4 meetings per year), other ministries, departments and NGOs, as well as parliamentarians and academia being formal members of this mechanism.

EU: DG ECHO is a separate Directorate-General in charge of Humanitarian Assistance and Civil Protection in the European Commission, but closely linked up to other parts of the Commission that deal with external relations and to the European External Action Service. This organisational set-up allows DG ECHO to put a strong emphasis on a needs-based approach and on the need for all EU institutions to respect the humanitarian principles. This is also governed by the 2007 Lisbon Treaty which sets out (Art. 214) that humanitarian aid operations shall be "conducted in compliance with the principles of international law and with the principles of impartiality, neutrality and non-discrimination."

FI : Finland's humanitarian policy went through a stakeholder consultation process before it was finalized.

IT: After the earthquake in Nepal (2015), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation and the Italian Department of Civil Protection drafted a specific cooperation agreement in case of major disasters to foster Italian response to the emergencies caused by natural disasters. The Memorandum of Understanding is currently under revision following the establishment of the Italian Agency for Development Cooperation.
Moreover, humanitarian offices in the Directorate General for Development Cooperation and in the Italian Agency continue to reach out other Directorates of the MFAIC, as well as other institutional partners to ensure that core humanitarian principles are not minimized in political decision-making.

LI : Liechtenstein has no own military and the State does not engage in economic cooperation. Insofar the IHCD is the only area within the administration where the GHD principles are of relevance. The Office for Foreign Affairs which is responsible not only for the emergency and reconstruction assistance but also for the overall coordination within IHCD, makes sure that the other relevant actors in the field of the bilateral and multilateral development cooperation are aware of the GHD principles. Liechtenstein is closely working together with the respective agencies in Switzerland and Austria in the humanitarian field. Also in these contexts GHD principles are discussed.

NL: The Humanitarian Aid cluster advices and works with Regional Departments and Embassies and informs these departments and embassies on humanitarian policy.

US: The USG's Humanitarian Policy Working Group (HPWG)'s strategic goals include improving other parts of our government's understanding of and adherence to humanitarian principles. The USG's humanitarian offices also continually reach out to other parts of USAID and the State Department to ensure the principles are not minimized in broader political decision-making. The group engages the U.S. Department of Defense extensively in this regard. The USG also relies on military liaison officers stationed at Combatant Commands in non-disaster times and deployed with the military during mega-crises for which the U.S. military is providing unique capabilities. HPWG fully recognizes, however, the challenges politics and foreign policy objectives can present to elevating humanitarian principles to assume an equal role and adjuring compliance with them. The U.S. also references GHD principles frequently when engaging UN governing bodies.

3. Which processes have you identified for engaging with humanitarian partner organisations in order to ensure their understanding and implementation of key humanitarian principles and codes of conduct in their programming (GHD 2,4,15,16)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators. The selection of experienced partners and the engagement in dialogue with NGOs are considered to be the most important processes for engagement with partners. Increased attention is given to participation in governing bodies of agencies or donor support groups and to dialogue with the private sector. The least progress was made with respect to the organization of seminars and trainings.

Other specific comments:

FI: Private Sector becoming increasingly a partner; support ALNAP, SPHERE, HAP etc. kind of initiatives in principle but funding has not been possible due budgetary constraints.

EU: We hold annual dialogues with some of our key partners.

SE : Examples of processes include: In order for Sida to identify a limited number of strategic humanitarian CSO partners, an assessment was undertaken, which among others assessed the organizations understanding and implementation of key humanitarian principles and codes of conduct in their programming. Sweden through Sida support ICVA and its work to increase awareness of the importance of the humanitarian principles. ICVA has also focused its attention to addressing the gap between policy and practice, by holding workshops on the humanitarian principles and Code of Conduct in partnership with the ICRC. Sweden through Sida has also supported the preparation of the Humanitarian Core Standard (CHS) through its support to and engagement with the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP) aimed at joining various standards and putting crises affected people at the centre of humanitarian assistance.

Good practice you have adopted:

CH: Close monitoring in the field (meetings and joint field mission).

DE: 1) Monitoring visits have become a regular element of our work with partner organizations. 2) Projects of partner organizations /NGOs that promote the implementation of HAP and SPHERE as well as the CHS are being funded by us, on the condition of having a multiplication value towards other NGOs, e.g. through seminars and trainings.

EU: DG ECHO channels its funding through NGOs, the Red Cross movement and the UN system on a basis of partnership agreements which lay down the requirement of respect for the humanitarian principles. In order to become a partner of DG ECHO, NGOs have to confirm that they subscribe to the humanitarian principles. They have to explain what quality standards (such as Sphere or HAP) they apply as an organisation. Our partnership agreements also specify that a grant can be awarded only if the action complies with the fundamental humanitarian principles. In case of breach of the respect of the humanitarian principles, DG ECHO can end a contract, and require that the funding be reimbursed to DG ECHO or end its partnership with the organisation which failed to comply altogether. In addition, the EC places a strong emphasis on strategic dialogue and working with partners both operationally and on policy-related issues in Brussels and in the field through the extensive network of ECHO humanitarian experts and regional and country offices.

IT: The Italian Agency is currently developing new procedures for humanitarian aid initiatives that will take into account engagement with partners.

SE : Due to the importance of the matter Sweden through Sida has worked closely with the Advance Training on Humanitarian Action (ATHA) at Harvard University during 2015 in order to enhance the knowledge and understanding of the humanitarian principles in humanitarian action including negotiations among humanitarian practitioners. This work has taken place on a regional level.

US: USG humanitarian offices require that international organizations and NGOs adopt codes of conduct in order to receive funding. PRM instituted a requirement that its staff complete training in the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse in humanitarian settings. Within USAID/OFDA's grant guidelines, agency proposals must observe the protection principles including: minimizing any unintended negative effects of your intervention that can increase people's vulnerability to both physical and psychosocial risks and result in harm, exploitation, and abuse; arranging for people's meaningful access to impartial assistance and services in proportion to need and without any barriers; setting up mechanisms through which affected populations can measure the adequacy of interventions or address concerns and complaints; and supporting the development of self-protection capacities of individuals and communities. USAID/OFDA requires implementing partners to take steps to ensure that programs reach older people and people with disabilities within the target population. The USG funds ALNAP, SPHERE, HAP and other organizations that try to elevate codes of conduct and humanitarian principles.

4. How are disaster risk reduction, capacity development and crisis mitigation integrated into all relevant strategies, including development cooperation and humanitarian assistance programs, to ensure coherence between humanitarian and development aid (*GHD 8*)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators. The most preferred way for donors is to ask partners to integrate disaster risk reduction, capacity development and crisis mitigation in their programs. Most progress was made with flexible financing. Donors are increasingly convinced that financing modalities are already flexible enough to ensure coherence between humanitarian and development aid. The least progress was made with the enhancement of internal expertise and follow-up capacities for more coherence between these dimensions.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with the establishment of policies and mechanisms that enhance coherence between DRR, capacity development and crisis mitigation.

Other specific comments:

CAN : For some crisis contexts we establish an interdepartmental task force in order to leverage and coordinate the various capacities of different parts of the Ministry and also other Departments.

FI : DRR tool exists as a part of programme/project implementation guidelines.

NL: Policy on DRR is integrated in the humanitarian policy framework. The implementation of DRR policies is divided between 2 departments of the MFA. Mitigation and Risk Reduction policies are implemented by IGG Department, while the Preparation component is managed by the Humanitarian Aid cluster. Coherence could be better between the 2 departments. In the policy framework it is stated that DRR should be integrated in the 15 Dutch partner country programmes. However, limited systemic monitoring of implementation of the policy intentions takes place. In our unearmarked funding to partners, we allow our partners to use money for organizational development. We also have a separate budget line for preparedness capacity building. So a (limited) part of our budget is going to capacity building.

SE : Even if resilience primarily is a development issue, humanitarian assistance can and should also contribute. Sweden through Sida does this through integrating the two perspectives of disaster risk reduction (DRR) and early recovery (ER) in its humanitarian assistance (Governments Humanitarian Strategy for Sida 2011-2014). This means that Sweden through Sida promotes mainstreaming DRR and ER in its own and partner-organization's analysis and programmes, support targeted DRR/ER interventions and promote synergies with longer-term development cooperation. As a result, Sweden through Sida supports specific DRR projects from the humanitarian budget and hence is an important actor for the strengthening the global DRR system (GFDRR, UNISDR and Huairou). Most humanitarian partners integrate DRR and early recovery in analysis and programming. Such an approach also includes providing rapid humanitarian assistance at deteriorating situations, provide multi-sectoral and multi-year humanitarian support, support food security rather than food aid, support DRR at local levels and support partner organizations that work with both short and long term issues. With the increased focus on resilience within the longer-term development cooperation, much progress has been made over the past year. There is increased awareness of the need for a common context analysis, based on various risks and vulnerabilities. Resilience is also increasingly included in new geographical development strategies. This has contributed to strengthening the synergies between humanitarian and development financing at several levels such as working in the same sector / area (mainly health and food security) or with the same issues such as long-term solutions for refugees and IDPs or DRR. In some contexts the same channels are supported from humanitarian and development funding, in others resilience-programs are funded from both humanitarian and development budgets. In addition, Sweden through Sida has entered into a partnership with USAID and the Rockefeller Foundation in the Global Resilience Partnership (GRP) with a focus on the Sahel, the Horn of Africa and Asia. We also follow the OECD/DAC work on risk and resilience and strengthen our internal capacity about resilience.

US: The USG has specific guidelines and policies for transitioning humanitarian programs to longer term programming that considers DRR and capacity building.

Good practice you have adopted:

AU : In 2014, Australia released a new development policy Australian aid: promoting prosperity, reducing poverty, enhancing stability. The policy outlined six investment priorities, including one focused on - Building resilience: humanitarian assistance, disaster risk reduction and social protection. This priority area purposefully brings together Australia's efforts to build resilience through all aspects of humanitarian action as well as other key investments in social protection and climate change mitigation. This investment priority will be opertionalised through the development of an updated Humanitarian Strategy which will for the first time

provide one strategic DFAT's investment in disaster risk reduction, preparedness, humanitarian response and recovery and stabilistaion activities. The new strategy is expected to be finalized in late 2015.

CH: Building-up of a Centre de compétences à Haïti in order to train the masons for building back better, started with humanitarian funding and then development funding. Joint strategies enables such integration.

Appui au Dispositif de prévention et de gestion de crises au Niger et même au Mali. Avec un mix de financement AH et développement et un dialogue « politique » conjoint AH-RC. Et on s'assure que d'autres partenaires importants vis-à-vis de ces Dispositifs, comme le PAM, jouent le jeu et les appuient également.

DE: 1) Our NGO partners are explicitly encouraged to include capacity building and DRR components in their projects. 2) Last year our annual retreat with NGOs focused on capacity building and strengthening local partners, underlining the importance of these issues. This has proved a good basis for our cooperation with NGO partners.

EU: Over the years, DG ECHO has made substantive and pioneering efforts in DRR, particularly with the flagship DIPECHO (Disaster Preparedness ECHO) programme. DG ECHO's investment in DRR has increased significantly in the last decade, in funding and related activities. From an initial focus on piloting and replicating a community-based disaster risk management approach, DG ECHO has developed a more comprehensive people-centred approach, including engaging with institutions at all levels. The Commission adopted a Communication in 2012 entitled 'The EU approach to resilience –learning from food security crises'. It proposes a strategic approach to guide aid strategies in order to increase aid effectiveness and to deliver maximum results with limited resources. The Commission is proposing a range of measures to increase resilience, including systematic analysis of risks and vulnerabilities, joint frameworks of action between humanitarian and development actors and greater flexibility in funding for transition situations. An action plan for Resilience in crisis-prone countries was also adopted in 2013. Moreover, ECHO has issued the EU Resilience compendium in 2015 giving a number of examples to show that systematic consideration of resilience options, early and sustained cooperation between different actors and most importantly, putting people first, leads to more effective development and humanitarian support. DG ECHO advocates proactively within the Commission on a wide range of EU policy areas to ensure that disaster risk management aspects (impacting both within Europe and on third countries) are fully incorporated into all relevant policies. Finally, as part of this longer-term approach, the Commission under the lead of DG ECHO has played an important role in the shaping of the new Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. Many elements of the EU's disaster risk reduction policy have been included as recommendations in the new Framework Particularly notable in relation to humanitarian aid and development funding is the recommendation 47 d 'Incorporate disaster risk reduction measures into multilateral and bilateral development assistance programmes within and across all sectors, as appropriate, related to poverty reduction, sustainable development, natural resource management, environment, urban development and adaptation to climate change' Commissions services are currently analyzing this and the other recommendations to determine the implications for EU policy making and financial instruments.

IT: The Office for Emergencies and Fragile States of the Italian Agency is in charge of financing relief, DRR and resilience interventions, enhancing coherence between humanitarian and development aid.

LI : Liechtenstein's Emergency and reconstruction assistance encompasses short-term and urgent measures to preserve human life and to alleviate the consequences of disasters, political crises and armed conflicts, medium-term development of social structures and infrastructure as well as preventive measures. Disaster Risk reduction and capacity development are two important components within the field of preventive measures. Within the multilateral and bilateral development cooperation we place strong emphasis on sustainable development and the protection of the nature. Rural development is one of the priority issues, which includes the promotion of a sustainable agriculture that respects and protects the landscape. Very often development projects contain a specific element for environmental or energy related issues. In addition, food security is a cross-cutting issue that we will follow more closely in the future.

SE : The integration of DRR and ER in the humanitarian strategy for Sida has been a good point of departure to integrate ER and DRR in humanitarian action as well as strengthening synergies with development cooperation to enhance resilience and impact.

US: The USG integrates disaster risk reduction, capacity development and crisis mitigation into the majority of its response programs, in accordance with GHD principles, to provide humanitarian assistance in ways that are supportive of recovery and long-term development. Risk reduction and capacity building are strategically incorporated into country development strategies, ensuring that development and humanitarian programs share common and cohesive goals toward strengthening the abilities of governments and communities to prevent, prepare for, mitigate and respond to humanitarian crises. USAID/OFDA provides funding for capacity building for local organizations implementing humanitarian assistance, either directly or with the support of an experienced organization or consultants, as well as for national and local government response agencies. Within its proposal guidelines, USAID/OFDA also requires agencies to assess the range of local skills, capacities, and resources that can be used to respond to and recover from the emergency. Within program strategies partners must consider whether proposed programs will be implemented as part of a larger strategy, how the program may augment government or local capacity, and how results will feed into longer-term programs or plans of other entities.

5. What funding instruments and mechanisms do you use to support the effective transition out of emergency into recovery, and to build co-ordination and response capacity as well as to strengthen resilience of affected states and/or communities (*GHD 9)*?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators with most progress being made in the use of bilateral development cooperation funding, and emphasis on NGO and multilateral funding.

The least progress was made in mixing humanitarian and development instruments.

Other specific comments:

NL: Most of humanitarian funding is going to responding to humanitarian needs, but in some cases it is used for early recovery and building resistance. In many emergencies there is a thin grey line between addressing humanitarian needs and addressing (early) recovery needs. Having said this, the difference between humanitarian and development funds is important for donors and implementers, but people affected by disaster do not distinguish relief and development. The divide between humanitarian aid and development partially exists because of the "independence" of humanitarian aid from the rest of policies (humanitarian imperative). With the increase of and the increased length of protracted crises, it is in increasingly becoming clear that we need to address protracted crises in a different manner and use both humanitarian aid (to address short term humanitarian needs) and development aid (to address resilience needs and root causes) of affected people and host communities. We are starting to do this at scale around the Syria crisis.

SE : Sweden contributes with substantial financial support to various funds and mechanisms related to disaster risk reduction. For example, Sweden is one of the largest donors to the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR), the World Bank's Climate Investment Funds (CIFs), the Green Climate Fund, the Adaptation Fund and the Least Developed Countries Fund. Even if resilience primarily is a development issue, humanitarian assistance can and should also contribute. Sida does this through integrating the two perspectives of disaster risk reduction (DRR) and early recovery (ER) in its humanitarian assistance (Governments Humanitarian Strategy for Sida 2011-2014). This means that Sida promotes mainstreaming DRR and ER in its own and partner-organisations analysis and programmes, support targeted DRR/ER interventions and promote synergies with longer-term development cooperation. As a result, Sida supports specific DRR projects from the humanitarian budget and hence is an important actor for the strengthening the global DRR system (GFDRR, UNISDR and Huairou). Most humanitarian partners integrate DRR and early recovery in analysis and programming. Such an approach also includes providing rapid humanitarian assistance at deteriorating situations, provide multi-sectoral and multi-year humanitarian support, support food security rather than food aid, support DRR at local levels and support partner organizations that work with both short and long term issues. With the increased focus on resilience within the longer-term development cooperation, much progress has been made over the past year. There is increased awareness of the need for a common context analysis, based on various risks and vulnerabilities. Resilience is also increasingly included in new geographical development strategies. This has contributed to strengthening the synergies between humanitarian and development financing at several levels such as working in the same sector / area (mainly health and food security) or with the same issues such as long-term solutions for refugees and IDPs or DRR. In some contexts the same channels are supported from humanitarian and development funding, in others resilience-programs are funded from both humanitarian and development budgets. In addition, Sida has entered into a partnership with USAID and the Rockefeller Foundation in the Global Resilience Partnership (GRP) with a focus on the Sahel, the Horn of Africa and Asia. We also follow the OECD/DAC work on risk and resilience and strengthen our internal capacity about resilience.

Good practice you have adopted:

AU : The Australian Civilian Corps (ACC) was formed in 2011 to bridge the gap between emergency relief and long term recovery programs, and to enhance the quality of Australia's response to situations of disaster and conflict. Since its establishment, the ACC has undertaken over 140 deployments in 20 countries, the majority in Asia and the Pacific. The ACC register is comprised of over 500 experienced civilian specialists with expertise in fields including aid coordination, disaster risk reduction, electoral assistance, health administration, engineering, and law and justice. ACC specialists deploy as Australian Government officials under the Australian Civilian Corps Act 2011. All specialists are trained and prepared in advance of deployment, and are typically deployed for between three to twelve months. The ACC's mandate is "to provide Australian specialists, primarily to help our neighbours in the Indo-Pacific region, to prevent, prepare for stabilise and recover from disasters and conflict". This allows the ACC to help build resilience of countries at risk of or emerging from conflict or disaster.

DE: 1) Project funding allows activities covering the whole spectrum of humanitarian assistance, from preparedness and DRR up to early recovery. 2) Funding Contributions to Pooled Funds, including country based PF has been increased considerably.

EU: Work to improve transition strategies in the EU is on-going, starting from the design of aid (including needs assessment) through to its implementation. Managing humanitarian and development needs in fragile states will include the development of a set of references to guide the humanitarian and development actors in

the programming and delivery of aid. However, further progress on working with the development actors in transition situations is necessary and the action plan for the Resilience Communication provides the necessary framework. The EU programming guidelines acknowledge the importance of improving synergies and complementarities between humanitarian and development aid, including through the involvement of DG ECHO experts in the preparation of the EU development actions. Nevertheless, this is an area where EU development and humanitarian actors need to work closer together in order to sustain long term development by building up the resilience of vulnerable populations. Some new financial mechanisms such as EU Trust Fund and assigned revenues allow the EU to mobilize additional funding in an innovative and coordinated way. The EU TF for CAR pools funds from the Commission (development and humanitarian funds) and Member States (MS) that are implemented in a coordinated and effective manner for LRRD/resilience. The newly established EU TF for Syria is mobilizing MS funds from the development side but possibly as well from the humanitarian side. Assigned revenues such as the DFID contribution for Sahel is another way of mobilizing MS funds in support of the EU's nutrition/resilience strategy in the region. These good practices are being developed further and replicated elsewhere, depending on the context.

IT: The Office for Emergencies and Fragile States of the Italian Agency has a financial envelope for humanitarian and recovery interventions as well as for resilience initiatives. Its budget is determined by the resources given by the annual Financial Law, as well as by the recurrent so called "International Mission Decree" to support cooperation initiatives in crisis areas, addressing both humanitarian and recovery needs. Moreover, Italy strongly supports regional EU Trust Fund mechanisms (such us the Madad Fund for the Syrian crisis, as well as of the Migration Trust Fund for Africa) which allow the use of a comprehensive range of funding modalities leading to enhanced donor coordination and EU and MS visibility.

SE : The integration of DRR and ER in the humanitarian strategy for Sida has been a good point of departure to integrate ER and DRR in humanitarian action as well as strengthening synergies with development cooperation to enhance resilience and impact.

US: The USG uses a variety of funding mechanisms to support transition, build capacity, and increase resilience. Through grants to NGO and UN partners, humanitarian assistance programs provide the foundation for effective transition, and are specifically designed to reduce risk and increase resilience. In areas of recurrent crisis, the USG is using Joint Planning Cells (JPCs) to coordinate response and longer-term development programs. These longer term programs, funded through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, are increasingly layered and sequenced with humanitarian assistance programs to ensure collaborative programming that builds resilience. The USG is promoting Relief to Development Transitions (R2DT) by incorporating planning, budgeting, and reporting on efforts to assist countries' transition into the budget cycle. The R2DT effort is an attempt to focus transitional planning and programming that will allow countries to move away from international humanitarian assistance and toward developmental interventions both internationally and domestically supported. The effort also tries to ensure that vulnerable populations are being factored into development plans, while also conserving humanitarian assistance resources. We accept that R2DT transition horizons vary greatly, though our expectation is that sustained focus on this issue as part of the budget cycle will support eventual transitions. Finally, the USG utilizes "crisis modifiers" as part of USAID/OFDA's DRR awards or through USAID Mission development projects. While an awardee is implementing a program, funds can be redirected immediately if there is an emergency or shock. Depending on the complexity of the emergency, an email or a 1-page concept paper can be submitted for approval by the grant manager and an USAID/OFDA field representative.

6. How do you verify that humanitarian organisations funded by you actively engage all relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries in all stages of the humanitarian response cycle (*GHD 7, 10)*?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

Although most progress was made in the monitoring of the implementation of IASC transformative agenda by humanitarian actors and through field visits and/ or field monitoring mechanisms, most responders verify active engagement of stakeholders through reports and evaluations.

Other specific comments:

SE : Strengthening participation of beneficiaries is a key priority for Sweden. It is also one of the goals of Sweden's humanitarian strategy for Sida. Within the evaluation of Sida's strategic partnership process, Sida evaluated among others how humanitarian partners engage affected population in the design, implementation and evaluation of the support that they are expected to receive. Sweden through Sida is also supporting the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP), including the creation of a Common Humanitarian Standard (CHS), to strengthen accountability and in particular to promote participation of affected populations. Sweden through Sida also uses a number of processes such as dialogue with partners, reports and evaluations as well as monitoring the implementation of the IASC Transformative Agenda. To ensure that humanitarian interventions reflect the different needs and opportunities of women and men, boys and girls Sida requests that projects/programmes has an integrated gender perspective and that data provided is disaggregated by gender. The IASC Gender Marker is one of the tools Sida use to ensure projects finances have a gender perspective.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: 1) During monitoring visits this issue is a separate criteria to be examined. 2) Organizations have to give comprehensive explanation on this issue, from the application through reports up to monitoring and evaluation. 3) Funding of studies and analysis on this issue (e.g. funding of ALNAP study).

EU: DG ECHO relies on its partner organisations to implement best practice in this respect. Our Framework Partnership Agreement's 'minimum standards for the implementation of humanitarian actions' include a clause requiring partners to promote the participation of beneficiaries in the establishment and implementation of projects. DG ECHO requires partners to identify how beneficiaries were involved in the design of the action. Beneficiary participation is monitored more closely for some projects than others, depending on the situation and kind of project – e.g. DIPECHO projects and, as the GHD principle implies in practice, levels of beneficiary involvement possible may depend on context and type of situation. Similar arrangements are evident in the later stages of the project cycle: DG ECHO-commissioned evaluations require external evaluators to use participative techniques during evaluations, but the monitoring and enforcement in practice could be reinforced. In addition, ECHO has introduced in its Single Form a Gender and age marker since 2014, and a Resilience marker since 2015, which is now mandatory for partners, as a way of operational check in order to ensure partners' projects funded by ECHO comply with minimum quality standards.

IT: In general implementation plans templates for bilateral initiatives, indication on coordination modalities with other local and international partners as well as stakeholders analysis is required.

SE: Sweden does not fund projects through Sida that has a Gender Marker code 0.

US: The USG provides funding to NGO and UN partners based on the most accurate needs-assessment data, which should be derived from direct engagement between its overseas staff and affected populations. USG humanitarian offices also stipulate in proposal guidelines that partners should engage beneficiary populations during all stages of the disaster cycle. We also undertake frequent field monitoring trips, which include beneficiary interviews and engagement. Additionally, the USG is using third-party monitors in locations that are inaccessible due to insecurity. These contractors are specifically hired to meet recipients of programs and to share information with both the implementing agencies and USG officials.

7. a) To what extent do you use common/multi-actor needs assessments undertaken by humanitarian organisations when deciding on your support to the international humanitarian response (*GHD 6, 14)*?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators, with emphasis on the fact that all or most responding donors use information provided by UN agencies, their embassies and NGOs.

The use of ECHO reports and other EU information made the least progress.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with respect to the use of CAPS and flash appeals.

Other specific comments:

CH: We actively support UNDAC role in emergency response.

NL: Participation in (UN led) coordination is a firm condition that we use in partner/program selection.

SE : Sida uses common/multi-actor needs assessments undertaken by humanitarian organizations when deciding on humanitarian support, including:
- UN: humanitarian needs overviews (HNO), humanitarian response plans, flash appeals and information from UN oganisations.
- EU: ECHOs Global vulnerability and crises (GVCA) as well as forgotten crises assessments that (will be replaced by Inform index) and the Humanitarian Implementation Plans (HIPs).
- Red Cross/Red Crescent appeals
- NGOs: we use information from both NGO and UN.
- Field staff: We have input and consultation with field staff.
- Methods organizations: we support and use ACAPS tools and ALNAPs reports
- In addition Sweden encourages partners to engage in common needs assessments such as Multi-cluster sector/initial rapid Assessment (MIRA) and use the Humanitarian Needs Assessment – The good Enough Guide.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: Each and every funding decision is being taken on the basis of at least two of the above mentioned instruments.

EU: DG ECHO is pushing for a coordinated needs assessment approach whenever these are feasible particularly in the early phases of a disaster with as much as possible consolidated core and common information on humanitarian crises to inform decision-makers. DG ECHO supports the work on needs assessment led by OCHA, as well as the (time-limited) ACAPS needs assessment capacity project. A significant investment in information management has also been made by ECHO via OCHA. Good practice example at country-level: ECHO support to the Join Needs Assessment (JNA) in Bangladesh, facilitated by ACAPS. The JNA products were seen as a very valuable source for ECHO field in understanding different crises situations, including affected people vulnerabilities and the broader impact of disasters. As such, they were useful for ECHO evidence-base programming in country. Several donors also found the JNA information as useful sources in prioritising funding allocations and coordinating their actions so as to avoid any overlaps and double funding (allowing for coherent and efficient donor actions, in line with the GHD principles). In addition, common understanding of situation through coordinated assessment is useful for donors' shared analysis, but also for potential collaboration between humanitarian and development actors as well as for engaging 'non-traditional humanitarian' stakeholders; e.g. climate change, as well as long-term development stakeholders.

IT: The Italian Cooperation uses a variety of common and multi-actor needs assessments as a basis for evaluation of its humanitarian response, including: Humanitarian Needs Overview and response plans, flash appeals and Red Cross/Red Crescent response funds (DREFs) or Appeals, ECHO Global Vulnerability and crisis (GVCA) and forgotten crisis assessments, Inform index as well as data gathered from dedicated websites (Reliefweb and Humanitarian info, Inter Agency Information sharing portals). We also refer to ECHO/ERCC and UNDAC reports as well as other specific thematic platforms (DRR) .

LI : When deciding on how to assist in a humanitarian emergency situation we always rely on common needs assessments, if they are available. We appreciate the UN appeals where you easily see all needs and all humanitarian organizations applying for funds in one document. We believe in the advantages of the cluster approach and the shared but clear responsibilities. We tend to choose organizations or clusters that are strongly underfunded.

SE : A systematic use of the various tools within the allocation process (see question 8).

US: The USG primarily relies on the expert analysis of USG field staff, which informs many of our funding decisions. The staff are directly engaged with the organizations conducting the assessments where the disaster is occurring/occurred. Additionally, the USG use and supports common-needs assessments through our funding to the Assessment Capacities Project (ACAPs) and to Consolidated Appeals, which increasingly rely on the Multi-Cluster Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA). These are all in addition to relying on data coming from cluster- or OCHA-coordinated needs assessments. We continue to advocate within multilateral policy and coordination fora, building coherence across the multiple tools that exist in the international humanitarian architecture. Though assessments do play a part in funding decisions, the lack of coherence and gaps in accurate secondary data preclude the USG from providing resources based exclusively on the basis of common-needs assessments.

7. b. How do you use common/multi-actor needs assessments ?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

Almost all responding donors refer to common needs assessments in their funding decisions process.

The least progress was made with respect to use of common needs assessments to categorize countries and situations.

Other specific comments:
SE : Sweden through Sida uses common/multi actors needs assessments as basis for our humanitarian allocation process deciding where, what and who to fund (see question 8).

Good practice you have adopted:
EU: See an example from Bangladesh from Q7.a. Also, the Integrated Analysis Framework, as ECHO's central annual needs assessment exercise, which includes detailed country and sub-country crises assessments and results in countries' analysis reports used for prioritisation and programming, should refer to relevant and available secondary data, information and analysis from existing and available common/multi-actor needs assessments in country. **SE :** Sweden through Sida uses the tools as a basis for the allocation process. **US:** The USG often relies on the needs assessments and prioritization that result in the Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs) and Strategic Response Plans (SRPs). The data, combined with the information the USG's field-based humanitarian advisors obtained from their own assessments and conversations with partners, result in who the USG chooses to fund. Additionally, the data from common needs assessments contribute to the USG's decisions on how much to allocate to a response and serves as a justification to our legislature.

8. Please detail the criteria and tools you use to decide who, where and what to fund (GHD 6,14)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

Most donor responses indicate that the needs of the affected population, budget availability and the capacities of the humanitarian actors on the ground come first, whereas most progress was made with donors taking into account the quality of the proposal, the availability of the necessary budget and the funding level of a crisis.

The least progress was made with respect to sectorial priorities.

Other specific comments:

CA : With regards to thematic priorities Canada believes that protection risks are particularly acute for certain groups, such as women and children, who have a heightened vulnerability to sexual and gender-based violence, trafficking, and other forms of abuse. Therefore, we do provide some thematic funding for themes such as sexual and gender based violence and child protection and education.

EU: Levels of vulnerability/needs of vulnerable groups; Access and security to operate; donor's potential value added/comparative advantage; all protracted crises (long-term) and rapid onset crises (including natural and man-made crises); poor overall response (including weak government/local response); contexts where intervention is difficult; risk of natural disaster.

FI : Needs based approach, with emphasis on poorest countries and most vulnerable populations. However, if needs are there assistance is provided also to ODA eligible middle income countries.

IT: Decision on the allocations is strictly dependent on budget availability, especially for those crisis situations funded through ad hoc financial Laws such us the previously mentioned "International Mission Decree". Under the new framework of the Italian Cooperation System, the MFAIC issues guidelines for the planning of activities in the countries and areas of interventions, manages the relations with the international organizations and inter-governmental agencies competent for development cooperation and establishes the overall annual amount to be allocated to each of them. According to the new Development Cooperation Law (n.125/2014), emergency interventions are decided by the MFAIC and implemented by the Italian Agency.

NL: A large part (50%) of our budget goes as unearmarked contribution to UN agencies/ funds, Red Cross (ICRC and IFRC), NGO's. For our unearmarked contributions we demand that partners abide to humanitarian principles and international quality standards. Another part (40%) is allocated to specific crises. For allocation of amounts to crises we use a methodology based on a) Inform Index b) UN data om humanitarian needs of affected populations c) funding gaps d) we look at implementation capacities on the ground (especially in conflict related crisis), quality of the proposals. We allocate our contributions in line with our available budget. In case of need we ask our parliament for extra money (2015: 110 million Euro additionally approved for Syria crises).

SE : Sweden's humanitarian funding is allocated through Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Sida (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency). The total envelope for 2014 was about 5,2 billion Swedish crowns, of which 42 percent was allocated as primarily unearmarked core support to multilateral humanitarian organizations or funds through the MFA – based on an assessment of their relevance, efficiency and capacity – and the remaining 58 percent as primarily country or project support through Sida. Sweden's humanitarian assistance is based on humanitarian principles and should therefore be needs-based. To ensure a needs-based allocation, Sida has developed a method for allocating its humanitarian assistance between and within crises.
First, of its budget of around 3 billion SKR, Sida allocates around 60% of the humanitarian budget to large humanitarian crises, 10% to smaller humanitarian crises and 25% as a reserve for new crises or worsening situations during the year. The remaining is for global support such as support for DRR and methods support.
Based on 13 criteria, including "number of people in need" (Humanitarian Response Plan),"vulnerability of populations" (ECHOs Global Vulnerability and Crises assessment, now becoming Inform Index), including if it is a "forgotten crises" (ECHO) and "level of financing" (Humanitarian Response Plan), Sida identifies a number of large humanitarian crises (18 in 2015) and suggest a draft allocation for each crises, based on the 60% of the budget. For each of these crises, Sida develops a "Humanitarian Crises Analysis" (HCA, available on web-site), based on Humanitarian Needs Overviews, Humanitarian Response Plans, partners analysis, ECHOs Humanitarian Implementation Plan and ICRCs appeal. The HCA describes the humanitarian situation, trends, risks and suggests priority areas, both geographic, sectoral/thematic as well as organisation, which is then discussed with field staff in order to agree on final budget, key focus areas and partners. Sida then prepares contributions to partners to ensure early disbursements (Jan-April). Projects for Gender Marker code 0 are not financed by Sida. The agreements are often multi-year. By mid-year, this situation of large humanitarian crises is assessed based on among others OCHA's "Global Humanitarian Overview – Status Report and parts of the available reserve can be allocated to these crises, particular underfunded crises. For new crises and worsening of situations during the year, the Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM) with partner-organizations in various sectors is available to allow for a response within 24 hours.

US: Connections with USAID development resilience and other types of assistance.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: Funding decisions are being taken in a transparent matter, with constant dialogue with partner organizations being at the centre. 2) Regular and annual planning meetings with our partner organizations is the main element to identify and discuss priorities. 3) Regional and sectoral strategies have been developed, in close dialogue with partner organizations.

EU: Following the completion of the annual Integrated Analysis Framework (IAF) exercise, ECHO identifies the allocations per individual country and region and prepares the Humanitarian Implementation Plans (HIPs) and the funding allocation for the worldwide decision (WWD). IAF country analyses are conducted by ECHO field experts in coordination with the respective operational units. This analysis provides a first-hand account of crisis areas and gives an insight into the nature and the severity of needs. ECHO also carries out at central level a global evaluation, which has two dimensions: (i) the Index for Risk Management - INFORM (overall and specific indicators), which categorises countries on the basis of risk to crises and disasters and includes dimensions on hazards and exposure, vulnerability and coping capacity; (ii) and the Forgotten Crisis Assessment, which identifies crises that have been overlooked or neglected by the international humanitarian community and/or the global media and which need special attention. This comprehensive annual process results in provisional allocations for each country/region, which are further examined in the light of other factors, one of the most relevant being the amount allocated for humanitarian assistance in the EU budget for the following year. Other key elements that intervene in the fine-tuning phase of the allocation process are the access to beneficiaries and the security aspects, the operational capacities of partners on the ground, which include the capacity to efficiently absorb funds already allocated to the country, and the presence of the other donors that may lead to changes in the priorities (in terms of geographical coverage, sectors, etc.), in order to not duplicate efforts and to ensure the best coverage of the needs. As a final step, a comparative analysis of proposed budget allocations is carried out in order to ensure consistency and balance of allocations across countries and regions, taking due account of the Commission's operational priorities. The EU funding under this operational strategy involves constant re-appraisal of humanitarian crises as they evolve. If the need for humanitarian assistance diminishes, often due to the start of rehabilitation and development activities, the Commission winds down its humanitarian work. The Commission puts a high priority on linking humanitarian aid and development activities. The exit strategy for all areas of humanitarian intervention is reviewed twice a year, first, when funds are initially allocated, then, during a mid-term review. The latter is an opportunity to review priorities for remaining funds in accordance with evolving needs.

LI : Before deciding on a financial contribution we need to know the extent of the damages, if the country concerned has asked for international assistance and if other Liechtenstein organizations are involved in the immediate relief activities. The latter is important because the Government has the possibility to financially support initiatives of Liechtenstein aid organizations or private associations. In general, there are no thematic or geographical priorities but a particular focus on forgotten crises, which means a particular focus on regions and situations that have lost international attention as well as support for seriously underfunded programmes and projects. We try to finance smaller operations where our comparatively small contribution has a real impact. About one third of the resources are reserved for the ICRC and one third for UN-agencies. To ensure that partner organizations have the necessary means to provide immediate assistance we pay regular and considerable contributions to the CERF and also to the respective fund of the WFP (IRA).

SE : The above mentioned allocation process, which has been strengthened year by year constitute for us a good practice (see above).

US: To fulfill the USG's humanitarian mandate of saving lives, alleviating suffering, and reducing the social and economic impacts of disasters, our humanitarian offices strive to obtain the most accurate needs-assessment data that identify affected and vulnerable populations and the scope of needs before allocating resources to humanitarian programs proportional to demonstrated need. The USG's field representatives will work with other donors in the affected country to determine how to best allocate funds in terms of geography, sector, and partner. This is coupled with engagement Washington will have with other donors at the headquarters-level. These exchanges will broaden the USG's database in order to make decisions on funding.

9. How do you address forgotten crises in your policies and programs *(GHD 6,14)*?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

CERF contributions are the preferred way to address forgotten crises, followed by support to NGO programs, which shows most progress.

The least progress was made with respect to the analysis of CAPs and other related financial information (FTS).

Other specific comments:

CA : We also provide unearmarked regional funding to address smaller crises. We have also piloted a pooled fund with a coalition of Canadian NGOs meant to support projects for smaller scale humanitarian crises.

NL: The NL is large donor to CERF. In our year planning we make use of the Inform Index and ECHO data to look at the smaller crises. The NL also supports the START-Fund which is set up to fund NGO early action in small and medium size and often forgotten crises.

SE : The substantial unearmarked core budget support from MFA tends to be allocated by the organizations towards forgotten crises. Also, in Sida's humanitarian allocation process explained under question 8, the forgotten crises assessment is included as one criterion. Sida allocates around 10% to smaller crises a number of them which are forgotten crises (see question 8). When Sida analyse the humanitarian situation in humanitarian crises, they also look particularly at the funding situation by the mid-year review.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: 1) Our contribution to PFs incl. the CERF has been increased considerably. 2) Joint campaign with NGO-partners on forgotten crisis (ongoing).

EU: The EU Forgotten Crisis Assessment attempts to identify crises characterised by very low media coverage, a lack of donor interest (as measured through aid per capita) and a weak political commitment to solve the crisis, resulting in an insufficient presence of humanitarian actors. At this stage, at least 15% of the planned geographical humanitarian aid budget allocation is being earmarked for these forgotten crises.

FI: The particular focus on forgotten crises is expressly stated the IHCD Act and in the strategy for the emergency and reconstruction assistance. In many cases we show continuity and uphold our assistance for more than one year. It is a clear advantage that Liechtenstein has no own political ambitions attached to its humanitarian and development cooperation. We can support programmes in areas that are politically difficult for other states, e.g. Colombia or Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories.

IT: The Italian Cooperation dedicated special attention to forgotten crisis : for example during the last years we provided funding to Saharawi refugees in Tindouf camps, as well as to Rohingya refugees. Moreover, we will double our financial contribution to the CERF in 2016 and we are committed to increase our core funding to international organizations by 126%, compared to 2015. In 2015 we also provided support to a local pooled fund (CHF for South Sudan).

US: From the USG's perspective, the humanitarian community lacks a common definition of a forgotten crisis. As policy, the USG funds based on needs identified—regardless of the country context. When in doubt, the USG evaluates situations defined as forgotten crises through our field teams and take into consideration other factors such as the ability to implement programs and the permissiveness of security environments. We also provide unearmarked/loosely earmarked funding to allow international organization partners to address forgotten crises. In addition, the USG contributes to the CERF.

10. To what extent do you consider funding imbalances across sectors in your funding decisions (*GHD 6, 14*)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

The focus on situations rather than on sectors made the most progress, whereas core and flexible funding are considered to be the most appropriate ways to fund sectorial imbalances.

The least progress was made with respect to the analysis of CAPs and other available information as a way to address these imbalances.

Other specific comments:

CA : We don't necessarily prioritize funding levels (as per FTS) of sectors to inform our decision making. The primary determinant would be the extent to which a sector is a priority need along with capacity to respond to that need and levels of financing available.

IT: On the multilateral track we often prioritize decisions on partner specific appeal or programs, which often determines sector allocation depending on the organization's mandate.

NL: Our preference is to provide core and flexible funding to our partners and allow partners on the ground to decide on sectoral priorities. However, reality is that in appeals there is not one bank account "appeal" number. Instead each UN agency (and NGO partners) has their own appeal. So we need to decide to which implementing partner the contribution will go. Making a choice for the implementing partner is often a choice for a sector or target group (WFP = food security/nutrition; UNICEF = education/WASH and children).

SE : In the above-mentioned allocation process Sweden through Sida analyses the humanitarian needs overviews and the humanitarian response plans to take into consideration sectoral imbalances. Sweden also supports core funding to humanitarian organizations, mainly UN as well as pooled funds, both at global and national levels. In 2014, 22% of Sweden's humanitarian assistance went to pooled funds.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: Requests for regular feedback from partner organizations on funding gaps and imbalances, as an element in funding decisions.

EU: DG ECHO actively coordinates with other EU donors within the Council working party on humanitarian aid and food aid (COHAFA). DG ECHO and EU Member States regularly update each other on their funding intentions in a given crisis and identify gaps in funding including per sector.

FI : X) on multiannual agreements with key partners, including ICRC, WFP, UNHCR, OCHA, UNRWA and ISDR.

LI : As most of Liechtenstein's contributions within its Emergency and Reconstruction Assistance are either core contributions or contributions without a strict earmarking, partner organizations can use the resources according to their own need assessment. Therefore, cross sector imbalances can be solved.

SE : Sweden believes that supporting the pooled funds is a good example of ensuring financing for key priorities of the humanitarian response plans.

US: In cases of genuinely harmful funding imbalances, the USG values real-time donor coordination in reaching agreement on funding priorities and gaps or ensuring sufficient coverage and proportional funding even when donors continue to prioritize different sectors. The USG evaluates imbalances according to its definition of an acute humanitarian need. The USG addresses "sector bias" by leveraging the comparative advantages of different parts of our and other donors' aid structures—for example, by coordinating with development colleagues and other donors to develop long-term strategic plans to address transitions in countries with recurring, cyclical crises.

11.How do you integrate information on funding from other GHD members and burden-sharing considerations into your funding allocation decisions between funding channels and crises (*GHD 6,14)*?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

Most progress was made in local donor coordination, which is at the same time the most preferred way together with the use of information provided by FTS and GHD members.

The least progress was made in the use of EU information.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with respect to the use of information provided by GHD members.

Other specific comments:

CA : Where we have a field presence we will receive reporting on other donor responses. Depending on the crisis, we will also have HQ based conference calls to coordinate with other donors.

FI : X) if feasible.

IT: We also gather information from the participation to the boards of the agencies, technical meetings and ad hoc high level donor events on specific crisis. Update data on funding gaps towards the appeals is provided to management structures on request.

NL: We share information in COHAFA (but mostly this is done after allocation decisions have been made), we make use of FTS (to look at funding gaps). We call upon other donors to increase contributions. In general, funding decisions are taken by most donors autonomously and after decisions are taken, others are informed.

SE : Sweden through Sida is using the Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIPs) to ensure complementarity with ECHO funding. Sida also uses the Financial Tracking Survey (FTS), EU information and work closely with other GHD members locally, participate in the Pooled Fund Board and local GHD meetings.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: Participation of our embassy staff in local donor coordination mechanisms has proved a best practice.

EU: Where the information is available in a timely way, funding by other donors are taken into account into DG ECHO's allocation process, and may lead to changes in the priorities (in terms of geographical coverage, sectoral gap filling, etc.) in order not to duplicate efforts and to ensure the best coverage of the needs. DG ECHO is within the first among the donor community to establish and share detailed assessments and budgetary allocations for the countries/crises in which it intervenes for the year ahead. DG ECHO also seeks to engage actively in dialogue throughout the year and in response to specific (notably deteriorating) crisis situations with other donors – notably EU Member States and the US, both at HQ and in the field, on funding intentions in different crises. Within the EU, DG ECHO manages a specific humanitarian financial recording mechanism ('EDRIS') that feeds directly into the FTS. However donor coordination on funding intentions and strategic planning is an area of 'good donorship' that DG ECHO would identify as having scope for considerable collective improvement.

US: The USG relies on the OCHA Financial Tracking System and frequent donor coordination calls during disaster responses to share information on funding allocations, whether to NGO partners or to funding appeals, in order to share the financial burden and implement complementary programs. The USG also demarches other donor governments to encourage increased contributions to humanitarian emergencies. As stated in question 8, the USG's field representatives will work with other donors in the affected country to determine how to best allocate funds in terms of geography, sector, and partner. This is coupled with engagement Washington will have with other donors at the headquarters-level. These exchanges improve burden-sharing between donors.

12. How do you ensure that your funding mechanisms and channels are effective in providing organizations with flexible, predictable and timely resources ? (*GHD 5, 11, 12, 13*)

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

CERF contributions, the mobilization of additional funding when necessary and the allocation of funds earlier in the year are the preferred ways to provide flexibility and predictability, with most progress being made in consultation with local partners to ensure that decisions are appropriate.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with respect to recent improved flexibility and predictability in funding mechanisms.

Other specific comments:

CA : While we have not recently brought more flexibility in our funding mechanisms, we believe that they are already very flexible and while we are not allocating funds earlier than previously, we are already committed to responding to the CAPS/SRPs in the first quarter of each calendar year. We also provide unearmarked funding at the regional and global (core) levels.

SE : In order ensure flexible, predictable and timely funding of partner-organizations work, Sweden uses various funding channels and mechanisms. In addition to core budget support to multilateral organizations Sweden also supports both CERF and local pooled funds and works through its local steering committees to strengthen the effectiveness of the funds. Sweden through Sida is also able to provide multi-year agreements with professional partner-organizations to ensure predictability, allowing for a longer-term timeframe and building of local capacity. Despite the absence of formal and binding agreements, the major recipients of core budget support, such as for example UNHCR, WFP, OCHA and ICRC, know that there won't be any drastic changes in the allocation from one year to another based on a longstanding relationship with Sweden. In new and escalating crises, Sweden through Sida, has developed a Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM) with a number of partner-organizations, which allows to respond to new and worsening crises within 24 hours.

US: We consult with our partners on the timing of the funding and have mechanisms to expedite funding. Agencies can submit unsolicited proposals for funding, so disbursing funds can be based on emerging needs rather than based on a fiscal calendar.

Good practice you have adopted:

AU : DFAT provides approximately a third of its annual humanitarian budget in the form of multi-year unearmarked funding agreements with key multilateral humanitarian partners. These multi-year agreement generally span three to four years and provide indicative levels of core funding as well as establish mutual obligations and performance objectives between DFAT and our partners. These agreements provide value for money for Australia by providing our partners with crucial funding predictability, allowing them to obtain value for money in procurements, such as purchasing supplies in advance of disasters. This predictability also provides partners the resources to invest in long-term program innovation and corporate systems and infrastructure thereby enabling more efficient program delivery.

DE: We have committed ourselves to multiyear funding in order to increase predictability, in the framework of the latest International Red Cross Conference and are advocating in different humanitarian fora for an increased use of multiyear funding.

EU: The timeliness and flexibility of funding are ensured by a range of different funding decision types and a series of specific derogations for humanitarian aid from the EU's Financial Regulation that sets out the rules for all areas of Commission spending. The annual budget is implemented through financing decisions from which the full range of ECHO partners are eligible to draw funding for specific response to individual crises. The decision-making authority varies according to type of crisis (prolonged/on-going or sudden-onset emergency) and the amounts involved so that DG ECHO is able to respond very rapidly when needed. The information on the financing decisions is available on our internet and regular meetings are organised with the partners to present ECHO funding priorities. DG ECHO ensures quality and maximises the possibility of flexibility in EC financial arrangements by arrangements with its humanitarian partner organisations. The agreements provide a long term framework for partnership which, although it does not represent a commitment to fund, does provide a certain degree of predictability in the relationship.

FI : We aim to allocate majority of our funds as early as possible in the beginning of the year (in 2015 about 86 % of our humanitarian funding was allocated in March).

IT: Under the new Italian Cooperation system the Agency is attributed autonomy over its organization , regulation, administration, assets, accounting and budgeting, which is drafted according to Civil Law principles. Its competences and rules of functioning - regulated by a specific Charter – facilitate a more flexible and predictable provision of resources. On the multilateral emergency channel, the Italian Cooperation continue to use the revolving financial mechanism called "Emergency Bilateral Fund" (EBF) in order to provide immediate response to crisis situations. The EBF is a cash reserve financed to major multilateral partners once (or more) in a year, from which financial withdrawals can be promptly made to respond to unforeseen on underfunded crisis. The Italian Cooperation has recently approved a substantial increase of its contributions for the EBFs with 8 different multilateral partners. The total humanitarian budget for the year 2016 has increased by 30% compared to 2015, reaching an amount of approximately 100 million Euros**.**

LI : Most of Liechtenstein's contributions within its Emergency and Reconstruction Assistance are either core contributions or contributions without a strict earmarking. Partner organizations therefore have the necessary flexibility to use the resources where they are most needed. The most important and long-term partner organizations know in advance with what amount they can count in the following year. Predictability and long-term planning is therefore guaranteed.

LU : In 2012, we established multi-annual MoUs with our main UN partners (2012-2015). Our 5 strategic partner NGOs receive annual indicative envelopes to increase predictability of funding.

NL: We are moving from one year funding allocation to multi-year (3 yrs) allocations with our core partners (5 UN-organisations, Red Cross and NGO's) and always keen to simplify our funding mechanisms. We strive to approve and transfer our core, unearmarked contributions in the first months of the year. In recent years (with the increase of crises affected people) we have been able to get extra money (Euro 570 million for the period of 2014-2017) and EUR 110 million additional for Syria in 2015.

SE: A substantial allocation of unearmarked core support to multilateral humanitarian organizations.

US: The USG helps build flexibility and predictability into our partners' responses by providing unearmarked funding in some cases, contributing to the CERF, and plus-ing up agencies' operational reserves. For USAID/OFDA and FFP, money for disaster assistance may be carried over to the next fiscal year so funding opportunities may be continuous.

13. What kind of mechanisms do you use to provide a fast and appropriate response to new and escalating emergencies ? (*GHD 17, 18*)

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows an overall progress in the indicators.

Contributions to UNDAC and CERFS/ERRFs are the preferred mechanisms with the former making the most progress.

The least progress was made with respect to the prepositioning of funds with NGOs.

Other specific comments:

FI : x) this is the responsibility of Ministry of Interior/ Kuopio Crises Management Center. Not included in humanitarian budget but paid from their budget.

IT: We provide substantial funding to EBF described in answer n. 12.

SE: In new and escalating crises, Sweden, through Sida, has developed a Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM) with a number of partner-organizations, which allows them to respond to sudden crises within 24 hours, subject to Sida's approval. Sweden also supports pooled funds. The core budget support to the organizations also contributes to their response capacity and flexibility as the funding is unearmarked.

Good practice you have adopted:

AU : The Humanitarian Partnership Agreement (HPA) is the primary mechanism for humanitarian funding for Australian NGOs. The Agreement brings together the department and six pre-selected Australian NGOs (Care, Caritas, Oxfam, Plan International, Save the Children and World Vision) to:
- strengthen the strategic humanitarian partnership between these organisations and the department
- support NGOs' efforts to foster community resilience and preparedness
- enable a rapid and coordinated response to humanitarian needs, especially in response to rapid-onset humanitarian emergencies.
The Agreement has three major components:
- a disaster risk management and disaster risk reduction component to expand the risk reduction programs of the six HPA partners
- a stand-by emergency response arrangement by which the department can request a single proposal for a joint humanitarian response from all or some of the NGO members of the Agreement
- regular strategic dialogue on humanitarian issues between DFAT and HPA NGOs.
Most recently, this partnership was activated to respond to the earthquake in Nepal, and Tropical Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu.

CH: We try to purchase in-kind assistance locally. We prioritize interventions, redirecting our funding on new emergencies.

DE: We have set up a contact group mechanism for fast and appropriate response in sudden onset crisis, as a forum for mutual information exchange and as a basis for decision making on funding appropriate and adequate measures.

EU: Different instruments for rapid decision-making / timely mobilisation of financial resources are available. DG ECHO's Director-General has the delegated authority to adopt a "Primary Emergency" Decisions to respond within the first 72 h that follow a sudden outbreak of a crisis (natural or man-made) for amounts up to and including € 3 million. The Director-General has also the delegated authority to take 'Emergency Decisions' of up to €5 million and non-emergency humanitarian financing decisions of up to €2 million. ECHO coordinates and supports the provision of European in-kind assistance through the Union Civil Protection Mechanism. This includes teams, equipment and other in-kind assistance, including notably through the European Emergency Response Capacity in the form of a pool of Member States' assets committed to the Union-level operations, as well as experts. Synergies and coordination between humanitarian funding and civil protection (in-kind) assistance are ensured, in particular through the engagement of the Emergency Response Coordination Centre (ERCC). ECHO can also rapidly mobilise logistic resources (ECHO Flight/humanitarian air service) and quickly dispatch in-kind relief items through direct implementation of Humanitarian Aid. Direct implementation of aid, including an air bridge, has been used, such as at the peak of the CAR crisis, to cope with the shortage of urgently needed items that could not be procured in the country by humanitarian agencies. Where relevant, grant agreements may be focused on Rapid Response Mechanisms (e.g. CAR, DRC) or integrate an emergency preparedness/response component, partly frontloaded, which is adjustable to circumstances in both financial and operational terms (e.g. Cameroon).

LI : In order to assist in emergencies, where immediate action is needed, Liechtenstein supports different funds. Liechtenstein is an active and long-standing supporter of emergency funds such as the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and WFP's Immediate Response Account (IRA).

NL: We have a combination of above mentioned mechanisms. Most important are our contributions to CERF, our flexibility to allocate additional funds. We also have certified rescue teams and disaster support teams, that can be sent (Nepal EQ) and participate and contribute staff to UNDAC and EU civil protection mechanisms. Occasionally we have sent supplies (Ebola).

SE : A substantial allocation of unearmarked core support to multilateral humanitarian organizations.

US: The President draws down the Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance fund to respond to urgent and unanticipated humanitarian crises, based on recommendations from the State Department. OFDA relies on its emergency response fund to respond to disasters that strike after resources in the beginning of the fiscal year have been allocated to specific country and global programs. We can also rapidly dispatch relief supplies from prepositioned stockpiles in Miami, Florida; Pisa, Italy; and Dubai, UAE. If needed and requested by the host government, the USG will also deploy urban search and rescue teams that are on stand-by. Depending on the type, size, complexity and location of a disaster, the USAID/OFDA Director may choose to deploy a Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART). The DART is a team of disaster response specialists that coordinates USG assistance in response to an international disaster. The DART conducts assessments of disaster impacts and humanitarian needs, reports on the disaster situation, and recommends follow-up actions, including the targeting and implementation of USG relief assistance and suggested funding levels.

14. What surge capacity do you have in place for contributing to international emergency response (*GHD17, 18*)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows an overall progress in the indicators.

Support to UNDAC/ INSARAG shows most progress and is at the same time the most preferred way to contribute to international emergency response.

Although deployment of USAR teams shows the least progress, it remains the 2nd most preferred surge capacity in place.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with respect to secondment of national experts.

Other specific comments:

CA : We also have a strategic partnership with the Red Cross which involves prepositioned funding as well as the ability to deploy Emergency Response Units (medical capacities. We also have internal coordination mechanisms that allow for the rapid and coordinated deployment of our military Disaster Assistance Response Team.

EU: ECHO has its own field expert surge capacity it can deploy in major/sudden/new emergencies. Experts are not seconded to partners but collaborate with them and contribute in different ways to international emergency response.

FI : x) through civil protection / Ministry of Interior mechanisms.

IT: Italy financially supports the United Nations Humanitarian Response Depot (UNHRD) in Brindisi, as part of the UNHRD Network, for the rapid response and deployment of in -kind relief items (health kits and NFIs) to affected populations worldwide. We contribute to EU response mechanism through the Italian Civil Protection Department, while UNDAC/INSARAG support is ensured through participation of members based both in the Italian Agency as well as in the Civil Protection.

SE : Sweden maintains preparedness for implementing or supporting humanitarian assistance through the provision of personnel and material supplies. The provision of Swedish personnel and material supplies is primarily to be provided by the Swedish Civil Contingency Agency (MSB). Sweden, through Sida, also provides support to surge capacities such as the Assessment Capacities (ACAPS), ProCap and GenCap projects in the areas of needs assessments, protection and gender.

Good practice you have adopted:

CH: We have national programmes officers working in our cooperation offices trained / deployed as UNDAC members.

EU: Disaster Response: DG ECHO is responsible for both humanitarian aid and civil protection policy and operations. EU civil protection assistance can be quickly mobilised through the Union Civil Protection mechanism (UCPM), where the Emergency Response Coordination Centre (ERCC) plays a key role as a coordination hub to facilitate a coherent European response during emergencies inside and outside Europe. The assistance relies on the Member States' resources and it includes in-kind aid, expertise, intervention teams and modules, and specific equipment to disaster stricken countries. Experts are also deployed for needs assessment and coordination with the local and/or national authorities and international response actors. Besides being a hub for coordination, the ERCC regularly hosts information-exchange meetings for different crises, involving Member States, partners and EU services. The ERCC also manages a pre-identified pool of Member States' response assets, including notably "civil protection intervention modules" - that can immediately be deployed to any large scale emergency. DG ECHO is financially supporting the transport of assistance delivered by the Member states, and the ERCC is in the lead for coordinating transport and logistics operations. Finally, a new surge system allowing easier, faster and flexible mobilisation of (additional) field experts in new or escalating emergencies has been introduced in 2015.

FI : Twice a year coordination meetings between MFA and Ministry of Interior of policy issues (UN, EU, national) in addition to situation specific exchange of information as necessary.

US: The USG's surge capacity includes the option to rapidly deploy Disaster Assistance Response Teams (DARTs), which can include search and rescue teams; access to procurement mechanisms that allow us to fund quickly and flexibly; and Interagency Agreements that allow USG humanitarian offices to request the assistance of other parts of the government when international disasters require particular assets. The USG also supports some of our partners' surge capacities and funds OCHA's GenCap and ProCap teams, as well as UNHCR's Surge Protection Capacity project.

---

15. In case you have a rapid response mechanism , how do you coordinate its deployment with other relevant stakeholders (GHD 17,18)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators, with 'Coordination through the humanitarian clusters' and 'relying on appeals' showing most progress. The establishment of internal coordination mechanisms between the different nationals stakeholders (NGOs, army, other specialized institutions) show the least progress, but is the preferred way to coordinate deployment of a rapid response mechanism.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with respect to regional or global coordination at EU level.

Other specific comments:

CA : Also through the Red Cross Movement.

IT: See answer 2, institutional tables are convened on ad hoc basis to tackle and coordinate the first phase of emergency response, in collaboration with national stakeholders.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: The recently established contact group for sudden onset crisis has proved functioning well for coordination among German organizations (Ecuador earthquake). We advocate for active participation in local humanitarian clusters, including making this a specific question in funding application proposals.

EU: DG ECHO (and the EU) strongly supports the central and overall coordinating role of the UN, particularly OCHA, in promoting a coherent international response to humanitarian crises. In particular, DG ECHO has a long standing cooperation with United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination UNDAC managed by UN OCHA. DG ECHO has established a network with crisis management actors in the EU Institutions and services, notably military and police, in order to increase liaison and coordination in situations where EU missions and operations operate in contexts where humanitarian actors are also active. Furthermore, DG ECHO has developed procedures with the EU Military Staff in order to mobilise military assets in exceptional circumstances in support of humanitarian assistance, in addition to the existing channels to access these assets in the framework of the Union Civil Protection Mechanism. The procedures are fully in line with the international Guidelines on the use of military assets in support of humanitarian assistance (the so-called Oslo and MCDA Guidelines). Finally, DG ECHO actively participates in the annual meeting of the Consultative Group on the use of Military and Civil Defence Assets in support of humanitarian assistance and supports the central role of OCHA (the Civil-Military Coordination Section) in civil-military coordination in humanitarian situations.
Concrete examples of good practice are:
- EU interservice missions (e.g. Cameroun, Chad)
- Weekly conference calls with EU military operations (e.g. EUFOR all along the CAR crisis)
- Joint donor missions in major crises (e.g. Soudan, CAR)
- Meetings on L3 crises with partners and EU Member States
- Regular briefings/meetings with Council groups
- Continuous inter-service coordination at working level
- Regular working-level meetings with NGOs
Civil protection resources can provide a contribution to humanitarian actions due to their advantages in terms of speed, specialisation, efficiency and effectiveness, especially in the early response phase. Where deployed in a humanitarian crisis, the use of civil protection assets is always needs-driven, complimentary to and coherent with humanitarian aid. The Emergency Response Coordination Center (ERCC) fosters increased coordination between the civil protection and humanitarian aid operations. The ERCC keeps direct links to the civil protection and humanitarian aid authorities in Member States which enables a smooth and real-time exchange of information. It ensures deployment of coordination and assessment teams composed of humanitarian aid and civil protection experts to conduct joint needs assessments. This intra-EU coordination enables a more effective and efficient integration of the European assistance to the global UN-led effort.

NL: When Dutch teams are involved, we coordinate responses with the Ministry of Defense, since we make use of transport facilities (plane's, boats) of the air force and navy. Within the EU we coordinate within the civil protection mechanisms. In the field, teams are integrated in and coordinated with UN coordination bodies.

US: No matter what assets and capacities the USG deploys, we always try to plug-in to the international humanitarian system's coordination mechanisms. During major natural disasters, USAID's DART generally leads and coordinates the USG response under the authority of the U.S. ambassador. As part of the Risk Management and Crisis Coordination Workstream, the USG will provide a coordination function for GHD over email and conference calls. The Crisis Coordination Framework was approved at the June 2015 GHD High Level Meeting.

16. How do you ensure that multilateral and ngo partners are accountable for their results and that the related administrative burden does not interfere with effective and efficient humanitarian assistance (ghd 16, 22, 23)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators. Reports focused on results, the use of external evaluations, and regular partner consultations indicate the most progress and are most widely used for partner accountability.

The least progress was made with respect to the limitation of the requested number of reports.

Other specific comments:

NL: A combination of the above. Our monitoring capacities are limited. We are increasing our capacities in the field – already started in the Middle East - to engage more and in depth with our implementing partners in the field. In terms of reporting: we normally accept the normal reporting agreed by partners with all donors and have no "additional" demands.

SE : Sweden monitors the impact of partner-organizations' programmes through field visits, regular and systematic dialogue, annual reports and participation in Executive Boards/Donor Support Groups and yearly meetings.

US: We engage multilateral and NGO partners at the HQ-level through representational missions in New York, Geneva and Rome, or through Washington.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: 1) The regulations and administrative work are a regular topic of the agenda of meetings with our partner organization, aiming at mutually working of efficiency and reducing administrative burden. 2) Supporting analysis / study on harmonized reporting and reducing administrative burden. 3) Co-chairing workstream in the Grand Bargain Sherpa Group on harmonized reporting / reducing administrative burdens.

EU: In terms of accountability, the implementation of EU funded operations is ensured by several layers of checks being ex-ante or ex-post controls:
- Strict selection and quality control mechanisms for partners under the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) signed with NGOs and International Organisations. Financial management and control requirements for UN bodies are laid down in the EU-UN Financial Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA).
- Strictly needs-based systems for identifying the actions to be funded. These needs assessments are carried out by the partner organisations and crosschecked/monitored by DG ECHO'S technical assistants on the ground.
- Ex-ante controls on the selection of projects and before the signature of contracts.
- Day to day monitoring of progress of projects. Each grant and contribution agreement is monitored by the desk and field expert and the outcome is recorded on a project appraisal worksheet ('fichop ').
- Project monitoring by a network of field experts (technical assistants) worldwide. These specialists are based in the field in order to facilitate operations funded by the EU, regardless of their location, and maximise their impact. They closely monitor projects and write regular reports. In order to enhance the rapid reaction capacity and monitoring of operations, the number of field experts has gradually been increased in recent years. Currently about 100 field experts are based in the various field offices.
- Regular field visits to projects by geographic desks, auditors and management.
- An obligation on the partners to provide reports after the end of the operations to substantiate their expenses.
- A thorough analysis of these reports and checks on eligible expenditure by both the operational and financial desk officers. Various procedures, such as check-lists and double checking, have been set up to ensure that partners' financial transactions are in line with the financial rules, comply with sound financial management and are recorded correctly in the accounting system. Expenditure which is not sufficiently substantiated in final reports is disallowed and deducted from the final payment.
- Six evaluations (at the aggregate level) are undertaken every year, providing a full geographical and thematic coverage of ECHO activities over a five-year period. All evaluation reports are published on DG ECHO 's website on Europa, and (starting recently) in EU Bookshop.
- EU-funded activities implemented by external partners and contractors are subject to a financial audit. The audit strategy is based on a twin-track approach: audits are performed both at partners ' headquarters on a cyclical basis for finalised projects and in the field for on-going projects.
With the entry into force of the revised partnership agreements in 2014, several procedures have been reviewed with the view to reduce the administrative burden imposed on partners:
- Most of the exchange between the partners and ECHO are made through an electronic platform.
- The application form and the report format has been simplified and is more user friendly.
- Light application form for urgent actions.

- List of key Result indicators have been introduced in the Logframe.
- Quality indicators (on gender and resilience) have been introduced.
- The number of details requested in the financial report has been reduced.
- Quality control mechanism for partners have been simplified.

LI : Multilateral partners generally do not make a special reporting to Liechtenstein. However, in regular (mostly annual) meetings we try to discuss the supported programmes in more detail. Smaller NGOS and also the supported agencies of other donor countries (Switzerland and Austria) are asked to make a special report for the use of the Liechtenstein funds. However, also in this case we ask only for annual reports (or for relevant information if the project is facing difficulties), which does not place a heavy burden on the organization.

US: The USG hires staff with substantial field experience or provides less-experienced staff with M&E training. Field staff conduct monitoring of both international organization and NGO programs. To do so, USG field staff receive trainings on general M&E for monitoring multilateral agency programs. USG staff remain in close contact with international organization and NGO staff to identify and address problems quickly. The USG encourages its partners to communicate openly all issues with project implementation and willing to solve procurement and other problems, if necessary. As needed, the USG will use third-party monitors, particularly in locations where USG field staff are not able to travel. The monitors will meet with beneficiaries and feedback the information to the USG for action. From there, it is shared with implementing partners for action.

17. How do you support research; policy development; evaluations and analysis of your own activities and that of other stakeholders; and sharing of good practice and lessons learnt (*GHD 21, 22*)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators. Participation in GHD or similar groups and participation in OECD/DAC peer reviews show most progress and are most widely used to support research.

The least progress was made with respect to the cooperation with other stakeholders to produce strategy papers.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made on shared lessons learned from monitoring and evaluations, support to academic research/ think tanks, and participation in joint evaluations.

Other specific comments:

SE : Sweden supports networks and organizations involved in quality assurance of humanitarian assistance and research institutions that conduct applied support research (ODI/HPG). Support is also provided to actors that use innovative methods and technical solutions that help stimulate innovation in order to improve humanitarian work (Humanitarian Innovation Fund). Sweden through Sida conducts quality assurance of humanitarian contributions by means of regular evaluations or seminars. Sida encourages partners to integrate evaluations in all its programmes as part of their monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems. In addition, Sida conducts evaluations of thematic and strategically important activities / programmes. An external evaluation of Sidas humanitarian assistance 2011-2014 will start shortly.

Good practice you have adopted:

EU: DG ECHO's sectorial policy documents provide for a coherent approach for the Commission's funding, advocacy and coordination with other actors, thus increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Commission-funded humanitarian assistance. This is in line with the Consensus commitment to develop policies to improve the impact of aid. Such policies cover specific sectors, such as humanitarian food assistance and WASH (water, sanitation and hygiene), health, gender, protection, DRR, nutrition and others. The policies set out the main challenges in the respective sectors, together with the comparative advantages of the Commission in helping to address them. They include entry and exit strategies linked to the Commission's funding and best practices for humanitarian responses; key messages for advocacy within and beyond the humanitarian sphere; and the Commission's position on improving coordination to maximise the impact of funds available – for example through the cluster coordination or linkage with post-humanitarian assistance. DG ECHO's sectorial policies are put in place in consultation with stakeholders and taking into account best practice and existing guidelines (e.g. from the IASC). Once finalised sectorial policy guidance is available publicly and is used to promote a quality approach across DG ECHO's operational response. Mechanisms to monitor and ensure their consistent application in practice are being put in place.A range of good practice guides and reviews have also been commissioned and published by DG ECHO's evaluation sector, with the intention of mapping and promoting established good practice for partner organizations. Reviews have covered topics such as Cash and Vouchers, Food Assistance, WatSan, and Gender. Reviews often form the initial step in developing the aforementioned sectorial policy guidance. EU funded research channelled through 'Framework Programmes' includes support for disaster management and humanitarian aid priorities such as the development of common seismic hazard maps covering all continents (SHARE project). Support for applied research (through the Commission's Joint Research Centre) to develop and enhance specific tools to improve the evidence base for operations – e.g. Early Warning Instruments such as GDACs; Risk Analysis tools such as INFORM.

IT: The MFAIC drafted – in partnership with civil society organizations - national guidelines on disability and humanitarian aid giving technical guidance on the inclusion of people with disability in humanitarian aid programs and highlighting good practices and lessons learned. The MFAIC and the Italian Agency also take part into the EU meetings on humanitarian aid, where MS are engaged in coordinating their activities towards a common policy strategy and sharing good practices. Italy also participates in the EU Task Force aiming at facilitating the implementation of the EU Consensus on humanitarian Aid. It is a forum for sharing and exchanging information and best practice, showcasing achievements, and supporting learning and the development of operational steps in response to commitments at the national, EU and international levels.

US: Regarding research and policy development, the USG supports the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP), the Overseas Development Institute's Humanitarian Policy Group, and the Sphere Project. In addition, the USG conducts internal evaluations (after actions) of all our major responses and refers to the identified lessons learned during future crises.

18.What documented change in policy, practice or decision-making have you undertaken as the result of lessons learnt from evaluations, peer reviews and other forms of learning (*GHD 21, 22)*?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators.

Most progress was made with the improvement of links between humanitarian action and resilience strengthening activities, followed by improved links between humanitarian action and development.

The systematic use of evaluations made the least progress.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made with respect to the total review and redesign of humanitarian policy.

Other specific comments:

CA: Our humanitarian assistance program is periodically reviewed by our internal evaluation department as well as by our Auditor General. The Department is required to formally respond to and follow up on the findings and recommendations arising from these audits and evaluations. One recommendation from our evaluation and from the DAC Peer Review is related to improving coordination between our humanitarian and development programs, some progress has been made but work is ongoing.

SE : New humanitarian policy framework as well as humanitarian strategy for Sida are under preparation, expected to be finalized shortly.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: The recommendations from the 2011/12 evaluation on German humanitarian assistance have been the starting point for a comprehensive realignment our our work. Strategies being developed (regional, sectoral and thematic ones), M&E concept has been developed, quality profile systems has been established to identify strengths and potentials of our partner organizations.

EU: Evaluation and review is an integral part of the DG ECHO policy and programme management cycle. An annual (indicative) programme of externally-conducted evaluation and review is established covering particular country operations or cross-cutting themes – with around 14 such evaluations conducted each year. These are made public through the DG ECHO website and proactively shared with EU Member States and through ALNAP. A summary of responses to recommendations is presented annually. Of particular importance to internal-decision shaping are the reviews undertaken as a key initial step in policy development or implementation assessment such as those mentioned above.
Concrete examples of best practice include:
1) New procedures: Action plans are now compulsory in ECHO for addressing evaluation results;
2) New procedures + Sharing of lessons learned: Dissemination plans are now compulsory for all evaluations, with the purpose of e.g. sharing lessons learned with other donors;
3) Systematic use of evaluations: All ECHO actions are now systematically addressed by evaluations;
4) Agreements with partners: The FPA was evaluated prior to its latest revision, and the evaluation results were taken into account for that revision;
5) Mainstreaming of thematic issues: Evaluations/reviews of Cash, Gender, Shelter, and Food & Nutrition (etc.) have provided inputs for policy development, guidelines etc. that have contributed to mainstreaming;
6) Humanitarian Action – Resilience: The ongoing evaluation of the Sahel action plan has a strong focus on Resilience building by humanitarian action;
7) HA – Development: The (several) DIPECHO evaluations provided inputs for the latest refocusing of the initiative.

IT: We adopted new guidelines for relief and humanitarian aid initiatives carried out in partnership with civil society organizations (see answer 2). Specific procedures implementing the above mentioned guidelines will be adopted by the end of June, aiming at providing rapid funding to NGOs and other CSOs. Humanitarian initiatives, for the first time, will include also direct financing to local organizations (except for relief initiatives). In coherence with GHD best operational practices we simplified partner reporting requirements for bilateral initiatives.

NL: We have started a new funding window for NGO partners and we use the ECHO FPA as a selection criterion. Around Syria and the refugee crisis we are aligning relief and resilience.

US: Evaluations of USG responses to earthquakes in El Salvador (1986) and Armenia (1988), led to the development of the DART model. Based on lessons learned, OFDA structured DARTs to be self-contained, self-sufficient, and capable of operating in chaotic and often dangerous environments. The DART deployment system was fully operational by 1989. Since then, OFDA has regularly deployed DARTs to respond rapidly to natural and man-made disasters around the world. The Washington-based Response Management Team supports the DART. Internal evaluations over the years also led to the institutionalization of technical best practices, featured most prominently in OFDA's Field Operations Guide, a tool developed for DARTs in 1993 that OFDA updates periodically to address evolving best practices. Relying on lessons learned from the Haiti earthquake and Japan tsunami responses, OFDA has begun changing a number of internal systems and procedures, particularly as related to improving whole-of-government responses to international disasters, and established an emergency classification system to help quickly activate the appropriate management teams and systems. OFDA most recently conducted an internal evaluation of our response to the Ebola response and looking at its interagency relationships and agreements to facilitate faster USG responses.

19. How do you integrate feedback from beneficiaries in your humanitarian assistance (*GHD 21, 22*)?

Comparison between 2013 and 2015 shows overall progress in the indicators. The requirement for partners to involve beneficiaries in the program cycle, the review of partner reports to ensure the involvement of these beneficiaries and relying on information drawn from evaluations indicate most progress and are most widely used.

The least progress was made with respect to the use of media reports.

Available data do not permit to conclude that progress was made on the use of information provided by a specific feedback tool.

Other specific comments:

EU: when possible, ECHO encourages the use of cash and vouchers (including multi-purpose and unconditional cash transfers) as opposed to in kind contributions in our operations which gives the choice to the beneficiaries about the type of inputs they need and thus increases the effectiveness, relevance and appropriateness of the support provided according to the needs and freedom of choice of beneficiaries, improving accountability to and dignity of beneficiaries.

NL: We have funded HAP in the past and are considering to fund the CHS-organisation. We fund and are member of ALNAP and make use of their reports and analysis. In the boards of our UN partners, we demand our partners to apply the IASC approved programme standards, including standards on accountability.

Good practice you have adopted:

DE: This criteria has been enlarged and become more differentiated in project proposals and reports, being a valuable tool to assess the quality of work of partner organizations.

EU: Throughout the implementation of operations through its field experts and desk officers executing field missions, DG ECHO is able to capture the feedback of beneficiaries and to integrate in on-going and/or future projects. In addition, DG ECHO commissions evaluations that require external evaluators to use participative techniques. Their findings and recommendations, including on how projects have effectively addressed the needs of beneficiaries, are an additional source of information helping DG ECHO to further improve its assistance. In addition, one of the priority areas of the Enhanced Response Capacities (ERC) budget line of DG ECHO is Beneficiary Accountability, with the aim of encouraging to find innovative approaches and tools to increase humanitarian capacity to integrate feedback from (and to) beneficiaries by closing the feedback loop.

SE : Sweden through Sida funds projects focused on beneficiary feed-back. Through support to the Common Humanitarian Standards (CHS) we encourage partners to use complaints mechanisms.

US: The USG has identified better incorporation of beneficiary feedback into our humanitarian assistance as an area for improvement. We try to rely on our partners to provide feedback and allow partners to alter programs within reason and as necessary to better meet needs identified during beneficiary interviews. In a limited number of projects, direct beneficiary surveys are conducted to gauge program satisfaction. As needed, the USG will use third-party monitors, particularly in locations where USG field staff are not able to travel. The monitors will meet with beneficiaries and feedback the information to the USG for action. From there, it is shared with implementing partners for action.

Annex : Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian Donorship

Objectives and definition of humanitarian action

1. The objectives of humanitarian action are to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity during and in the aftermath of man-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for the occurrence of such situations.
2. Humanitarian action should be guided by the humanitarian principles of *humanity*, meaning the centrality of saving human lives and alleviating suffering wherever it is found; *impartiality*, meaning the implementation of actions solely on the basis of need, without discrimination between or within affected populations; *neutrality*, meaning that humanitarian action must not favour any side in an armed conflict or other dispute where such action is carried out; and *independence*, meaning the autonomy of humanitarian objectives from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.
3. Humanitarian action includes the protection of civilians and those no longer taking part in hostilities, and the provision of food, water and sanitation, shelter, health services and other items of assistance, undertaken for the benefit of affected people and to facilitate the return to normal lives and livelihoods.

General principles

4. Respect and promote the implementation of international humanitarian law, refugee law and human rights.
5. While reaffirming the primary responsibility of states for the victims of humanitarian emergencies within their own borders, strive to ensure flexible and timely funding, on the basis of the collective obligation of striving to meet humanitarian needs.
6. Allocate humanitarian funding in proportion to needs and on the basis of needs assessments.
7. Request implementing humanitarian organisations to ensure, to the greatest possible extent, adequate involvement of beneficiaries in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian response.
8. Strengthen the capacity of affected countries and local communities to prevent, prepare for, mitigate and respond to humanitarian crises, with the goal of ensuring that governments and local communities are better able to meet their responsibilities and co-ordinate effectively with humanitarian partners.
9. Provide humanitarian assistance in ways that are supportive of recovery and long-term development, striving to ensure support, where appropriate, to the maintenance and return of sustainable livelihoods and transitions from humanitarian relief to recovery and development activities.
10. Support and promote the central and unique role of the United Nations in providing leadership and co-ordination of international humanitarian action, the special role of the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the vital role of the United Nations, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and non-governmental organisations in implementing humanitarian action.

Good practices in donor financing, management and accountability

(a) Funding

11. Strive to ensure that funding of humanitarian action in new crises does not adversely affect the meeting of needs in ongoing crises.
12. Recognising the necessity of dynamic and flexible response to changing needs in humanitarian crises, strive to ensure predictability and flexibility in funding to United Nations agencies, funds and programmes and to other key humanitarian organisations
13. While stressing the importance of transparent and strategic priority-setting and financial planning by implementing organisations, explore the possibility of reducing, or enhancing the flexibility of, earmarking, and of introducing longer-term funding arrangements.
14. Contribute responsibly, and on the basis of burden-sharing, to United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeals and to International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement appeals, and actively support the formulation of Common Humanitarian Action Plans (CHAP) as the primary instrument for strategic planning, prioritisation and co-ordination in complex emergencies.

(b) Promoting standards and enhancing implementation

15. Request that implementing humanitarian organisations fully adhere to good practice and are committed to promoting accountability, efficiency and effectiveness in implementing humanitarian action.
16. Promote the use of Inter-Agency Standing Committee guidelines and principles on humanitarian activities, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the 1994 Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief.
17. Maintain readiness to offer support to the implementation of humanitarian action, including the facilitation of safe humanitarian access.
18. Support mechanisms for contingency planning by humanitarian organisations, including, as appropriate, allocation of funding, to strengthen capacities for response.
19. Affirm the primary position of civilian organisations in implementing humanitarian action, particularly in areas affected by armed conflict. In situations where military capacity and assets are used to support the implementation of humanitarian action, ensure that such use is in conformity with international humanitarian law and humanitarian principles, and recognises the leading role of humanitarian organisations.
20. Support the implementation of the 1994 Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief and the 2003 Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets to Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies.

(c) Learning and accountability

21. Support learning and accountability initiatives for the effective and efficient implementation of humanitarian action.
22. Encourage regular evaluations of international responses to humanitarian crises, including assessments of donor performance.
23. Ensure a high degree of accuracy, timeliness, and transparency in donor reporting on official humanitarian assistance spending, and encourage the development of standardised formats for such reporting.