



SWISS PRESIDENCY OF THE GOOD HUMANITARIAN DONORSHIP 2010-2011

Annual Report - July 2011

I. INTRODUCTION

During the period under review, GHD continued to focus strongly on the enhancement of humanitarian values and principles, including the protection of civilians, the safety and security and a broad reflection on quality standards in humanitarian action. Efforts were also made to better link the GHD Geneva based policy group with GHD-like field groups and concrete implementation of GHD principles. Given the evolving diversity of emerging donors, the GHD group pursued efforts aimed at reaching out to new potential members.

Switzerland, when taking over the presidency of the GHD in 2010, decided to focus particularly on three priorities, namely the operationalisation of the GHD principles, the protection of civilians in armed conflicts and the quality standards in humanitarian action. A strong emphasis on the protection of civilians in armed conflict allowed donors to hold thorough discussions on their role in that respect and to agree that this effort should continue in the coming years. Likewise, many efforts have been pursued around the quality standards issue and there is now a vast acknowledgment from most of the donors that efforts should continue to achieve better quality and accountability within the humanitarian system. Following a first positive experience of having the Chairs of the oPt donor group participating to the GHD meetings, there was a broad acknowledgment within the GHD group that more experience sharing and exchanges should be encouraged between the GHD and field groups. Globally, the period under Swiss chairmanship was characterised by a great deal of achievements.

Three GHD plenary working meetings were held in Geneva, attended by an average of 30 member states, on 20 October 2010, 15 February and 26 May 2011. A detailed work plan for 2010 to 2011 listing the main activities to take place during the period under review was agreed upon at the first meeting. A high level meeting was held on 22 July 2011 on the sidelines of the humanitarian segment of ECOSOC in Geneva. Several work streams were active throughout the year, including indicators, safety and security, and protection of civilians in armed conflicts.

As announced during the GHD meeting in May, Germany and Poland will co-chair GHD for the 2011-2012 period.

II. OVERVIEW OF GHD PRIORITY AREAS AND WORKSTREAMS

1. THE “FUTURE” WORKSTREAM

The “future” work stream refers to the design and consolidation of the Good Humanitarian Donorship website. During the first meeting under Swiss chairmanship, it was acknowledged that since the current version of the GHD website was created under the co-chairmanship of Ireland and Estonia, Switzerland would continue to develop it and to ensure it is updated.

The website was regularly updated and maintained throughout the year, and relevant documentation was uploaded in order to make it an effective communication tool. During the 2011 crisis in North Africa, a humanitarian crisis page was created on the website in order to file all donor contributions and response updates which allowed donors to access up-to-date information regarding their own responses almost in real time during the crisis. A large number of people signed up to the website during this period, which underscored its usefulness for GHD members. While some tasks are still pending, with some member pages still to be completed and countries details (logos, humanitarian strategy, etc.) still to be added, most of the website development has been completed and the GHD work plan can be modified accordingly.

2. ENHANCING PARTNERSHIP

The relationship between GHD Group and OECD/DAC is being strengthened as was agreed at the GHD October meeting. Consequently, the chair invited the OECD/DAC humanitarian liaison officer to regularly participate at the afternoon sessions of GHD meetings as of February 2011. Themes discussed include lessons learned from the OECD/DAC peer reviews.

With regard to the Global Humanitarian Platform, UNHCR has launched the concept of “providers of first resort” to emphasise the role of local NGOs and communities, which are often the first to respond following the occurrence of natural disasters. The GHD is interested to continue working on Principles of Partnership and potential role of GHP in bringing focus to the local NGO actors and their capacities to respond to humanitarian emergencies.

With respect to early recovery, the IASC Humanitarian Financing Group (HFG) decided to follow up on the Montreux X conclusions and produce guidelines for the development of clearer and more effective criteria for the integration of early recovery activities in CAPs and Flash Appeals, and to explore the feasibility of a highlighting system for early recovery projects in humanitarian financing mechanisms.

With respect to preparedness, two informal donor consultations were convened by the IASC Task Team on Funding for Preparedness (TTFP) to solicit feedback and opinions from donors regarding issues related to preparedness funding, and to outline a forthcoming study to be undertaken by Development Initiative (DI). Preliminary findings of this study were presented by DI at the GHD High Level Meeting in July and highlighted that whilst funding for preparedness has increased in recent years, it still constitutes only 4,9 percent of overall humanitarian aid and 0.5 percent of overall ODA.

Regarding the lessons drawn by IASC from the Haiti response, the IASC Principals asked the Steering Committee to review the key lessons outlined in the report entitled “Response to the Humanitarian Crisis in Haiti following the 12th January Earthquake: Achievements, Challenges, and Lessons to be Learned”, which was produced in July, in

order to outline some practical steps to implement the lessons learned. A Humanitarian Liaison Working Group meeting was held on 25 October to enable IASC members to listen to donor suggestions regarding priority challenges and lessons to be learned and acted upon.

Framework on Cluster Coordination Costs and Functions at the Country Level.

A “Framework on Cluster Coordination Costs and Functions at the Country Level” was presented by the U.S. to the GHD membership for endorsement at the May meeting of the GHD. The Framework agreement was the outcome of a Multi-stakeholder meeting co-chaired by OCHA and the U.S. which included participation of Global Cluster Leads and the sixteen donors (all GHD members) who have funded clusters. The document was based on the work of a small group of select IASC members and donors. The Framework spells out the expectations of all stakeholders regarding the outcomes for cluster coordination in the field as well as for funding of field-based cluster activities. OCHA presented the Framework agreement to the IASC for acceptance as an IASC document, and included the agreement as background for IASC Principles’ discussions. The GHD group endorsed the Framework at the June meeting as “good practice” and asked that it be included in the GHD website.

GHD engagement in the IASC principal’s work – humanitarian Reform Process

At the Principals’ December 2010 meeting, ERC Amos initiated a discussion on “Developing a new business model for humanitarian response”. Evaluations of Haiti and Pakistan, phase 2 of the cluster review, whetted the appetite for strengthening the humanitarian system and for building on the system of coordination established in 1991. V. Amos recently chaired the Principals meeting and set the tone for the coming months, defining 5 priority areas for improving the humanitarian response: coordination, leadership, accountability for performance; accountability to affected people; building capacity for preparedness and advocacy and communication. Donors have initiated discussions on how they can engage with OCHA in order to support the implementation of these priority areas.

GHD members expressed their wish for more information on IASC’s activities and finally expressed their views that IASC and OCHA should probably be represented during afternoon sessions of GHD meetings. Donors also suggested that IASC should organise debriefings ahead of each IASC Principals meeting, and that IASC updates within the GHD meeting should be made more structured and concise. GHD members also agreed to intensify the dialogue between the GHD group and OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), as well as to engage more strongly with the IASC on issues such as cluster coordination and humanitarian policy.

During the GHD High Level Meeting held on July 22, 2011, there was a broad agreement that while GHD members support the strong engagement of the ERC and await concrete actions to be seen at the field level, the GHD as a group should primarily focus on strengthening their internal humanitarian systems and policies. It was agreed that donors should use their leverage outside the GHD group to support the reform process undertaken by the principals by sharing their analysis and conveying common messages to the various UN Boards and other meetings such as Montreux where they participate. Nevertheless donors stressed that it is important to be informed transparently on the work of the IASC and in that respect the briefings from OCHA to the GHD groups should be of better quality. Likewise it seems important for many donors that the GHD communicate with the IASC with one voice and suggested to invite representatives from OCHA and IASC at the GHD meetings.

With respect to joint donor field visits, a visit to Zimbabwe was organised by Spain on 21 and 22 February 2011, which was attended by GHD members from the capitals, from Geneva and embassies in Zimbabwe. The objective was to study the advantages of the UNCAP process that was developed in Zimbabwe following a strategic and programmatic approach rather than the usual presentation of uncoordinated and often overlapping projects. This in turn should allow better coordination between and within the clusters and hopefully a more strategic and needs-based response. Donors may follow up to ensure the CAP process emancipates from project-led processes and agency competition to reflect need-based programming. As explained by Japan (one of the participants), the visit also helped understand the progress made on the UN reform front and how the cluster system works, or is supposed to work. In the case of Zimbabwe, the strong leadership exercised by the RC/HC and his personal commitment to the cluster system has led to effective coordination within the cluster system. At the July High Level Meeting, OCHA informed the GHD that the “Zimbabwe model” might be streamlined in order to become the norm.

The EC chair and the Sweden co-chair from the OPT donor group also briefed the GHD on the outcome of a mission in Gaza and East Jerusalem from 14 to 17 May 2011 in Gaza and East Jerusalem with the UN's Emergency Response Coordinator - Valerie Amos and European Commissioner Kristalina Georgieva, who both emphasised that donors have a clear role to play in the protection issues that arise, and that while a political solution needs to be found, donors will continue to support the coordination of humanitarian work in the region.

SHARE initiative

The GHD-SHARE meetings aim at exchanging experiences about donors' humanitarian aid policies and practices as well as gaining more knowledge around specific humanitarian thematic topics. The meetings were usually chaired by the permanent Mission of Estonia and hosted by a GHD member. In addition to the regular GHD members the invitation to attend the meetings was also extended to a number of non-GHD members countries. The working group has convened 10 times so far and the four meetings held during the period under review were hosted by Switzerland, Germany, Japan and Korea in July. The discussions and presentations included Sweden, Germany, Japan, Korea and Switzerland's humanitarian aid policies, protection of civilians, civil-military coordination (OCHA), strengthening EU disaster response (ECHO), preparedness (OCHA) and accountability (Humanitarian Accountability Partnership). At the end of the July meeting Estonia handed over the Chair of the SHARE initiative to Hungary.

Outreach by GHD to other countries and donors - potential members

Countries such as India, South Africa, Indonesia, United Arab Emirates, Argentina, as well as China and Russia, are significant regional powers and are playing increasingly important roles in responding to humanitarian disasters. Collaborating with these and other countries is becoming critical for a group like the GHD, which begun to reach out to them a number of years ago in order to share experiences and establish periodical dialogue on humanitarian policy and action. In this respect it was agreed during the first meeting under Swiss chairmanship to continue pursuing this effort.

A luncheon was organised on Friday 6 May to which 6 countries were invited - Argentina, India, Indonesia, Liechtenstein, Mexico, United Arab Emirates – with the aim of sensitizing them to the GHD group and its activities within the framework of the GHD principles. Together with 10 GHD countries and the EC, Switzerland participated and chaired this event. As a result, two new members (Liechtenstein and Mexico) have

joined the group during the reporting period. It was pointed out that reaching out to new interested countries is a collective responsibility of all GHD members in order to make the principles more widely shared and ensure that the GHD group is more representative of the current geopolitical environment. During the High Level Meeting held on July 22, it was suggested to reach out new members that have signed and ratified international humanitarian law conventions and treaties and to do more in that respect at the field level.

In October 2010, an outreach meeting was organised by OCHA and Poland in Warsaw in order to familiarise participants with the international humanitarian response system and the tools and services managed by OCHA as its main coordinating body. Here, the participants - including members of the GHD group and the GHD Chair - discussed the response to the earthquake in Haiti, including international search and rescue efforts and the implementation of the cluster approach, as well as best practices in disaster preparedness. Hungary announced that it will be hosting the next OCHA outreach meeting in 2011.

In addition to enlarging the basis of the GHD group, there is a push for stronger integration of national governments into the planning and response of emergencies. For the first time, the Montreux XI retreat on humanitarian coordination, which was convened by several GHD members on May 23 and 24, was opened up to participants from emerging economies around the world. In this respect, the Montreux XI discussion highlighted the importance of the complementary roles of national and international players in ensuring that humanitarian assistance is provided in as timely and targeted a manner as possible.

Needs Assessment Task Force (NATF)

EC continued to liaise with the Needs Assessment Task Force (NATF) on behalf of the GHD, and to update the group on ongoing activities relating to the assessment of needs. Donors continued their support for a better coordinated and common needs assessment system. In 2010, progress was made on making needs assessment more credible and more joined-up. The IASC Needs Assessment Task Force (NATF) has approved a package of guidance and tools designed to support a coordinated approach to assessments in emergencies. These include: Operational Guidance on Coordinated Assessments in Emergencies; Key Humanitarian Indicators and Guidance; the Multi-Cluster Initial and Rapid Assessment Methodology and the Humanitarian Dashboard which has been rolled-out recently in Libya and Yemen.

Quality standards in emergency response

Following the large-scale emergencies that occurred in 2010, there was consensus among many international players that some issues relating to the quality of the delivered assistance and to accountability need to be addressed. Switzerland decided to bring these players together in order to discuss current issues and map out potential solutions. Several GHD members such as Sweden, Germany, Canada, Norway, Finland, Australia, Czech Republic, and Japan, have repeatedly expressed their strong interest in this initiative. A consultative group comprising a variety of organisations - UN, INGOs, Alnap, HAP, IFRC, etc. - has been created and is working on quality standards in humanitarian action. While the goal of this initiative is to raise awareness and promote common approaches in order to address accountability and quality issues, the consultative group provided regular updates on its progress to the GHD group throughout the year. The issue of quality standards in humanitarian action was discussed by the GHD throughout the year, including at a session held on 26 May under the leadership of Peter Walker (from Feinstein International Centre) on the role that donors could play in the process, and at a side event organised by OCHA, IFRC, ICVA

and SDC during the ECOSOC humanitarian segment on 21 July 2011. In addition, the Humanitarian Action Office (HAO) of the Spanish Agency on Development and Cooperation (AECID) presented its process of standardisation of humanitarian response in the sectors of health and WASH in order to foster better quality of response.

Council of the European Union

On 10 June upon the invitation of the Hungarian Presidency of the Council of the European Union, Switzerland presented to the Working Party on Humanitarian Aid and Food Aid of the Council (COHAFA) its priorities as GHD chair, its national strategy on the protection of civilians in armed conflicts and the outcome of the seminar held on 25 May in Geneva on the same subject.

3. STRENGTHENING THE OPERATIONAL FOCUS

During the February meeting, members agreed on the need for strengthening communication between GHD-like groups in the field (DRC, OPT, Sudan, etc.) and the GHD group in Geneva (as well as in Rome and New York) in order to reinforce mutual understanding and support. In addition to supporting a strong focus on a set of key principles, Switzerland as chair initiated more frequent and close contact between the GHD group in Geneva and the field groups. In collaboration with the EC, the chairs of the GHD-like group in oPt attended the GHD May 2011 meeting to report in person on the ongoing work and priorities of the group. In the meantime equally important the field groups were kept well-linked up to the discussions that took place in Geneva. Several donors mentioned their strong support for pursuing this very important and useful two-way link to the field. An invitation to the DRC - GHD group has been issued for later in the year.

Donor field groups liaison

The GHD invited the chairs of the OPT donor group to participate in the May meeting in Geneva in order to share views and perspectives between Geneva and the field. The donors group in oPt is co-chaired by the EC and Sweden in a context of protracted crisis. The Humanitarian Donors Group in oPt was established in order to enable donors to face the various contextual challenges, including those relating to coordination and information sharing, but it also promotes common messages, joint missions, evaluations and assessments, which create a strong interaction with the UNCT. The group also contributes to the more efficient linking of emergency relief and transitional funding phases. It is particularly valuable in the areas of coordination of activities, sharing of donors' experiences and fostering a better understanding of how national authorities work and are structured, thus permitting a collective stance on the complexity of the situation in oPt.

Rome working group and New York

The chair engaged with donors in New York as well as with the Rome group, where regular updates on the Geneva progress were delivered. In March 2007, a number of Rome representatives of signatories to the GHD process agreed to establish a Rome GHD Working Group under the initial leadership of the UK Permanent Representative there. Its defined objective is to promote the development and application of GHD in relation to the World Food Programme (WFP) and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO).

At the first Rome workgroup meeting under Swiss chairmanship, Switzerland indicated its wish to push forward the issue of humanitarian principles within the Rome-based UN agencies. Appropriate terms of reference were drafted for the Rome workgroup. It was

agreed that instead of the proposed informal “Friends of protection” group it would be more productive to have official terms of reference for the Rome workgroup, including an element relating to protection. A total of 3 Rome workgroup meetings were organised subsequently to the GHD Geneva meetings. Updates on the workgroup's progress were provided, including information about the GHD global activities. In addition, a presentation on the “Global Food Security” clusters by representatives of WFP and FAO was delivered on 15 July, which strongly focused on the humanitarian principles of the GHD Initiative as they relate to the implementation of the “Global Food Security” cluster. During the annual meeting of the Rome workgroup, Switzerland will present its draft project on quality standards in humanitarian action, as well as the GHD global annual report for 2010-2011. The 2010-2011 Rome workgroup chair will also present its annual activities report.

Feedback on the Montreux Humanitarian Retreat

The eleventh session of the Montreux Humanitarian Retreat was for the first time attended by emerging donors and partner countries in addition to the traditionally invited donors, UN agencies, RCRC Movement and INGOs. This year's theme was “Harnessing New Capacities to Meet the Humanitarian Challenges of Tomorrow”, which includes sharing mutual perspectives, expectations and priorities among a wide range of stakeholders. This forward-looking theme allowed participants to consider future trends in disasters and ways of adapting the current response system. There is broad consensus that the humanitarian architecture is evolving in the right way, but it needs to be adjusted in line with emerging trends in disaster response. The participants felt that international response should increasingly be viewed as complementary and as a means of strengthening the national response and capacity, depending on the scale and nature of the disaster. Preparedness and planning are currently regarded as largely insufficient, and resources have not been adequately invested to date. The participants also called for a shift of focus back to people to whom the humanitarian community is accountable, and cited the need for the donor base to be enlarged and diversified, for example through the involvement of the private sector in humanitarian action.

There was also a strong focus on using innovative and emerging technologies to deal with, and prepare for, an increasingly diverse range of humanitarian emergencies. In order to more effectively link the Montreux event with the GHD, all documents relating to the Montreux Humanitarian Retreat should be made available on the GHD website.

GHD Indicators Review

During the first meeting under Swiss chairmanship, Canada updated the group on the shared accountability and GHD indicators work stream, emphasizing the many fundamental GHD targets and cross-cutting issues covered by the working group initially led by Belgium, Canada and Germany.

Belgium, Canada, Germany and Japan on behalf of the members of the WG on GHD Indicators Review (work stream 2.4) informed of the progress of the WG in implementing a first phase of the WG mandate during GHD plenary sessions of 2010-2011. The first phase consisted in a user analysis among GHDI membership on the current indicators; an analysis of their strengths and weaknesses and the potential for developing indicators for all of the GHD principles; and scoping of a robust, relevant and comprehensive monitoring instrument, including examination of the benchmarking issue.

Steps that were completed in 2010-2011 include the finalization of the terms of reference of the review, the selection of an independent consultant (Development Initiatives), conclusion of a contract between Germany and DI on behalf of the WG, completion of a user analysis among GHD membership through questionnaires and interviews to better

understand donor's opinions and use of the current GHD indicators and preparation of a draft report by Development Initiatives on a first phase of the review.

The WG reviewed the draft report in March 2011 and requested additional information from the consultant. Taking into account additional information received, the WG is preparing for a substantive discussion with the GHD membership of the outcome of the first phase. The upcoming GHD plenary discussion is intended to be a step in deciding on the implementation of a second phase of the review, which would consist in the following actions: design and formulate a new list of robust indicators that clearly measure progress on the Stockholm commitment; undertake thorough testing of indicators that they can help to drive progress and are methodologically sound (ensure testing includes the ability to measure and report on indicators in the future); produce supporting documentation that notes the strength of each indicator and guides correct measurement, terminology and presentation; present a set of options at a GHDI-membership event highlighting strengths and weaknesses of individual indicators and the inputs needed from GHDI members to ensure that future indicator measurement is a success; if so recommended by the GHDI membership, identify and develop benchmarks/targets for relevant indicators.

The report to be presented by Development Initiatives (DI) on the first phase of the review of indicators is being finalised and will be distributed prior to the GHD plenary meeting where this item will be on the agenda.

Safety and Security workgroup

Following the recommendations from Montreux X, a work stream on Safety and Security in Humanitarian Action was set up under US leadership. The objective of the working group is threefold: to raise awareness within the donor community concerning new developments and concerns in the security sector; to improve consistency and coherence in donor policies and practices and develop new, more effective ways to ensure predictable assistance for security to enable our partners' operations; and to examine a number of the issues identified for further discussion at Montreux X.

As agreed at the first meeting held in November 2010, the group has begun to identify key issues of concern and to share information relating to risk management policies and practices. Both donors and partners recognized that risk management is a fundamental element of good programme management. Donors and operational partners increasingly recognized that effective security management involves a careful balance and blending of acceptance, protection and deterrence methodologies based on an organisation-specific contextual analysis. A thorough understanding of the environment and how an organisation's programming and mode of operation interact with local dynamics is critical to the establishment effective security management systems that enable implementation and reduce risk to staff, especially in high-threat environments. In these environments, a long-term presence and essential activities, or those that are of most relevance to the affected communities, help to build acceptance of operational partners and thus to enhance the security stance of humanitarian players. Donors recognized therefore that systematic and sustained attention and engagement in safety and security issues is critical to humanitarian action in high risk environments.

At the second meeting held in June 2011, the discussion focused on the shift from the narrow view that "security" protects aid workers to the more accurate characterization that risk management enables humanitarian access and hence programming. Within that discussion, participants recognized that it would be mutually beneficial to all to share technical practices and policy approaches that donors take with their implementing partners. To this end, the group recommended that a chat room be created in the "donor only" section of the GHD website for the GHD Working Group on Safety and Security.

The group has also drafted a joint statement on safety and security to be presented at the GHD annual meeting.

Protection of civilians in armed conflict

During the first GHD meeting under Swiss chairmanship, the chair announced its intention to place the protection of civilians in armed conflict higher on the agenda of the GHD group. In this attempt to contribute to the enhancement of humanitarian values and principles, a GHD working group on the protection of civilians in armed conflict has been established under Swiss leadership. Two key achievements for the year were the presentations from Switzerland and the UK on their respective approaches and attempts to protect civilians during the last phase of the conflict in Sri Lanka, with a thorough analysis of the reasons for the overall failure of the international community to protect the civilians. The key lesson to be drawn relates to the fact that, while there was not a lack of standards for overcoming imposed obstacles to humanitarian action, there was an insufficient will on the part of UN member states to implement these standards. Finally a seminar on national strategies and best practices relating to the protection of civilians in armed conflicts was held on 25 May 2011, with an update on associated debates within the Security Council and in the UNSG report on the protection of civilians, and drawing attention to current challenges relating to this issue. Switzerland, France, Canada and Austria outlined their national strategies and approaches regarding the protection of civilians in armed conflict, and presented some specific examples to illustrate their implementation. The specific challenges to humanitarian access were discussed, and a dialogue was held concerning the definition of the term "protection of civilians". Many countries stated that possessing a strategy or guidelines for protecting civilians in armed conflict was beneficial, since this facilitated the coordination of the related activities among their organisations and ministries, etc. While the outcome, as well as the process of developing such guidelines or strategies, was considered very beneficial, the aim of developing a strategy is to obtain specific results on the ground. This is clearly where a greater emphasis is required in the future. A follow-up seminar is envisaged within the next 12 months in order to focus on the implementation of protection of civilians in armed conflict.

III. NEED-BASED ALLOCATION AND FINANCING

EC continued to liaise with the Needs Assessment Task Force (NATF) on behalf of the GHD, and to update the group on ongoing activities relating to the assessment of needs. Discussions then underscored the importance of strengthening ties between HUNAPS/ACAPS and PCNA/PDNA methodologies.

IV. 2011-2012 priorities for the GHD

During the GHD High Level meeting that took place on July 22 on the margin of the humanitarian segment of the ECOSOC, the incoming co-chairs presented their priorities for the 2011-2012 cycle. While the actual work streams and priorities would continue, the incoming co-chairs proposed a new focus on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and humanitarian preparedness. The efforts developed during the previous years on reaching out new GHD members will continue as well. New partnerships and setups will be looked at, notably on potential links between the GHD and the ODSG groups; the incoming co-chairs will also consider inviting to the afternoon sessions of the GHD a representative from the IASC in addition to the representative from OCHA. While emphasizing that GHD activities for 2011-2012 should build on the 2010-2011 work plan and continue to focus on promoting and implementing principles, some GHD members expressed their interest in exploring more in depth thematic such as the quality initiative

as well as the transition between humanitarian assistance to recovery and development. The importance of the work at field level was also emphasized, particularly the focus on needs based humanitarian assistance, as well as the work to develop common need assessments. Engaging with the OECD INCAF group as well as in the framework of BUSAN may provide opportunities for GHD members to actively promote their principles and build new partnerships. Based on these discussions the co-chairs will present a draft work plan at the GHD meeting in October 2011.

V. MEMBER UPDATES

Following the outreach luncheon organised in May 2011, Liechtenstein and Mexico officially joined the GHD group, which as of July 2011 comprises 39 members: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, European Commission, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico; the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Throughout the period under review, GHD members made significant progress in consolidating their approaches to better donorship. Many countries provided concise updates and feedback on their progress on various fronts, including Canada's review of humanitarian aid strategic framework, Spain's humanitarian aid policy review process, Korea's new humanitarian policy development, the UK's multilateral framework and humanitarian policy reviews, SIDA's evaluation of its humanitarian assistance, Finland's new humanitarian aid policy being up-dated and expected to be concluded before the end of the year 2011 – the new policy will include guidelines for funding, and Poland's review of its multi-annual cooperation programmes. Donors exchanged views on the ties between GHD principles and national humanitarian aid policies, pointing out that they faced similar constraints when mainstreaming GHD principles into their policies. The European Commission also presented its "Global Need Assessment (GNA)" initiative, with 129 countries being screened for prioritisation according to nine GNA vulnerability indicators, and pointed out that the identified crises failed to attract adequate funding, as well as media and political attention and finalised after an informal reviewing and feedback process from other donors.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The activities outlined in the present report provide an overview of the various achievements during the period under review. While humanitarian access is globally under threat, it is important that donors continue to promote and implement humanitarian principles and values and to support appropriate, high-quality and needs-based allocation of humanitarian aid. Such activities carried out under the "safety and security" and "protection of civilians in armed conflict" work streams need to be pursued in order to address new developments. There is also a broad and strong push for more systematic and global focus on issues relating to accountability. This goes beyond donors' accountability for implementing GHD principles within their own policies, towards specific improvements to humanitarian assistance. It refers to the quality standards that humanitarian organisations are able to ensure and promote when providing humanitarian assistance, making their actions more accountable to people affected by crisis, and to a more systematic integration of national governments in the preparedness, planning and response phases of natural disasters. It also refers to a better and more efficient humanitarian system that is able to learn from past experience and adapt to new conditions. Finally, the evolving environment in which the international community is

operating also calls for a more inclusive and diversified group of countries to discuss and promote humanitarian principles.