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Executive summary

Total humanitarian assistance from the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donors of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) reached US$9.2 billion in 2006 in current prices.

While there was a small decrease in both total humanitarian assistance (-6%) and official development assistance (ODA, -5%) compared to 2005, both volumes are significantly higher than for any previous year – and the long-term trend is still upwards. And while total ODA has increased substantially in three of the last four years, humanitarian assistance has maintained a fairly constant 9% share.

At US$1.2 billion, Sudan received the greatest share (18%) of total humanitarian assistance for the second year running in 2006. It represented by far the largest UN consolidated appeal process (CAP) appeal requirement in both 2005 (in spite of the tsunami and the South Asia earthquake) and 2006 – and was the largest recipient of bilateral humanitarian assistance from DAC donors in both years. Meanwhile, assistance to Iraq again fell significantly, underlining the fact that ongoing support is now being funded from development rather than humanitarian budgets.

Africa continues to increase its share of total humanitarian assistance (46% in 2006) despite the scale of recent natural disasters in Asia. This suggests that the substantial rises in humanitarian assistance in 2005 and 2006 are the result of multiple crises, rather than any single emergency – and that the tsunami expenditure was additional to other crises, rather than at their expense. Meanwhile, humanitarian assistance to Europe has almost dropped out of the picture now that spending on refugees in the donor country has been excluded from the total humanitarian assistance figures.

Despite lacking a flash ‘headline crisis’, 2006 saw one of the best performances since 2000 in terms of CAP appeal coverage. In 2007, although the gap between best and worst funded crises increased, the share of needs met overall improved, reaching 72%. This hints at better alignment of bilateral humanitarian assistance priorities – and suggests that mechanisms such as the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) are starting to meet their objectives of strengthening core elements of humanitarian response in underfunded crises as well as mobilising support from relatively new donors that might otherwise lack the appropriate means to administer emergency funds bilaterally. Nonetheless, this still means that more than a quarter of the humanitarian needs identified by the UN as the higher priorities went unfunded and unmet in both 2006 and 2007.
Total humanitarian assistance from DAC donors reached US$8.9bn in 2006 ... which represents 9% of ODA.

The US remains the largest single donor of total humanitarian assistance by volume ... and Sudan received the largest share for the second year in a row.

There are signs of increased humanitarian expenditure in support of UN CAP appeals ... yet more than a quarter of the highest priority humanitarian needs were unmet in both 2006 and 2007.
The term 'humanitarian assistance' is used to describe both the aid and action designed to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain and protect human dignity during and in the aftermath of emergencies.

**Total humanitarian assistance** refers to the official humanitarian expenditure of the 23 donors who are members of the OECD DAC. This expenditure is captured in the official DAC statistics on aid.

The humanitarian expenditure by multilateral agencies includes all unearmarked funding from DAC donors, plus funding from other sources.

**Global humanitarian assistance** is the term used for all international humanitarian funding, which includes amounts over and above those captured in the official DAC statistics on aid.

Still missing from these figures are local response and remittances from family members and diaspora communities ... no “guesstimate” of total global humanitarian spending can quantify the scale of resources mobilised through these means, both of which are hugely significant for saving lives and humanitarian response but not yet gathered or reported internationally.
1.1 Official humanitarian assistance expenditure

1.1.1 How much is there?

Total humanitarian expenditure reached US$8.9 billion in 2006 (US$9.2 billion in current prices) – its second highest ever level.

Figure 1.1: Total humanitarian expenditure, 1990–2006 [Source: OECD DAC, Table 1]

The net decrease of US$614 million (-6%) between 2005 and 2006 largely reflects the decline in assistance to tsunami and earthquake-affected countries together with a significant reduction in assistance to Iraq and Ethiopia. However, continued high expenditure on other African crises, ongoing funding to post-disaster countries in Asia (albeit at a lower level) and increased spending in the Middle East in 2006 meant that the decrease in total humanitarian spending compared with 2005 was less than might have been anticipated.

In 2005, total humanitarian aid jumped by US$2.3 billion (31%) to peak at US$9.6 billion. This was driven by donor response to the tsunami, the South Asia earthquake, and significant increases in humanitarian assistance to crises in Africa (particularly Sudan, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Ethiopia).
Bilateral humanitarian assistance followed the same pattern, falling slightly to just under US$6.6 billion in 2006 compared with US$7.1 billion in 2005 after a significant rise from US$5.3 billion in 2004.

**Figure 1.2:** Bilateral humanitarian expenditure, 1990–2006 [Source: OECD DAC, Table 1]

1.1.2 What are the long-term trends?

Figures 1.1 and 1.2 above reveal the long-term trend towards increased humanitarian assistance. From the beginning of the 1990s, a series of complex humanitarian emergencies such as those in south-eastern Europe and the Great Lakes pushed total humanitarian expenditure to an average of over US$5 billion a year – double the US$2 billion average of the 1980s.

The Bosnia crisis in 1991 marks a key point along this trajectory. Humanitarian expenditure doubled that year and has never since fallen back to its pre-1990 levels. The current decade has seen a step change, with humanitarian expenditure rising to over US$7 billion in 2003 and 2004 (largely in response to Iraq) and again to around US$9 billion in 2005 and 2006. It remains to be seen whether what we are witnessing at this point is a spike – or a new plateau.

Figures 1.1 and 1.2 also clearly highlight the spikes in funding associated with major emergencies. As Figure 1.3 illustrates, while the graphs show a significant increase in humanitarian assistance in 2005, this was less pronounced that the spikes in expenditure seen in 1991, when humanitarian assistance more than doubled in response to the Bosnia crisis, or 1999, when donors increased spending by US$2.5 billion in response to the crisis in Kosovo and in the aftermath of Hurricane Mitch.
A further observation about the long-term trend is that while in the past the focus of attention has moved from one crisis to another to create individual peaks of expenditure, over the past two years, humanitarian donors have found themselves responding to multiple crises in different regions, ranging from fast onset natural disasters like the tsunami and the South Asia earthquake, ongoing complex emergencies in Africa such as Sudan and DRC, the aftermath of military intervention in Afghanistan and Iraq, and increased needs in the Middle East as a consequence of intensified hostilities. Responding to these multiple crises is stretching the humanitarian system and leading to a debate as to whether the system has sufficient capacity to cope with these multiple demands.

1.1.3 How does humanitarian expenditure compare with aid as a whole?

In 2006, total ODA reached US$102 billion. This represents a slight (-5%) decline on the US$107 billion recorded for 2005. In 2005 and 2006, net debt relief accounted for US$24 billion and US$19 billion respectively.

Total humanitarian assistance accounted for 12% of the US$33.9bn growth in ODA between 2000 and 2006.
While total humanitarian assistance as a share of overall ODA fluctuates slightly in response to crises, its share has been within the range of 6%–10% for each of the last 16 years, and has been constant at 9% for the past four years. Since total ODA increased substantially in three of these four years, humanitarian assistance has effectively maintained its share of a growing cake.
Bilateral humanitarian expenditure as a share of bilateral ODA has shown an upward trend over the past 10 years. Bilateral humanitarian expenditure as a share of bilateral ODA excluding debt relief peaked at 12.2% in 2005 and fell back slightly to 11.7% in 2006. It has consistently represented over 10% of bilateral ODA for each of the last four years.
Virtually every DAC donor has a commitment to increase its ODA. For European Union (EU) members, the minimum level must be 0.51% by 2010 and 0.7% by 2015. It remains to be seen whether humanitarian assistance will keep pace with committed increases in aid as a whole.

Many of the financial pledges to increased ODA have been made side by side with pledges to achieve substantive outcomes such as universal primary education and access to health care, and in the context of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

Some commentators have seen the increases in humanitarian aid as a dilution of the resources for long-term poverty reduction. It is worth noting that much humanitarian assistance is spent in the poorest countries and on basic services and reducing vulnerability. While immediate needs are the priority, effective humanitarian assistance can also mitigate the risk of crisis driving people into chronic poverty and thus play a part in the achievement of the MDGs and the eradication of poverty.

1.1.4 How much humanitarian assistance is there in addition to that reported by the DAC?

GHA guesstimates that global humanitarian assistance reached US$14.2 billion in 2006. In addition to multilateral and bilateral assistance expenditure captured by the OECD DAC data, this includes an estimate of humanitarian assistance from non-DAC donor governments and voluntary contributions to Red Cross, Red Crescent and UN agencies as well as some official flows of assistance not included within the DAC definition of ODA (e.g. post-conflict peace activities and landmine clearance).

It is still not possible to quantify the resources mobilised through local response and remittances from family members and diaspora communities, both of which are hugely significant but not yet gathered or reported internationally.
The funds raised for humanitarian activity from voluntary sources from 19 of the largest NGOs amounted to US$1.4 billion in 2006. We guesstimate that these NGOs account for around 75%–80% of total NGO voluntary funding. Our estimate for total NGO voluntary funding in 2006 is therefore around US$1.7–US$1.8 billion.

Figure 1.8: Shares of global humanitarian assistance, 2005 and 2006 [Source: OECD DAC, Table 1 and Part 1, Fund flows 114; OECD DAC CRS; UN OCHA FTS; GHA special report on NGO funding for humanitarian activities; and annual reports]
1.2 How much does each DAC donor contribute to humanitarian assistance?

In 2006 the US accounted for 35% (just over US$3 billion) of the official humanitarian assistance total, once again making it the largest single DAC humanitarian donor by volume. The next largest donors were the UK, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden.

Figure 1.9: Total humanitarian assistance by donor (under and over US$200 million), 2006 [Source: OECD DAC statistics, Table 1]

Collectively, the EC and EU member states are the largest providers of humanitarian aid, contributing US$4.2 billion in 2006, which represented 50% of the total. This includes the finance managed directly by the EC, which is primarily channelled through the Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid (DG ECHO).

Figure 1.10: Shares of total humanitarian assistance by donor, 2006. Note that percentages in pies may not add up to 100% due to rounding. [Source: OECD DAC statistics, Table 1]
1.2.1 Which donors have increased their bilateral humanitarian assistance?

Only 10 DAC donors reported increases in bilateral humanitarian expenditure in 2006. The UK was the only country to report a significant increase – up by US$178 million on 2005. Canada’s contribution increased by US$46 million, Germany’s by US$35 million and Sweden’s by US$26 million. A further six donors registered modest increases of US$20 million or under.

Both the US and Japan reported very significant decreases in bilateral humanitarian assistance in 2006 of US$456 million and US$321 million respectively. Norway’s contribution decreased by US$58 million, the EC’s by US$42 million and New Zealand’s by US$30 million.

Figure 1.11: Change in volume of bilateral humanitarian assistance by donor, 2005–2006 [Source: OECD DAC, Tables 1 and 2]

Figure 1.12: Shares of bilateral assistance by donor, 2006 [Source: OECD DAC, Tables 1 and 2]
1.2.2 What priority does each DAC donor give to humanitarian assistance?

While overall volume levels are clearly crucial to the capacity to deliver, looking at the amount of humanitarian assistance as shares of gross national income (GNI) and ODA reveals the priority given to humanitarian assistance. Calculating donor contributions per citizen provides a further perspective on generosity.

In 2006, the US, by far the largest donor in terms of overall volume, gave a high proportion of its ODA (13%) to humanitarian assistance – but this was marginally less than Luxembourg (15%), Finland and Norway.

The UK, the next largest donor in terms of absolute volume in 2006, allocated 9% of its total ODA to humanitarian assistance, while Germany allocated 6%. France and Japan, both substantial donors with ODA flows of over US$10 billion, allocated only 2% to humanitarian assistance. This may partly reflect the composition of ODA from France, which includes very substantial amounts of debt relief for 2006. Also, it should be noted that Japan’s total ODA figure for 2006 reflected a very significant increase in multilateral contributions.

Figure 1.13: Total humanitarian assistance as a share of ODA by DAC donor, 2006
(Source: OECD DAC)

The five donors that have achieved the ODA target of 0.7% of GNI – Luxembourg, Sweden Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands – are also the most generous in terms of humanitarian assistance as a share of GNI, reflecting the allocation of 10% or more of their ODA to humanitarian assistance in 2006.
The next three most generous donors – Ireland, Finland and Switzerland – have relatively small aid programmes but managed to allocate 0.05% of more of their GNI to humanitarian work. The UK is the largest donor by volume to be among those countries allocating 0.05% of GNI or more to humanitarian assistance.

**Figure 1.14:** Total humanitarian assistance as a share of GNI by DAC donor, 2006 [Source: OECD DAC]

Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands head the tables in terms of humanitarian assistance expenditure as a share of GNI – and are also the most generous when their assistance is calculated on a per citizen basis:

- Luxembourg and Norway gave US$94 and US$81 per citizen in humanitarian assistance respectively
- Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands gave US$52, US$44 and US$33 per citizen respectively.

**Figure 1.15:** Total humanitarian assistance per citizen, 2006 [Source: OECD DAC]
1.3 Where is humanitarian assistance being spent?

Note: For 2005 and earlier years there are discrepancies between bilateral and total humanitarian assistance figures on the one hand (which now all exclude ODA spent on refugees in the donor country) and geographical allocation totals on the other (which include ODA spent on refugees from that country or region for their first year of residence in the donor country as allowed under DAC rules). It has not been possible for the DAC to retrospectively disaggregate the domestic refugee elements in the geographical data. All 2006 and future data on humanitarian assistance excludes refugees in the donor country.

1.3.1 Which regions receive the most?

Africa received 46% of the total humanitarian assistance allocable by region in 2006. As Figure 1.16 shows, Africa’s share has increased every year since 2000 – including 2005, despite the scale of the tsunami response.

Figure 1.16: Shares of DAC total humanitarian assistance allocable by region, 2000–2006 [Source: OECD DAC]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In volume terms, humanitarian assistance to Africa showed a slight decrease of US$392 million (-8%) in 2006, having risen every year between 1998 and 2005. However, at least two-thirds of this reduction in 2006 is simply a result of excluding domestic refugee costs from the picture. Eight of the countries in the “top 15” list of highest recipients of total DAC humanitarian assistance in 2006 were in sub-Saharan Africa compared with six in 2005.

Figure 1.17: Annual changes in DAC total humanitarian assistance volume (US$m) by region, 1996–2006 [Source: OECD DAC]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>-318</td>
<td>-129</td>
<td>-84</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>-392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>-303</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-267</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>-216</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>-447</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>-1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-88</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-346</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-204</td>
<td>-213</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>-675</td>
<td>-528</td>
<td>-249</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-90</td>
<td>-287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-1156</td>
<td>-251</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>-686</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>-2041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asia’s share of regionally-allocable assistance fell to 34% in 2006 from a high of 38% in 2005, boosted by the tsunami and the South Asia Earthquake. In volume terms, there was a marked decrease of just over US$1 billion or 25% in 2006 – this fall has to be seen in the context of the 43% (US$1.3 billion) increase in 2005. Three Asian countries featured in the DAC top 15 list in 2006 – Pakistan, Indonesia and Sri Lanka – reflecting ongoing humanitarian support in the year after the South Asia earthquake and the tsunami.

The Middle East was the only region to see an increase in regionally allocable assistance in 2006, reflecting the impact of the Lebanon crisis and increased funding to Palestine/Occupied Territories (OCT). As a result, its share increased by 2% to 15% in 2006. Three countries in the Middle East featured in the DAC top 15 list in 2006 – Palestine/OCT, Lebanon and Iraq.

The proportion of humanitarian assistance allocated to the Americas remained constant at 4% in 2006 but fell further in volume terms. Meanwhile regionally allocable humanitarian assistance to Europe fell to below US$100 million in 2006, accounting for only 1% of the total. This significant drop, down from US$385 million in 2005, is almost entirely as a result of the exclusion of domestic refugees from the statistics. None of the countries in Europe or the Americas featured in the DAC top 15 list for 2006.

1.3.2 Which countries receive the most?

Sudan received the most total humanitarian assistance in 2006 with US$1.2 billion (18%). It was followed by Palestine/OCT with US$701 million (10%) and then DRC, Pakistan, Indonesia, Lebanon and Ethiopia who all received around 5% of the total.

Despite the tsunami and the South Asia earthquake, final figures confirm that Sudan also topped the list in 2005, with the US$1.2 billion it received representing 15% of the total for that year. Indonesia was next with US$610 million (8%), followed by Ethiopia US$588 million (7%), Pakistan US$569 million (7%) and Iraq US$471 million (6%).
In the past four years, the top 10 recipients have consistently shared over two-thirds of the available bilateral humanitarian assistance. In each of the last six years, one country has received significantly more assistance from donors than any other – Sudan in 2005 and 2006, Iraq in 2003 and 2004, and Afghanistan in 2001 and 2002 – with the top recipient typically receiving around one-fifth of total bilateral assistance.
Over the last 12 years, 10 countries have dominated the humanitarian scene in terms of volume of assistance received. While some humanitarian emergencies, such as the Balkans crisis, have a clear beginning, middle and end, others are more intractable. Countries such as Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia, Iraq and Sudan repeatedly appear on the DAC list of top recipients and have been the subject of frequent CAP appeals.

**Figure 1.20:** Concentration of bilateral humanitarian assistance, 1998-2006  
[Source: OECD DAC, Table 2a]

**Figure 1.21:** Top 10 recipients of total DAC humanitarian assistance, 1995–2006  
[Source: OECD DAC, Table 2a]
1.3.3 How does the bilateral allocation of humanitarian assistance by DAC donors reflect the humanitarian priorities defined in the UN CAP?

Eight of the top 15 recipients of bilateral humanitarian assistance from DAC donors in 2006 were the subject of individual CAP appeals. Of the remaining seven countries:

• three had been the subject of flash CAP appeals in 2005 – so the significant humanitarian assistance evident in the bilateral figures for those countries in 2006 is most probably in response to appeals the previous year
  – Pakistan (included in the South Asia earthquake appeal) received US$321 million in bilateral humanitarian assistance in 2006
  – Indonesia (covered in the tsunami appeal) received US$276 million in bilateral humanitarian assistance in 2006
  – Sri Lanka (covered in the tsunami appeal) received US$108 million and was also the subject of a common humanitarian action plan (CHAP) with a US$30 million requirement in 2006

• three had humanitarian requirements that were recognised by the international community and coordinated by the UN in the shape of ‘non-CAP’ appeals
  – Afghanistan (with requirements of US$119 million) and Ethiopia (US$28 million) were the subject of joint appeals
  – Kenya was the subject of a non-CAP UN appeal following the floods

• one was neither the subject of a CAP or non-CAP appeal
  – Iraq has not been the subject of a UN CAP appeal since 2003 and received a total of US$146.3 million in bilateral humanitarian assistance in 2006.

Figure 1.22: UN CAP appeals and bilateral humanitarian assistance compared, 2006 [Source: OECD DAC statistics, Table 2a and OCHA FTS. Map Development Initiatives’ own – for illustrative purposes only and not to be taken as necessarily representing views on boundaries or political status]
Chad had the 8th largest CAP appeal requirement in 2006 (US$193m) but was the 17th largest recipient of bilateral humanitarian assistance from DAC donors (US$68m).

Zimbabwe was the 16th largest recipient of bilateral humanitarian assistance in 2006 (US$83m) but had the third largest CAP appeal requirement (US$426m).

Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Iraq, Pakistan and Sri Lanka were among the top recipients of bilateral humanitarian assistance in 2006. None of the countries had a CAP appeal requirement in 2006 but Pakistan, Indonesia and Sri Lanka had significant CAP appeal requirements in 2005. In 2006, Afghanistan and Ethiopia were both the subject of joint appeals (with requirements of US$119m and US$28m respectively). Sri Lanka was the subject of a CHAP (US$30m).

The CAP appeal for West Africa (US$246m) covered 16 countries in the region. These countries received a total of US$230m in bilateral humanitarian assistance from DAC donors in 2006, US$98m of which was allocated specifically to Liberia.

---

**Top 15 CAP appeal requirements, 2005 (US$ million)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Ocean Earthquake-Tsunami*</td>
<td>1409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia Earthquake**</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine/OCT</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Region</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chechnya/neighbouring republics</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including Indonesia and Sri Lanka
** Including Pakistan

---

**Top 15 CAP appeal requirements, 2006 (US$ million)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine/OCT</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes Region</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn of Africa</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top 15 bilateral recipients of DAC-reported spend, 2006 (US$ million)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Spend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan***</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia***</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine/OCT</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka***</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Part of a UN CAP appeal in 2005 (but not in 2006)
The CAP process is designed to identify all of those countries in crisis that require a consolidated humanitarian response. Not all countries in crisis will be subject of a CAP appeal – in some cases the country in question may not wish to be the subject of an appeal; in others, sufficient funds may be mobilised outside a CAP and other coordination mechanisms will enable a consolidated response. Nevertheless, the CAP highlights many of the countries that are in most need of humanitarian assistance, so comparing the pattern of CAP priorities with funding from DAC donors provides a means of assessing the extent to which humanitarian assistance is focussed on identified needs.

Of the 12 largest CAP appeals launched for individual countries in 2006, only one (Lebanon) received more in bilateral assistance from DAC donors than the amount requested in the appeal.

By way of comparison, in 2005, contributions from DAC donors exceeded the total amount requested in two of the 10 largest appeals – DRC and Eritrea. In the remaining eight countries, DAC contributions amounted to less than the amount requested, sometimes significantly so. For example, while Sudan received more humanitarian assistance than any other country in 2005, DAC donors contributed US$1.1 billion against a total appeal request of US$1.9 billion.

Many of the countries for whom CAP and flash appeals were launched in 2005 and 2006 are the subject of protracted emergencies and repeated appeals.

Between 1995 and 2006, nine countries were the subject of eight or more annual appeals: Sudan (12); Sierra Leone and Somalia (11); Angola (10); Afghanistan, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), DRC, Liberia and Uganda (8). All have also featured in the DAC’s list of top 10 recipients over the same period, five of them also on eight or more occasions: Sudan (12), Afghanistan and Iraq (11), Angola (9) and Ethiopia (8). For these countries, donors clearly have mobilised resources in response to need, if not always up to the level requested.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia/Timor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia and Montenegro</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States of Ex Yugoslavia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But for some smaller countries with more limited needs (and less profile), mobilising resources continues to be a problem. For example, the Djibouti Drought appeal in 2005 was only 34% funded, and DAC donors contributed only US$3.5 million to the country.
1.4 Does humanitarian assistance reach everyone in need?

At present, there is no single consistent way of measuring needs across humanitarian crises or assessing whether or not these are being adequately or equitably met. The CAP process was not designed for this purpose and therefore has clear limitations—but at present, it provides the best means of comparing the extent to which needs are met across different crises.

1.4.1 Are needs more likely to be met in natural disasters or complex emergencies?

Since 1997, a total of US$39.7 billion has been requested via 236 CAP appeals. Of this, the vast majority (US$36.5 billion) has been in response to 193 consolidated appeals for complex emergencies. The remaining US$3.2 billion has been in response to the 43 flash appeals launched in response to sudden onset emergencies.

In 2006 the amount requested for consolidated appeals increased by US$1 billion to reach US$4.9 billion, up from US$3.8 billion in 2005. In 2007, this slipped back slightly to US$4.7 billion.

The amount requested for flash appeals fluctuates considerably from year to year. Only US$188 million was requested in response to the five flash appeals launched in 2006. By contrast, over US$2 billion was requested in response to a total of 10 flash appeals in 2005, with the tsunami representing 65% of this total. In 2007, the total requested for flash appeals was US$372 million.

Figure 1.24: Total requirements for UN consolidated and flash appeals, 1997–2007
[Source: OCHA FTS]
Figure 1.25 shows the percentage of needs met as a share of the required funds within each of the appeals launched in 2006. The three most successful appeals, all of which exceeded requirements, were the flash appeals launched for the Lebanon crisis, Kenya and Timor-Leste. This suggests that in 2006, donors responded more generously to flash appeals than to consolidated appeals. At the same time, there was a discernable trend towards improved funding of all appeals in 2006 – as acknowledged by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) in its Humanitarian Report 2007. During the year, US$3.4 billion (66%) was raised in response to the total CAP appeal requirement of US$5.1 billion.

**Figure 1.25: Percentage of needs met within the CAP appeals, 2006**

[Source: OCHA FTS]

1.4.2 How much money is received per person in different situations?

Levels of funding per person vary hugely between emergencies. Figure 1.26 shows how much was requested and how much was received per person inside the appeals in 2006. (Somalia’s two appeals have been combined for the purposes of this analysis. Guinea-Bissau, Horn of Africa, Kenya, Lebanon Crisis and Timor-Leste have not been included as we do not have sufficient data regarding numbers of beneficiaries.)
In 2006 appeal requests ranged from less than US$100 per person for Cote d’Ivoire, Republic of Congo, Great Lakes, Burundi and Guinea to between US$211 and US$373 per person for DRC, West Africa, Palestine/OCT, Sudan, Nepal, Somalia and Central African Republic (CAR) and up to US$797 per beneficiary in Chad. The amounts received per person vary widely too. Those requiring the least per person – such as Cote d’Ivoire (US$12), Republic of Congo (US$21) and Burundi (US$79) – were also the least successful, seeing only around half of their needs met inside the appeal.

1.4.3 Which years have had the best CAP appeal funding coverage since 2000?

In 2007, 72% of needs were met across all CAP appeals for both complex emergencies and sudden onset disasters. This is a significant improvement on the average of two-thirds of needs met in the previous three years and lower only than 2003, when 76% of needs were met, largely driven by a huge and 91%-funded appeal for Iraq. In 2000 and 2001, less than 60% of needs were met.

There is always a significant range for needs met across the appeals. This reflects not only the variations in the willingness of donors to finance different countries, but also capacity and access. In some situations with very high needs, it may not be possible to reach affected populations.
In 2006, 96% of needs were covered in the five best funded appeals. This is well above the 85% average reached since 2000 and matches the previous best coverage of 2003, which reflected the success of the Iraq appeal that year. In 2007, the share of needs met in the top five appeals was just below average at 83%. However, the share of needs met in the bottom five appeals dropped to 30% – lower than all but two years in the last eight. Meanwhile, the five least funded appeals saw 48% of their needs met in 2006. This was well above average and significantly higher than for any other year since 2000.

Figure 1.27: Five best funded and five least funded CAP appeals by percentage covered, 2000–2007 [Source: OCHA FTS]

While figures were up significantly for 2006, reflecting the overall trend towards slightly better CAP appeal funding, the gap between the most successful and the least successful appeals remains huge. In addition, figures for both 2006 and 2007 show that over a quarter of the highest priority needs by identified by the UN are still going unmet. While some countries, such as CAR for example, fared much better than in previous years thanks to mechanisms such as the CERF, others remain consistently underfunded. For example, Burundi has been the subject of appeals every year since 2000, and has only seen more than 50% of its appeal requirements met once. Meanwhile, only once has the Republic of Congo, the subject of appeals in 2000, 2001, 2005 and 2006, seen more than 48% of its needs met in any given year.
1.5 What is humanitarian assistance funding spent on?

GHA reports traditionally rely on OCHA Financial Tracking System (FTS) and World Food Programme (WFP) International Food Aid Information Service (INTERFAIS) data for analysis of humanitarian spending by sector. Due to changes in reporting in 2006 figures, we are also able to provide information on allocations of bilateral assistance to emergency food aid on the basis of CRS data for the first time.

1.5.1 Which sectors receive the most humanitarian assistance funding?

Food has always comprised the largest share of commitments to humanitarian appeals, accounting for US$12.2 billion (54%) of the US$22.6 billion committed to CAP appeals since 2000. It has accounted for more than 50% of total commitments each year except 2005, when the share fell to 38% as commitments to all other sectors increased proportionately in response to the multiple appeals that year, particularly in response to the tsunami.

By comparison, commitments to health (US$1.4 billion), water and sanitation (US$560 million), education (US$492 million) and shelter plus non-food items (US$428 million) are very small.

Figure 1.28: Volume of donor commitments to all sectors, 2000–2007 [Source: OCHA FTS]
Since 2003, a small proportion of commitments to appeals has been allocated annually to ‘sector unspecified’ humanitarian assistance. This allows OCHA to allocate to the most urgent unfunded priorities. In the past five years, just over US$1 billion has been allocated on a sector unspecified basis, with the US$313 million total for 2007 suggesting that this is represents an ongoing trend, which should lead to increased effectiveness and coordination.

Figure 1.30 (below) shows that sectors such as agriculture, health, education and water and sanitation have been consistently underfunded over the last eight years, all receiving less than 40% of the funding requested over this period. Economic recovery and shelter plus non-food items faced even larger shortfalls, with only 29% of identified needs met within the appeal process. The only year that bucked the trend was 2005, when all of these sectors saw a significantly higher proportion of the appeal needs met as result of the tsunami response. Meanwhile, as well as being the largest sector in terms of volume, food is consistently the best funded in relation to appeals.
The gap between funding for food and funding for other sectors may not be quite as large as the headline figures suggest for reporting reasons. Food aid reporting to the FTS tends to be very complete compared with other sectors. Up to now, NGOs and the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement have not been consistently involved in either the needs assessment or the CAP. The cluster approach makes sectoral coordination much more inclusive and sector leads can be from NGOs as well as from the UN. Currently if an NGO or a Red Cross agency has a particular focus on a sector – Oxfam on water for instance – actions in that sector may not be fully reported within the FTS data. Current efforts to improve needs assessment and the cluster approach for sectoral coordination should both improve the data and understanding of humanitarian aid resources for different sectors.

1.5.2 What are the main trends in food aid?

Figure 1.31 illustrates the fluctuations in total food aid volumes from donors since 1990. While there are peaks and troughs, there has been a general downward trend since 1999. While a number of factors have contributed to this trend, the most significant is the world price of grain, which has been higher this decade than during the 1990s.
Who gives the most food aid?

According to INTERFAIS data, the US provided just under half of all emergency food aid in 2006. The EC provided 9%, while 8% came from the UN (as a CERF contribution to WFP).

Figure 1.32: Donors of emergency food aid, 2006 [Source: The Food Aid Monitor, INTERFAIS, June 2007]
The OECD data confirms emergency food aid as a very significant component of bilateral assistance for both the US and Canada, at 47% and 60% respectively. Recent DAC peer reviews have recommended that both countries should further reform their emergency food aid by reducing the tied element following a study that estimated the costs arising from the tying of food aid.

For more information see “The Development Effectiveness of Food Aid: Does Tying Matter?” http://www.oecd.org

Figure 1.33: Bilateral emergency food aid volumes and shares of bilateral emergency distress relief [Source: CRS, OECD DAC]

Overall, emergency food aid represented 32% of DAC donor emergency distress relief in 2006.
Some distributions are strongly skewed towards neighbouring countries – for example, over 90% of China and Australia’s food aid went to Asia in 2006. However, although 13.5% of US food aid went to Latin America and the Caribbean (making the US the largest food aid donor to the region), two-thirds of it went to sub-Saharan Africa. Equally, while 30% of EC food aid went to Eastern Europe in 2006, 45% of it went to sub-Saharan Africa.

Who are the main recipients of food aid?

A total of 76 countries received emergency food in 2006. The two largest recipients were Ethiopia and Sudan, both long-term recipients of emergency food aid, who together received one-third of the total emergency food aid.

**Figure 1.35: Major recipients of emergency food aid, 2006** [Source: The Food Aid Monitor, INTERFAIS, June 2007]

![Pie chart showing food aid distributions]

- Ethiopia - 18%
- Sudan - 15%
- DPRK - 6%
- Somalia - 5%
- Uganda - 5%
- Palestine/OCT - 3%
- Afghanistan - 3%
- Zimbabwe - 3%
- Indonesia - 2%
- Tanzania - 2%
- Burundi - 2%
- Malawi - 4%
- Zambia - 3%
- 62 others - 24%

Sub-Saharan Africa received just under three-quarters of emergency food aid in 2006, with Asia receiving 17% and North Africa and the Middle East, Eastern Europe and CIS and Latin America and the Caribbean sharing the remaining 9%.
Total food aid to sub-Saharan Africa fell by 12% in 2006. In Asia, there was a significant drop (-51%) – but that drop needs to be viewed in relation to the tsunami the previous year. Food aid to eastern Europe remained stable, while there was a slight increase to Latin America and the Caribbean and a more marked increase to North Africa and the Middle East.

**Figure 1.36: Shares of emergency food aid by region, 2006 [Source: The Food Aid Monitor, INTERFAIS, June 2007]**

**Figure 1.37: Food aid volumes by region, 2004, 2005 and 2006 [The Food Aid Monitor, INTERFAIS, June 2007]**
2.1 New rules for reporting and analysing official humanitarian assistance

2.1.1 DAC implements new definition of humanitarian aid

The revised DAC directives on official humanitarian aid reporting align the definition of humanitarian aid with that agreed by the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative. The directive states that “[within] the overall definition of ODA, humanitarian aid is assistance designed to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain and protect human dignity during and in the aftermath of emergencies. To be classified as humanitarian, aid should be consistent with the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence”.

The directive sets out three main categories of humanitarian aid – emergency response; reconstruction and rehabilitation; and disaster prevention and preparedness. Emergency response is further broken down into the following categories:

- material relief assistance and services (Creditor Reporting System (CRS) code 72010)
- emergency food aid (CRS code 72040)
- relief and coordination services (CRS code 72050).

Donors will report their expenditure against these revised codes for the first time in 2007 figures (to be published towards the end of 2008).

See www.oecd.org/dac/stats/crs for further details.
2.1.2 “Activities designed to protect the security of persons or property through the use or display of force are not reportable as ODA”

In April 2007, the DAC published its revised directives on statistical reporting. The new directive reconfirms that “activities designed to protect the security of persons or property through the use or display of force are not reportable as ODA”.

This decision follows debate within the DAC about the pros and cons of expanding the definition to include some aspects of security expenditure. On the one hand, a number of donors advocating a “whole of government” approach to security issues favoured such expansion, whereas others raised concerns about diluting the definition of ODA, and diverting limited aid budgets from the core purpose of poverty reduction.

2.1.3 Domestic refugee costs excluded from humanitarian assistance

In June 2006 it was agreed that, while expenditure on refugees in the donor country for the first year of residence could be reported as ODA, it could no longer be reported as humanitarian assistance. The DAC put this change into effect as far as possible in the 2006 statistics and has now also applied the change to total humanitarian assistance and bilateral assistance figures reported by individual donors prior to 2006. This means that the information on humanitarian assistance in DAC Table 1 now excludes all domestic refugee costs. However, it has not been possible to apply the same retrospective amendment to DAC Table 2a, which analyses humanitarian assistance and ODA by recipient country and region. This gives rise to some discrepancies when looking at the data.
2.2 The Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)

2.2.1 Who is supporting the CERF?

In 2007, 65 states and three corporations contributed over US$384 million to the CERF, with a further US$1.4 million in unpaid pledges:

- the three largest donors – the UK, the Netherlands and Norway – provided 50% of the total amount
- another four donors – Sweden, Canada, Ireland and Spain – contributed more than US$20 million each (accounting for a further 35% of the total)
- 11 states, including India and Korea, contributed between US$1 million and US$20 million (accounting for 14% of the total)
- 41 other countries made paid up contributions of less than US$1 million each and their combined funding amounted to 1% of the total amount.

Figure 2.1: Total contributions to the CERF, 1 March–31 December 2006 and 1 January–31 December 2007. Note that numbers in pie charts may vary slightly due to rounding. [Source: UN OCHA]
By way of comparison, between 1 March (when the CERF was officially initiated) and the end of December 2006, the CERF secured contributions of just under US$299 million from 51 states, plus one local government and one private corporation:

- the three largest donors – the UK, the Netherlands and Sweden – contributed over half (55%) of the total amount
- two other donors – Norway and Canada – contributed more than US$20 million each (jointly accounting for a further 17% of the funding)
- 13 of the 51 states (including India, Qatar and Korea) contributed between US$1 million and US$10 million each (23% of the total)
- a further 33 states contributed less than US$1 million each and their combined contribution accounted for 1% of the total.

All DAC donors have contributed to the CERF in at least one of the two years it has been operating but its funding is heavily concentrated on the same few large donors – UK, Norway, Sweden, Netherlands, Canada, Ireland and Spain.

Nonetheless, the increasing number of contributing countries may suggest both confidence in the mechanism and also suggests that the CERF is providing a way of supporting urgent and neglected crises for donors who would find it challenging to do this bilaterally. This has a double benefit of increasing funding to these crises while enabling a more coordinated response.

2.2.2 Where are the funds being distributed?

55 countries received funds via the CERF in 2007:

- DRC topped the list with US$53 million, followed by Bangladesh (US$27 million), Sudan (US$25 million) and Somalia (US$16 million)
- US$228 million was disbursed to rapid response emergencies in 45 countries
- US$123 million was disbursed to underfunded crises in 23 countries.

Figure 2.2: Top 15 recipients of CERF funding, 1 March–31 December 2006 and 1 January–31 December 2007 [Source: UN OCHA]
35 countries received funds via the CERF in 2006:

- the top four recipients were DRC (US$38 million), Sudan (US$36 million), Afghanistan (US$32 million) and Kenya (US$27 million)
- US$182 million was spent on jump-starting humanitarian response in rapid onset crises or sudden deteriorations of existing crises in 24 countries
- US$77 million was spent on underfunded crises in 17 countries.

In 2006 the CERF contributed just under US$6 million to the UN consolidated appeal for CAR – a contribution that equated to 20% of the country’s total appeal funding for the year. CAR traditionally finds it difficult to mobilise resources but the CERF contribution meant that it fared much better in 2006, with its appeal 63% met compared to only 35% in 2005. This provides a good example of the CERF achieving one its core objectives – to strengthen core elements of humanitarian response in underfunded crises.
2.3 Cluster approach

The cluster approach was introduced in 2005 in order to improve predictability, response capacity, coordination and accountability by strengthening partnerships in key sectors of humanitarian response and formalising the lead role of particular agencies/organisations in each of these sectors.

In November 2007, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), which had been responsible for initiating the cluster approach, published the results of an evaluation to examine whether the approach had led to any measurable improvements. The evaluation found that the cluster approach had:

• improved efforts to identify and address gaps within sectoral programming in humanitarian response in the field – particularly in chronic emergencies
  – cluster lead agencies were found to have been successful in directing or redirecting partners to fill gaps
  – the responsibilities of cluster leadership have helped to drive capacity increases within those agencies
• helped to foster stronger and more predictable leadership over sectors
  – but questions remain regarding ultimate accountability and how ‘provider of last resort’ will work in practice
• improved preparedness and surge capacity at field level
  – but the system has yet to face the litmus test of concurrent, large-scale emergencies
• marginally improved partnerships between lead agencies and NGOs – notably allowing for progress in developing standards and guidelines among partners
• introduced potential for enhanced efficiency and reduced transaction costs
• improved prioritisation of response and strategic planning at the level of CAPs/CHAPs, particularly when underpinned by a common funds mechanism
  – this had a tendency to falter in sudden onset cases
  – joint needs assessments increased in number but there is room for improvement in terms of quality/usefulness
  – further room for improvement in monitoring and evaluation
• enjoyed mixed success in terms of engaging host states.
Individual cluster performance at the global and field levels was found to vary. Where a cluster performed poorly or failed to add value, this was generally attributed to weak leadership – a low level of operational capacity of the lead agency and/or weak coordination skills of personnel placed in coordinating roles.

The evaluation report, which was based on field research in the four roll-out countries (Chad, DRC, Somalia and Uganda) plus desk research on the fast onset emergencies, concluded with a series of recommendations for IASC members, cluster lead agencies, donors, OCHA senior management and individual agencies aimed at addressing the identified points of weakness. It urged that these action steps be prioritised in months to come as the cluster roll-out continues.

Further information on the cluster approach is available online at: www.humanitarianreform.org

2.4 Global Humanitarian Forum

The Global Humanitarian Forum was launched by Kofi Annan, Former UN Secretary-General, in October 2007. Based in Geneva, its mission is to foster dialogue and broker partnerships to strengthen the international community’s ability to address humanitarian challenges.

The Forum’s board includes a wide range of high-profile public figures from government, civil society, the business community, the military, humanitarian organisations and academia.

The Forum will organise a series of workshops and events, including an ‘Annual High Level’ meeting. The first of these is planned for June 2008 and will focus on the humanitarian impact of climate change on the poorest and most vulnerable people.
2.5 DAC peer reviews

In 2004, the DAC agreed to take an active role in promoting the GHD initiative and to include broader coverage of humanitarian assistance in its peer reviews of donor performance on development cooperation.

The GHD assessment framework was applied to five reviews in 2005. A synthesis report published in February 2006 identified four distinct areas for improvement including:

- policy – lack of comprehensive framework
- volume – the need for increased humanitarian allocations
- budget systems – improvements aimed at increasing timeliness and flexibility
- management – consolidation of management structures.

A further 10 peer reviews were completed during 2006 and 2007. A synthesis report of the humanitarian component of these is being drafted in advance of the next GHD meeting in July 2008.

The latest reviews confirm wide endorsement of GHD principles by donors but only two of those reviewed recently – the UK and the Netherlands – have adopted national GHD action plans.

The need for a comprehensive policy framework for humanitarian assistance was noted in a number of reviews, as was the need to increase or sustain core humanitarian budgets. Several donors were praised for high levels of unearmarked contributions to UN agencies and for their support of the CERF and the common (pooled) humanitarian funds (CHF).

The need to ensure coherence across government departments and improve coordination with other actors was noted in a number of reviews, as was the need for some donors to increase their capacity at field level.

Further information on the DAC peer reviews can be accessed online at: www.oecd.org/dac/peerreviews
2.6 Common (pooled) humanitarian funds (CHF)

CHFs were piloted in DRC and Sudan during 2006. The purpose of these funds is to meet priority needs and enable the Humanitarian Coordinator to ensure that strategic needs are met and critical projects financed.

Since donor contributions to the CHF are unearmarked, they support the principles of the GHD initiative – money is allocated at country level on the basis of need, by the Humanitarian Coordinator. This empowers the Humanitarian Coordinator role and increases his/her flexibility in responding to changing circumstances on the ground. The CHF also encourages timely and predictable funding, since donors are expected to provide funds (or at least make pledges) at the beginning of the year.

An independent evaluation carried out on the two pilots in September 2007 concluded that the funds had a positive impact. Summarising key achievements, it noted that CHFs had:

- become established and overcome initial problems, particularly NGO concerns
- empowered the Humanitarian Coordinator
- supported and incentivised coordination
- filled gaps sectorally, geographically and temporally
- allowed smaller donors to fund activities in Sudan and DRC
- empowered the field to improve targeting of funds.

Nevertheless, it noted that “while many of the teething problems relating to financial administration have been reduced, there remain a number of outstanding challenges in the areas of governance, management structures, allocation, and accountability”. The evaluation team attributed these problems largely to the fact that the pilot schemes were established very quickly (over three months) and there was little opportunity to stress test systems and structures.

The review recommended that the CHF should continue as a funding mechanism in both countries – but that “considerable work” was needed in order for them to realise their potential and overcome “outstanding weaknesses”. While the original plan had been to roll out further CHFs from January 2008, this has been delayed until March in order to address the issues raised by the review and to develop an agreed, standardised model.

Despite reservations amongst humanitarian organisations and some donors, pooled financing mechanisms at the country and global levels are set to continue and proliferate.

The full evaluation report is available online at: http://www.reliefweb.int
3 Basic concepts, definitions and methodology

3.1 What are the main sources of data?

3.1.1 OECD DAC online databases

The OECD DAC provides data on the volume, origin and types of aid and resource flows to over 180 aid recipients. The data covers ODA, other official flows (OOF) and private funding (foreign direct investment, bank and non-bank flows) from DAC and other donors as well as multilateral organisations.

The official data used for Global Humanitarian Assistance 2007/2008 was published in December 2007 and is available online at: www.oecd.org/dac/statsdac/reftables

The DAC database provides disbursement as follows:

- Table 1 for all disbursements of ODA and bilateral humanitarian assistance from 1960–2006
- Table 2a for all disbursements of ODA and bilateral humanitarian assistance by recipient country and region and ODA to multilateral agencies
- Table 7b for tying status of ODA
- reference section – indicators for population, GNI, GNI per capita for all developing countries and regions.

The CRS database provides data on commitments made by all DAC members, broken down by detailed sub-sector and countries/regions.

Additional analysis is taken from the statistical reference tables of the OECD DAC Annual Development Cooperation Report. See www.oecd.org/dac

3.1.2 UN OCHA FTS

UN OCHA’s FTS captures voluntary statements of contributions to humanitarian assistance from over 60 countries, validated by the agencies receiving the contributions.

FTS data primarily covers contributions to countries that are a subject of the CAP appeal or contributions in response to a natural disaster and which have been reported to the FTS either by the donor or by the recipient agency.

Humanitarian aid departments of donor governments, UN agencies, the Red Cross and Red Crescent agencies, selected NGOs and other international organisations. Additional data has been compiled from the humanitarian aid departments of donor governments, UN agencies, the Red Cross and Red Crescent agencies, selected NGOs and other international organisations.
### 3.2 How do you deal with inflation and exchange rates?

Data shown in constant prices has been deflated on the basis of the DAC deflators, which, along with annualised exchange rates, are available at: www.oecd.org/dac. The base year for the current report is 2005.

### 3.3 Basic concepts and definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bilateral aid/assistance</strong></td>
<td>Aid that is controlled and spent by donor countries at their own discretion. It may include staff, supplies, equipment, funding to recipient governments and funding to NGOs. It also includes assistance channelled as earmarked funding through international and UN organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)</strong></td>
<td>The Central Emergency Revolving Fund (CERF) was established in 1991. The new CERF (this time the Central Emergency Response Fund) was officially launched on 9 March 2006. It has a grant element of US$450 million and a US$50 million loan element. Up to two-thirds of the grant facility can be allocated to rapid response to emergencies while the remaining third is for underfunded emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster approach</strong></td>
<td>A mechanism for sector coordination introduced by the UN in December 2005 to “enhance the ability of the ERC (globally) and the humanitarian coordinators (on the ground) to manage humanitarian response effectively”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td>A commitment refers to the firm – but not legally binding – pledges of assistance made by donors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common humanitarian action plan (CHAP)</strong></td>
<td>A strategic plan for humanitarian response in a given country or region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidated appeal</strong></td>
<td>A tool for structuring a coordinated humanitarian response to complex and/or major emergencies within the consolidated appeals process (CAP). See also “flash appeal”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidated appeals process (CAP)</strong></td>
<td>The objective of the CAP is to set a common strategy and to implement a coordinated response to complex emergencies and natural disasters. The ability to fulfil this objective depends on the extent to which the programmes within the CAP are funded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constant prices

Constant (real terms) figures show how expenditure has changed over time after removing the effects of exchange rates and inflation. DAC deflators along with annualised exchange rates, are available at: www.oecd.org/dac

Debt relief

Debt relief may take the form of cancellation, rescheduling, refinancing or reorganisation:

- debt cancellation is relief from the burden of repaying both the principal and interest on past loans – most of the poorest countries have had outstanding debt arising from past aid loans cancelled
- debt rescheduling is a form of relief where principal or interest payments are delayed or rearranged
- debt refinancing is where a new loan or grant is arranged to enable the debtor country to meet the service payments on an earlier loan.

Official bilateral debts are reorganised in the Paris club of official bilateral creditors.

Development Assistance Committee (DAC)

The DAC is the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. Its members are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Sweden, the UK, the US and the EC. These members have “agreed to secure an expansion of aggregate volume of resources made available to developing countries and to improve their effectiveness”.

The DAC, set up in 1960, sets the rules for what can and cannot be counted as official development assistance (ODA).

Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC)

Coordinates the efforts of the special representatives of the UN Secretary-General to complex, man-made emergencies and the tasks of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator (UNDRO), who handles natural disasters.

Emergency response funds (ERFs)

ERFs are project funds, managed by OCHA in-country, for short-term NGO (and occasionally, as in the case of DRC and Somalia, UN agency) projects of around US$100 000–US$150 000.

The Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance (OCHA)'s FTS captures voluntary statements of contributions to humanitarian assistance from over 60 countries.

Financial Tracking System (FTS)

FTS data primarily covers contributions for countries that are a subject of a CAP appeal or in response to a natural disaster and which have been reported to the FTS either by the donor or by the recipient agency.

Flash appeal

A tool for structuring a coordinated humanitarian response to sudden onset emergencies. It is triggered by the UN’s humanitarian coordinator in consultation with the IASC country team and following endorsement by the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) and the IASC. The government of the affected country is also consulted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>A term used within the context of the Global Humanitarian Assistance (GHA) project to provide a guesstimate of global expenditure on humanitarian assistance. It includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• total humanitarian assistance (see separate definition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• donations to NGOs, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and UN agencies by members of the general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• certain expenditure by DAC donor governments that falls outside the official definition of either ODA or humanitarian assistance (security expenditure and activities such as mine clearance, for example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the activities of governments that are not part of the DAC (‘non-DAC’ donors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In spite of efforts to be all encompassing, this calculation still excludes local response and remittances from family members and diaspora communities. Compare: “humanitarian assistance” and “total humanitarian assistance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Humanitarian Assistance (GHA)</td>
<td>GHA is an independent project, established by Development Initiatives in 1999 to monitor funding for humanitarian action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 2004–2007 phase of the project was funded by the Candadian International Development Agency (CIDA), the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD)</td>
<td>The GHD initiative was created by donor governments at a meeting in Stockholm in 2003 with the idea of working towards achieving efficient and principled humanitarian assistance. The initiative provides a forum for donors to discuss good practice in funding humanitarian assistance and other shared concerns. By defining principles and standards it provides both a framework to guide official humanitarian aid and a mechanism for encouraging greater donor accountability. See: <a href="http://www.goodhumanitariandonorship.org/">http://www.goodhumanitariandonorship.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross national income (GNI)</td>
<td>The total value of goods and services produced within a country (i.e. its gross domestic product (GDP)), together with income received from other countries (notably interest and dividends), less similar payments made to other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>The term used to describe the aid and action designed to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain and protect human dignity during and in the aftermath of emergencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanitarian assistance includes both responses by local communities and governments of affected countries and the international response to crises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This report deals mainly with the official international flows of humanitarian assistance that include the part of ODA that is allocated to: emergency response; reconstruction and rehabilitation; and disaster prevention and preparedness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</strong></td>
<td>The primary mechanism for inter-agency coordination of humanitarian assistance. It involves UN and non-UN humanitarian partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inside the CAP appeal</strong></td>
<td>Funds given by donors for needs identified within a consolidated or flash appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multilateral agency</strong></td>
<td>International institutions with governmental membership that conduct all or a significant part of their activities in favour of developing and aid recipient countries. They include multilateral development banks (e.g. the World Bank and regional development banks), UN agencies, and regional groupings (e.g. certain EU and Arab agencies).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Multilateral aid/assistance**   | Multilateral humanitarian aid is funding given to UN agencies, international organisations or the EC to spend entirely at their own discretion within their mandate. It cannot be earmarked in any way.  
  Compare “bilateral assistance”. |
| **Official development assistance (ODA)** | Official development assistance (ODA) is money spent on development and humanitarian assistance by members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC).  
  ODA is made up of grants or concessionary loans given by the official sector to a defined list of developing countries. Reporting to the DAC is mandatory for all DAC members. |
| **Outside the CAP appeal**        | Funds given by donors for a country that is the subject of a consolidated or flash appeal but not for the specific needs identified within the appeal document. |
| **Remittances**                   | Private transfers between individuals – often relatives or friends – in another country.                                                                                           |
| **Total humanitarian assistance** | In this report, total humanitarian assistance is calculated by adding the following:  
  • total bilateral ODA for humanitarian assistance from all DAC donors  
  • ODA from the EC for humanitarian assistance  
  • total multilateral contributions to UNHCR and UNRWA  
  • multilateral contributions to WFP in proportion to the share of WFP's operational expenditure allocated to relief.  
  Compare “humanitarian assistance” and “global humanitarian assistance”. |
3.4 Abbreviations

CAP Consolidated appeals process
CAR Central African Republic
CERF Central emergency response fund
CHAP Common humanitarian action plan
CIDA Canadian International Development Agency
CIS Commonwealth of Independent States
CRS Creditor Reporting System (DAC)
DAC Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)
DANIDA Danish International Development Assistance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
DFID Department for International Development (UK)
DPRK Democratic People's Republic of Korea
DRC Democratic Republic of the Congo
EC European Commission
DG ECHO Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid (formerly European Community Humanitarian Aid department)
ERC Emergency Relief Coordinator
EU European Union
FAO Food and Agriculture Organization
FRY Former Republic of Yugoslavia
FTS Financial Tracking System (OCHA)
G8 Group of eight: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the UK and the US
GHD Good Humanitarian Donorship
GNI Gross national income
HIC High income countries
HIPC Heavily indebted poor countries debt initiative
IASC Inter-Agency Standing Committee
ICRC International Committee of the Red Cross
INTERFAIS International Food Aid Information System (WFP)
MDG Millennium Development Goals
NGO Non-governmental organisation
OCHA Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN)
ODA Official development assistance
OECD Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
ROC Republic of Congo
ROK Republic of Korea
UNDP United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF United Nations Children’s Fund
UNRWA UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
WFP World Food Programme
How much does the world spend on meeting the humanitarian needs of people affected by conflict, crisis and disaster? How far does this go to meeting the needs of those in crisis? Drawing on data from governments, the UN, the OECD and NGOs, the Global Humanitarian Assistance 2007/2008 report aims to present objective information to assist in the process of mobilising resources, measuring equity and ensuring the effectiveness of humanitarian aid.

Chapter 1 attempts to quantify and analyse long-term trends in humanitarian assistance. How much official humanitarian assistance is there? How does it compare with aid expenditure as a whole? How generous are donors in terms of expenditure per citizen or as a share of gross national income (GNI)? What about other sources of humanitarian assistance? How does the bilateral allocation of humanitarian assistance reflect the humanitarian priorities defined in the UN consolidated appeal process (CAP)? Is it reaching everyone in need?

Chapter 2 takes a look at the latest developments in humanitarian assistance financing and policy. What are the implications of the new rules for reporting and analysing official humanitarian assistance and aid? What do the latest assessments of funding mechanisms such as common (pooled) humanitarian funds (CHF) and Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) tell us about their contribution to a strengthened humanitarian response? What steps are being taken to improve predictability, response capacity and coordination?


The GHA website also contains humanitarian donor profiles for each of the 22 DAC member countries, information about our work with the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) initiative and details of our special focus reports.

Global Humanitarian Assistance 2007/2008 is an independent report funded by: the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Humanitarian Assistance, Peace and Security Division; the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Humanitarian Assistance and NGO Co-operation; the Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, the Netherlands, Humanitarian Aid Division; the Swedish International Development Co-operation Agency (SIDA), Division for Humanitarian Assistance and Conflict Management; and the UK Department for International Development (DFID), Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Department (CHASE).