

hpg

Humanitarian  
Policy Group

# Donorship Principles and Good Practice: a summary of indicators and interpretations of good practice

---

Jonathan Pickering



An HPG Background Paper

March 2006

## Overview

The following table summarises initiatives undertaken to date to formally measure or interpret the requirements of the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) Principles and Good Practice measures. Formal indicators developed so far include:

1. **Collective indicators:** the global indicators being developed as part of the GHD initiative and the impact indicators developed as part of the GHD pilot in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). As yet no set of indicators covers all GHD measures.
2. **Individual donor indicators:** at present the only formal indicators available at this level are those contained in Canada's domestic strategy for GHD and in the targets set by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) in its Public Service Agreement with the UK Treasury; some of these individual indicators could form the basis for further collective indicators.

The table also covers a wider range of 'interpretations' of good practice. While not strictly formal indicators, they encapsulate views of donors, intergovernmental organisations and research bodies on what constitutes good practice. While some of the interpretations are more 'aspirational', many of them are already being implemented by one or more donors participating in the GHD initiative. A number of the interpretations could eventually form the basis for collective indicators, while others may remain more suitable as general guidance. Documents cited which contain interpretations of good practice include:

1. **OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) peer reviews** of the development cooperation programs of six donors between 2004 and 2005, which have used an assessment framework specifically linked to GHD in assessing donors' humanitarian aid.
2. **Reviews of donors' collective progress**, either covering EU donors, donors involved in a GHD pilot country or all donors involved in GHD
3. **Reviews of an individual donor's progress:** at present the primary example is the UK National Audit Office's review of DFID's response to humanitarian emergencies.
4. **Donors' and international organisations' own interpretations of good practice** as contained in selected policy documents.

Some of the documents cited in the table do not specifically link their indicators or interpretations to an individual GHD Principle or Good Practice measure, but an effort has been made to make a specific linkage in the table in order to facilitate systematic assessment of good practice. Inevitably this categorisation involves a degree of subjective assessment, particularly given the overlap between some measures. For this reason internal cross-references are included, as well as cross-references to other pre-existing documents that may not specifically refer to GHD but contain standards that could be relevant to the particular measure. Further details about individual documents cited in the table are outlined below. Given the range of donors' approaches to GHD and humanitarian aid generally (as well as the range of documents setting out those approaches), the interpretations and examples of good practice included in the table should be considered as illustrative rather than exhaustive.

## Annotated list of documents cited in the table

### A. Formal indicators

#### 1. Collective indicators

GHD Initiative, *Global Good Humanitarian Donorship Standards and Indicators*, updated 10 January 2006 <http://www.goodhumanitarianandonorship.org/dac-peer-reviews.asp>

GHD Initiative, *Impact Indicators for DRC Pilot*, December 2003 (listed in the table as 'Global indicators') <http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/GHDDRC-indicatorsrevised18-12-2003.doc> (listed as 'DRC pilot impact indicators')

*Where the DRC indicators document also includes comments additional to the indicators, these are covered in the column on interpretations of good practice.*

#### 2. Individual donor indicators

Canada, *Good Humanitarian Donorship: Canadian Domestic Strategy*, draft June 2005

<http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/Canadian%20GHD%20domestic%20strategy%20-%20June%202005.doc>

United Kingdom, Department for International Development, *Technical Note to the DFID Public Service Agreement (PSA) 2005-2008* <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Pubs/files/PSA/technicalnotes.pdf>.

*See Objective IV, Target 3, point 4, Indicator 1 (page 19).*

### B. Interpretations of good practice

*Where several documents contain roughly equivalent interpretations of good practice, these are noted in square brackets beside the first cited instance of the interpretation. To avoid repetition and point to possible areas of consensus, some minor elaborations from other documents may be incorporated into the wording of the original interpretation provided that they do not substantially change the content of the original interpretation.*

*Specific examples of good practice are included in italics and parentheses (examples derived from the DAC peer reviews are referred to as 'DAC examples').*

#### 1. DAC peer reviews

OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), *Humanitarian Aid in DAC Peer Reviews: A Compilation of Coverage 2004-05*, 17 January 2006, DCD/DAC(2006)4.

*The peer reviews covered in this compilation are: Norway, Australia (both 2004), Belgium, Switzerland, Germany and Sweden (2005). Some interpretations are highlighted in the reviews as instances of model practice exemplified by one or more donors, while others are presented more as a reasonable minimum standard for good practice (whether or not donors currently comply with that standard).*

OECD Development Co-operation Directorate, *Assessment Framework for Coverage of Humanitarian Action in DAC Peer Reviews*, DCD/DIR(2004)11, 13 May 2004

*The OECD Assessment Framework is not treated as a source of indicators as such, since the framework is largely a conversion into question form of the Stockholm text of GHD. Instead, they are included as cross-references in the last column of the table. Comments on the DAC wording are noted only where it makes a significant addition or change to the wording of the Stockholm text. The numbering is based on the sections of the DAC framework (sections 1-3); some subsections listed in the DAC framework as dot points have been manually numbered for the purposes of the table.*

## 2. Reviews of donors' collective progress

- Harmer, Adele, Lin Cotterell and Abby Stoddard, *From Stockholm to Ottawa: A Progress Review of the Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative*, Humanitarian Policy Group Research Briefing 18, London: Overseas Development Institute, October 2004 <http://www.odi.org.uk/hpg/papers/HPGbrief18.pdf> (listed as 'HPG progress review')
- United Kingdom, Department for International Development, *Lessons Learned from the Good Humanitarian Donorship Pilot in Burundi 2002 – 2005*, London: DFID, December 2005 <http://www.goodhumanitariandonorship.org/GHD%20Burundi%20pilot%20-%20lessons%20learned%20Final.doc> (listed as 'Burundi pilot lessons')
- Willitts-King, Barnaby, *Good Humanitarian Donorship and the European Union: A Study of Good Practice and Recent Initiatives*, commissioned by Development Cooperation Ireland, September 2004 [http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/EU\\_GHD\\_study\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/EU_GHD_study_final_report.pdf) (listed as 'EU study')

## 3. Reviews of an individual donor's progress

- United Kingdom, National Audit Office, *DFID: Responding to Humanitarian Emergencies*, London: National Audit Office, November 2003 [http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/nao\\_reports/02-03/02031227.pdf](http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/nao_reports/02-03/02031227.pdf) (listed as 'UK audit')

## 4. Donors' and international organisations' interpretations of good practice

*Documents are listed in the table by the name of the country or organisation unless otherwise indicated. A substantial amount of the available information on donors' own strategies is synthesised in Harmer and Stoddard (2005). Other documents referred to specifically under this category were either produced subsequently or contain particular interpretations of good practice considered to be of potential interest to other donors.*

- Australia, AusAID, *Humanitarian Action Policy*, January 2005 <[www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/humanitarian\\_policy.pdf](http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/humanitarian_policy.pdf)
- Denmark, *GHD Implementation Plan*, March 2005 <http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/implementation%20plan.rtf>
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid – ECHO 2006 Operational Strategy, 6 January 2006 [http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/pdf\\_files/strategy/2006/strat\\_2006\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/echo/pdf_files/strategy/2006/strat_2006_en.pdf) (listed as 'ECHO')
- Harmer, Adele and Abby Stoddard, *Review of Good Humanitarian Donorship Domestic Strategies*, London: Overseas Development Institute, 2005 [http://www.odi.org.uk/hpg/papers/GHD\\_Domestic\\_Strategies\\_review\\_2005.pdf](http://www.odi.org.uk/hpg/papers/GHD_Domestic_Strategies_review_2005.pdf) (listed as 'Domestic strategies review')
- Ireland, *GHD Implementation Plan*, July 2005 <http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/Ireland%20GHD%20Domestic%20Strategy.doc>
- Netherlands, *GHD National Implementation Plan*, July 2005 <http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/nat%20impl%20plan%20fin.doc>
- Netherlands, *Grant Policy Framework for Humanitarian Aid 2005*
- Sweden, *The Government's Humanitarian Aid Policy*, Government Communication 2004/05:52, 16 December 2004 <http://www.sida.se/shared/jsp/download.jsp?f=Regeringens+skrivelse+200405+52+engelska.pdf&a=3996>
- Sweden, *GHD Domestic Implementation Plan*, January 2005 <http://www.reliefweb.int/ghd/GHD.follow-up%20matrix.Sweden.Jan%202005.rtf> (listed as 'Sweden GHD plan')
- Switzerland, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), *Solidarity Alive: Humanitarian Aid Strategy 2005*, Zurich, 2005 [http://162.23.39.120/dezaweb/ressources/resource\\_en\\_23576.pdf](http://162.23.39.120/dezaweb/ressources/resource_en_23576.pdf)

United Kingdom, Department for International Development (DFID), *Saving lives, relieving suffering, protecting dignity: DFID's Humanitarian Policy*, Draft 4 January 2006

United Nations, General Assembly, 'Strengthening of the coordination of emergency humanitarian assistance of the United Nations', UNGA Resolution 60/L38, 12 December 2005

<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/638/47/PDF/N0563847.pdf?OpenElement>

(listed as 'UN CERF [Central Emergency Response Fund] resolution')

*This resolution documents the decision of member states to scale up the UN's Central Emergency Revolving Fund (a small loan facility for UN emergency funding) into the Central Emergency Response Fund, a larger fund with a substantial grant component (\$450 million) and an ongoing loan component (\$50 million) in order to strengthen the UN's capacity to initiate early responses to crises.*

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text) <i>Objectives and definition of humanitarian action</i>	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
<p>1. The objectives of humanitarian action are to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity during and in the aftermath of man-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for the occurrence of such situations.</p> <p>2. Humanitarian action should be guided by the humanitarian principles of humanity, meaning the centrality of saving human lives and alleviating suffering wherever it is found; impartiality, meaning the implementation of actions solely on the basis of need, without discrimination between or within affected populations; neutrality, meaning that humanitarian action must not favour any side in an armed conflict or other dispute where such action is carried out; and independence, meaning the autonomy of humanitarian objectives from the political, economic, military or other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to areas where humanitarian action is being implemented.</p>	<p><i>Canada - domestic strategy</i> <i>1. Policies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Humanitarian policy statement adopted</li> <li>- Updated international humanitarian action programming framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adoption of a comprehensive donor policy and/or legislative framework for humanitarian action clearly outlining the objectives of humanitarian action consistently with GHD 1 (<i>DAC examples: Australia, Sweden; also UK</i>)</li> <li>- Recognition of humanitarian principles in policy and legislation on humanitarian action consistently with GHD 2 [EU, HPG] (<i>DAC examples: Australia, Sweden; also UK</i>)</li> <li>- Clear agency responsibility for policy on and coordination of humanitarian action</li> <li>- Sufficient autonomy of donor humanitarian agencies from other policy interests (eg security and foreign policy), while ensuring coordination and consistency between humanitarian and development aid programs [EU]</li> <li>- Funding principles and operational guidelines are consistent with humanitarian policy</li> <li>- Formulation of an action plan to translate humanitarian policy into action and monitor its implementation [HPG]</li> </ul>	<p><i>EU study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Process for systematically updating policies</li> </ul>	<p><i>See also:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 2 (principles), GHD 6 (needs) and GHD 8 (prevention and preparedness)</li> <li>- DAC framework 1(a)</li> </ul> <p><i>See also:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 1 (objectives) and GHD 6 (needs)</li> <li>- Sphere Handbook, Common Standard 4 (targeting)</li> <li>- DAC framework 1(b)(ii) and (iii)</li> </ul>

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
<p>3. Humanitarian action includes the protection of civilians and those no longer taking part in hostilities, and the provision of food, water and sanitation, shelter, health services and other items of assistance, undertaken for the benefit of affected people and to facilitate the return to normal lives and livelihoods.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adoption of definition of humanitarian action that is consistent with GHD 3, making clear policy distinction between protection and assistance (<i>DAC example: Sweden</i>)</li> <li>- Clarity in donor policies around how to deal with protection in areas of conflict prevention and peace-building</li> </ul>	<p><i>HPG progress review</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dialogue between donors and implementing partners to ensure consensus on nature of protection-related activities</li> </ul> <p><i>Australia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Encouraging implementation of IASC Six Point Plan on prevention of sexual exploitation in humanitarian crises</li> </ul> <p><i>UN CERF resolution</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promotion of a culture of protection, taking into account particular needs of women, children, older persons and persons with disabilities [also Australia, UK, Switzerland]</li> </ul>	<p><i>See also:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stockholm Implementation Plan point 4 (common definition of official humanitarian assistance)</li> <li>- ALNAP guide to protection (2005) – includes checklists of good practice</li> <li>- DAC framework 1(a)</li> </ul>
<b>General principles</b>				
<p>4. Respect and promote the implementation of international humanitarian law, refugee law and human rights.</p>	<p><i>DRC pilot impact indicators</i> [covered in part under GHD 15]</p> <p><i>Canada – domestic strategy</i> 2.2 - Ministerial statements, speeches reflect GHD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognition of IHL in policy / legislation on humanitarian action (<i>DAC example: Switzerland</i>)</li> <li>- Application of a rights perspective in humanitarian action (<i>DAC example: Sweden</i>)</li> <li>- Effective coordination between donor aid agencies and agencies responsible for human rights</li> </ul>	<p><i>HPG progress review</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High-level political sponsorship of GHD</li> </ul> <p><i>EU study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promotion of public awareness of humanitarian obligations and GHD [Sweden]</li> <li>- Communication and promotion of GHD among</li> </ul>	<p><i>See also:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 1,2, 19 (re civil-military interaction), and 21 (learning and accountability)</li> <li>- GHD implementation plan point 5 (promoting GHD among other donors)</li> <li>- On the responsibility to protect: 2005 World Summit Outcome, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 60/1, 24 October</li> </ul>

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Existence of a position or body overseeing linkages between human rights and humanitarian action (<i>DAC example: Germany</i>)</li> <li>- Training of military personnel and other government officials on IHL and other relevant standards [EU, Australia]</li> </ul>	<p>stakeholders and other donors who have not yet signed up to the initiative, including non-DAC donors [HPG]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development and use of guidelines on humanitarian advocacy</li> <li>- Support for newer donors from donors with more established humanitarian programs</li> </ul> <p><i>Domestic strategies review</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification in humanitarian policy of stakeholders and participants, and strategy for their engagement</li> </ul> <p><i>UK</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure that humanitarian concerns reflected in mandates of peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions</li> <li>- Implementation of states' responsibility to protect against worst violations of human rights (as agreed in Millennium Review Summit)</li> </ul>	<p>2005<sup>1</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DAC framework 1(b)(i)</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> <http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/487/60/PDF/N0548760.pdf?OpenElement>.



Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
5. While reaffirming the primary responsibility of states for the victims of humanitarian emergencies within their own borders, strive to ensure flexible and timely funding, on the basis of the collective obligation of striving to meet humanitarian needs.	<p><i>Global indicators</i>  1 – Donor funding is flexible and timely</p> <p>1A. Proportion (percentage) of donors' core humanitarian funds committed during the first quarter of their respective fiscal year to ongoing complex emergencies</p> <p>1B. Percent of donor funding accessible during the first month following the declaration of an onset natural disaster</p> <p><i>DRC pilot impact indicators</i>  1. Donor funding is flexible and timely</p> <p>a) x% of funding <i>pledged</i> to CHAP activities by January 2005</p> <p>b) x% of funding <i>disbursed</i> to CHAP activities in the first quarter 2005</p> <p>c) x% of funding <i>disbursed</i> to CHAP activities by the end of the second quarter / at the MYR [Mid-year review]</p> <p>d) x% of funding provided (either new funding or through re-allocation) to <i>new activities and/or in newly accessible areas</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Substantial proportion of ODA allocated to humanitarian aid</li> <li>- Funding principles at agency and Finance ministry level promote flexibility and timeliness</li> <li>- Common budget for humanitarian funding</li> <li>- Consolidation and coordination of agency responsibilities for humanitarian aid</li> <li>- Adequate resourcing of agencies responsible for humanitarian aid</li> <li>- Proportion of humanitarian aid allocated to refugees in donor country should not be too large</li> </ul>	<p><i>HPG progress review</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD donors encourage participation of new donors in humanitarian assistance</li> </ul> <p><i>Switzerland</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- International advocacy of victims' cause</li> </ul> <p><i>UK audit</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Formalisation of different agency / departmental responsibilities for humanitarian aid</li> </ul> <p><i>UK</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commitment to increase humanitarian aid in line with increases in overall development aid as long as need continues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Humanitarian assistance represented 11% of overall ODA in 2003 (Global Humanitarian Assistance Update 2004-05, 6)</li> <li>- GHD donors have expressed in-principle support for an MDG on humanitarian emergencies (UK audit 12)</li> </ul> <p><i>See also:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 12 (predictability and flexibility in funding)</li> <li>- DAC framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1(c) – flexibility at policy level</li> <li>1(d) – timeliness at policy level</li> <li>2(i)(iii) – timeliness and flexibility in specific context (compare principle 12)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> The DRC indicators document notes that this indicator 'Does not apply to country pilots but rather to the global level'.

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
6. Allocate humanitarian funding in proportion to needs and on the basis of needs assessments.	<p>identified at mid-term review and CHAP revision</p> <p><i>8. Funding requirements for assistance effort is shared equitably among donors</i></p> <p>a) More donors providing funding, including x new (non-traditional) donors<sup>2</sup></p> <p><u>Global indicators</u></p> <p><i>2. Donor and agency funding for CAPs and CHAPs is allocated on the basis of needs assessments</i></p> <p>2A. Number of CHAPs based on the IASC [Inter-Agency Standing Committee] Needs Analysis Framework [NAFM]</p> <p>2B. Proportion of funds committed to the priorities identified in the Common Humanitarian Action Plans</p> <p>2C. Percentage change in proportion of funds committed against five least well-funded Consolidated Appeals<sup>3</sup></p> <p><u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u></p> <p><i>2. Donors' and agencies' funding is allocated based on needs assessments</i></p> <p>a) Standard needs assessment criteria</p>	<p>- Commitment to needs-based approach in humanitarian action policy and funding principles (<i>Example: UK</i>)</p> <p>- Broad geographic scope of funding rather than regional specialisation</p> <p>- Humanitarian aid is untied</p>	<p><u>HPG review</u></p> <p>- Effective prioritisation procedures for funding in place</p> <p><u>DRC pilot</u></p> <p>- Assessments are carried out on an inter-agency basis [or jointly with multiple donors – Denmark]</p> <p><u>EU study</u></p> <p>- Consistency of donor resource allocation with ECHO's Global Needs Assessment [ECHO]</p> <p>- Financial support for independent needs assessment as a separate activity [HPG]</p> <p>- Use of IASC NAFM [HPG]</p> <p>- Sufficient humanitarian expertise of staff in diplomatic missions</p>	<p><u>See also:</u></p> <p>- GHD 2 (issue of need informs many of the principles) and GHD 14 (CAP/CHAP)</p> <p>- Sphere Handbook, Common Standard 2 (initial assessment) and 3 (response)</p> <p>- ODI paper on Measuring Humanitarian Need (2003)</p> <p>- SMART (Standardised Monitoring and Assessment of Relief and Transitions) methodology:<sup>4</sup> focuses on two key measures of need:</p> <p>- Crude mortality (or death) rate</p> <p>- Nutritional status of children under five</p> <p>- DAC framework 2(i)(i)</p>

<sup>3</sup> The global indicators document notes that 'debate continues' on this indicator – issues include its appropriateness as an indicator (whether there are other factors that have an impact on levels of funding of CAPs) and the formula used for measurement.

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.smartindicators.org/>.

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
	<p>elaborated and accepted for all priority sectors</p> <p>b) Donor funding for collection of baseline data, in particular number of beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex) and for needs assessments</p> <p>c) Joint (i.e. agencies, NGO's, beneficiaries, governments and donors) needs assessments conducted for all priority sectors and results used as basis for CHAP</p> <p>d) Priorities in CHAP fully funded to implementation capacity</p> <p>e) x% of funding provided for non-priority sectors</p> <p><u>Canada – domestic strategy</u> 2.2 10 CHAPs based on the IASC common needs analysis framework</p> <p><u>UK – DFID Public Service Agreement targets</u> - Greater take-up of new UN Needs assessment methodology piloted in Burundi than in previous year</p>		<p><u>Netherlands</u> - Humanitarian action takes into account HIV/AIDS issues [Australia]</p> <p><u>UK audit</u> - Support for UN Disaster Assessment and Co-ordination system and Humanitarian Finance Work Programme's work on definition of need and need-based allocation - Measures to assess and improve quality of baseline data and needs analysis provided by partner organisations [UK audit, UK] - Assessment of cost-effectiveness of humanitarian action</p> <p><u>UK</u> - Support for WHO and UNICEF work to ensure effective monitoring of mortality and malnutrition needs and outcomes - Support for UN agencies to strengthen evidence base of CAPs - Balanced program that meets non-food as well as food needs</p>	

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
7. Request implementing humanitarian organisations to ensure, to the greatest possible extent, adequate involvement of beneficiaries in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of humanitarian response.	<u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u> [Covered under DRC 3(a) – see GHD 8]	- Methods for ensuring involvement of beneficiaries clearly set out in policy - Efforts to ensure that commitment to beneficiary involvement is implemented at an operational level	<p><u>Sweden</u> - Eligibility of countries for humanitarian aid limited to OECD List of Aid Recipients</p> <p><u>EU study</u> - Use of participatory methods of impact assessment</p> <p><u>Denmark</u> - Involvement of beneficiaries a requirement in NGO funding applications [Sweden GHD plan]</p>	<u>See also:</u> - GHD 8 (capacity building) - Sphere Handbook, Common Standard 1 (participation) - Red Cross / NGO Code of Conduct - HAP-I principles of accountability (focus on accountability to beneficiaries) - ALNAP handbook on participation (2003) - DAC framework: 1(h) 4(s) Involvement of beneficiaries in monitoring and evaluation [see also GHD 22 (evaluation)]
8. Strengthen the capacity of affected countries and local communities to prevent, prepare for, mitigate and respond to humanitarian crises, with the goal of ensuring that governments and local communities are better able to meet their responsibilities and co-ordinate effectively with humanitarian partners.	<u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u> <u>3. Local capacities strengthened</u> a) x capacity building activities for local NGOs and local institutions engaged in humanitarian activities included in CHAP and funded by donors b) Local capacity	- Disaster risk reduction and prevention integrated into development strategies - Support for international disaster reduction initiatives such as Yokohama Strategy 1994, Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 <sup>5</sup> International Strategy for Disaster Reduction and ProVention Consortium - Adequate proportion of	<p><u>Netherlands</u> - Donor-funded international NGOs channel their assistance through local NGOs</p> <p><u>Australia</u> - Support for strengthened organisational capacity of national disaster management offices</p>	<u>See also:</u> - GHD 7 (involvement of beneficiaries) - GHD 18 (contingency planning) - DAC framework 1(e) Capacity generally 2(i)(vi) How donor makes choice between Northern and Southern NGOs 3(l) Local capacities for contingency planning (also

<sup>5</sup> Both from World Conferences on Disaster Reduction (1994 and 2005 respectively).

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
	<p>component increasingly included in agencies' and NGOs' programs</p> <p>c) x activities handed over to local authorities and local NGO's for implementation by December 2005</p>	<p>disaster / conflict management funding allocated to prevention and risk reduction</p> <p>- Donor policy and guidelines on conflict / disaster prevention developed and promoted [UK audit] (<i>Example: DFID Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy Paper</i>)</p> <p>- Flexibility in funding guidelines to allow direct funding of local NGOs</p> <p>- Untying of food aid [Sweden, UK]</p> <p>- Purchasing of food aid supplies in surplus markets close to affected location [Sweden] (<i>DAC example: Sweden</i>)</p> <p>- Use of cash rather than in-kind assistance where appropriate (<i>DAC example: Switzerland; see also UK</i>)</p>	<p>- Use of community-based disaster management practices</p> <p><i>Ireland</i></p> <p>- Support for key conflict prevention initiatives and agencies (eg CHD, International Alert, WSP)</p> <p><i>UK audit</i></p> <p>- Categorisation of expenditure to track funding for prevention</p> <p>- Clear allocation of responsibilities for prevention and mitigation across humanitarian and development departments</p> <p>- Country and regional strategies assess risk emergencies occurring and consider strategies for prevention and mitigation</p> <p><i>Sweden</i></p> <p>- Local procurement of inputs and hiring of labour</p>	<p>under GHD 18)</p>
<p>9. Provide humanitarian assistance in ways that are supportive of recovery and long-term development, striving to ensure support, where appropriate, to the maintenance and return of sustainable livelihoods and transitions from humanitarian relief</p>	<p><i>DRC pilot impact indicators</i></p> <p><i>7. Recovery and long-term development is linked to humanitarian programs</i></p> <p>a) Priorities identified in CHAP given adequate consideration in PRSP /UNDAF [UN</p>	<p>- Recognition in humanitarian action policy of link between humanitarian action and development (<i>Examples: Australia, Sweden, UK</i>)</p> <p>- Comprehensive policy for conflict prevention and post-conflict peace-building</p>	<p><i>DRC pilot</i></p> <p>- CHAP and PRSP / UNDAF inform one another</p> <p>- Same general analysis of country situation provides basis for both humanitarian and development strategies</p>	<p><i>See also:</i></p> <p>- DAC framework 1(f)</p>

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
to recovery and development activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Assistance Framework]</li> <li>b) Development programs in place to encourage durable solutions for refugees and IDPs</li> <li>c) Extent to which needs are assessed based on vulnerability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Coordination between agencies responsible for humanitarian and development assistance, while retaining the distinction between these two types of aid [HPG]</li> <li>- Flexibility in duration of humanitarian projects</li> <li>- Flexibility in budgets (eg special budget line) to fill financing gap during transitions (<i>DAC example: Norway</i>)</li> <li>- Donor recognition of long-term commitment at early stage of engagement in peace process [UK audit]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exit strategies of humanitarian implementing organisations are coordinated with entry programs of development agencies</li> <li><i>Australia</i></li> <li>- Guidelines for humanitarian assessment in development cooperation programs in place</li> <li>- Strategies in place aimed at reducing vulnerability of HIV-AIDS affected areas to humanitarian crises, and linking HIV prevention to relief operations</li> <li><i>EU study</i></li> <li>- Clear tracking of expenditure on transitional aid</li> <li><i>UK audit</i></li> <li>- Defined process for moving from humanitarian aid to long-term assistance</li> <li>- Country teams assess impact of emergencies on future development plans</li> <li>- Transition strategy communicated to partner organisations</li> </ul>	

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
			<u><i>Netherlands grant policy framework</i></u> - Funding applications address gap between humanitarian aid and rehabilitation - Funding applications outline an exit strategy	

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
<p>10. Support and promote the central and unique role of the United Nations in providing leadership and co-ordination of international humanitarian action, the special role of the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the vital role of the United Nations, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and non-governmental organisations in implementing humanitarian action.</p>	<p><u>Global indicators</u>  3. <i>Donors advocate for and support coordination mechanisms</i>  3Ai – Number of <i>joint</i> donor statements in support of coordination mechanisms delivered at each of the UNHCR, UNICEF, and WFP governing body meetings  3Aii – Number of <i>individual</i> donor interventions including statements in support of coordination mechanisms and common services delivered at each of the governing body meetings of UNHCR, UNICEF, and WFP  3B. Proportion of funding to UN coordination mechanisms and common services earmarked at or below the country level</p> <p><u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u>  4. <i>UN leadership and coordination role supported by international community</i>  a) Portion of funds from all donors available for <i>coordination</i> activities  b) Portion of funds from all donors available for <i>security</i> activities  c) Coordination component included in all project reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Specific strategy on donor’s approach to multilateral humanitarian organisations (may be part of a larger policy on humanitarian aid or engagement with multilateral organisations)</li> <li>- Relationships with multilateral humanitarian organisations managed through a single donor agency or coordination unit [EU]</li> <li>- Strategic partnership agreements with multilateral agencies and NGOs [EU]</li> <li>- Support for multi-donor coordination processes such as OCHA and ICRC donor support groups [UK]</li> <li>- NGO participation in donor humanitarian coordination mechanisms [EU]</li> <li>- Concentration of support to NGOs to prevent proliferation of NGOs implementing humanitarian assistance</li> </ul>	<p><u>EU study</u>  - Annual consultations with UN agencies and Red Cross</p> <p><u>UK</u>  - Relative funding allocation across organisations based on analysis of their performance and needs</p> <p><u>Sweden</u>  - Ability to fund organisations other than those in donor’s own country</p>	<p><u>See also:</u>  - GHD 14 (CAP / CHAP)  - DAC framework 1(g)  2(i)(v) How donor makes choices between multilateral and bilateral channels  2(i)(vi) How donor makes choice between Northern and Southern NGOs</p>



Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
	<p>d) % of coordination costs agreed to in CHAP are funded on time.</p> <p>e) Heads of UN agencies participate in drafting of common strategy.</p> <p><i>Canada - domestic strategy</i>  <i>3.1 Coordination supported and strengthened</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussion of key coordination issues and strengthening humanitarian system during ECOSOC</li> <li>- Successful inclusion of language on enhancing humanitarian coordination in the 2005 UN Summit</li> <li>- [Humanitarian Coordinator / Resident Coordinator] consulted on funding allocations at the country level</li> <li>- Increase in number of [donor country] NGO partners who participate in CHAP</li> </ul>			
<p><b><i>Good practices in donor financing, management and accountability</i></b>  <i>(a) Funding</i></p>				
<p>11. Strive to ensure that funding of humanitarian action in new crises does not adversely affect the meeting of needs in ongoing crises.</p>	<p><i>Global indicators</i>  [See also indicator 1A (funding to ongoing crises) under GHD 5 (flexible and timely funding) and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Principles for funding allocation take into account needs of ongoing crises</li> <li>- Decisions whether to fund a CAP take into account whether it</li> </ul>	<p><i>HPG progress review</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Humanitarian action is defined in terms of the nature of the need (which may be ongoing) rather</li> </ul>	<p><i>See also:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 6 (funding in proportion to need)</li> <li>- DAC framework 2(i)(ii)</li> </ul>

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
	indicators under GHD 6 (needs)]	is already well-funded compared to other appeals ( <i>DAC example: Sweden</i> )	<p>than a particular crisis phase</p> <p><i>EU study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of contingency reserve funds rather than transferring funds from underspent areas or relying on supplemental parliamentary allocations [HPG]</li> <li>- Policy commitment to targeting ‘forgotten emergencies’</li> </ul> <p><i>ECHO</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of Forgotten Crisis Assessment (FCA) Index</li> </ul> <p><i>UK</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aim to ensure that there are no ‘forgotten emergencies’ by 2010</li> </ul>	
12. Recognising the necessity of dynamic and flexible response to changing needs in humanitarian crises, strive to ensure predictability and flexibility in funding to United Nations agencies, funds and programmes and to other key humanitarian organisations.	<p><i>DRC pilot impact indicators</i></p> <p>6. Funding is made available on longer-term basis</p> <p>a) x % of agencies funded on multi-year basis for priority activities<sup>6</sup></p> <p><i>Canada – domestic strategy</i></p> <p>2.1 (cont’d) - Pooled funding tested in DRC with other donors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic partnership agreements with UN agencies and NGOs [HPG] (<i>DAC example: ECHO Framework Partnership Agreement with NGOs</i>)</li> <li>- Budgetary / parliamentary regulations allow approval of multi-year funding</li> <li>- Use of multi-year funding agreements with organisations [UK audit, HPG]</li> </ul>	<p><i>EU study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of core funding to multilaterals</li> <li>- Indication to multilaterals of available funding for coming year</li> </ul> <p><i>Denmark</i></p> <p>Target percentage of humanitarian funds allocated on a multi-year</p>	<p><i>See also:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 5 (flexible and timely funding)</li> <li>- GHD 13 (reducing earmarking)</li> <li>- DAC framework 2(i)(iii) – includes timeliness (see also question 1(d) under GHD 5)</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> The DRC indicators document notes that the indicator measures percentage of *agencies* funded on multi-year basis, since multi-year funding for individual *sectors* is not yet feasible.

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
13. While stressing the importance of transparent and strategic priority-setting and financial planning by implementing organisations, explore the possibility of reducing, or enhancing the flexibility of, earmarking, and of introducing longer-term funding arrangements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partners informed of funding intentions (end December) and funds transferred (end February 2006)</li> <li>- Abridged proposal format for rapid onset disasters developed</li> <li>- Longer term funding arrangements in place</li> <li>- 2006 NGO proposals considered at same time as 2006 CAPs/institutional appeals</li> </ul> <p><u>Global indicators</u></p> <p>1C. Percentage change in proportion of donor funds earmarked at country level or above in financial year.</p> <p><u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u></p> <p>5. Earmarking is reduced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Percentage of funds pooled at country level;</li> <li>b) Percentage of funds agencies bring to country from donors unearmarked at the HQS [headquarters] level</li> <li>c) Percentage of funding at less specific level of earmarking, at least at organizational level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aid legislation permits reduction in earmarking</li> <li>- Use of ‘thematic’ funding and ‘soft’ earmarking at less specific levels [HPG]</li> </ul>	<p>basis (<u>Example: Denmark – 25% on 5-year basis</u>)</p> <p><u>UK audit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Block funding of several NGO projects in one grant</li> </ul> <p><u>UK</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support for development of new instruments (eg CERF, Common Funds) to enable UN and other organisations to access early and flexible funding for new and ongoing crises [UN CERF resolution]</li> </ul> <p><u>EU study</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor target set for reducing earmarked funding (<u>Example: UK</u>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DRC impact indicators note: ‘Moving towards unearmarked funds will be directly related to the degree to which all partners can agree upon a common strategy and to which the strategy is based upon solid needs assessments.’</li> </ul> <p><u>See also:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 12 (greater flexibility in funding)</li> <li>- DAC framework 2(i)(iv)</li> </ul>

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
<p>14. Contribute responsibly, and on the basis of burden-sharing, to United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeals and to International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement appeals, and actively support the formulation of Common Humanitarian Action Plans (CHAP) as the primary instrument for strategic planning, prioritisation and co-ordination in complex emergencies.</p>	<p><u>Canada – domestic strategy</u> 2.1 10% increase in proportion of total IHA expenditures earmarked above the country level 3.1 10% decrease in earmarking at or below the country level to OCHA</p>	<p>- Policy on allocation of bilateral and multilateral humanitarian funding - Aid legislation / policy framework permits pooled funding - Targets for multilateral / CAP funding [HPG] - Aim of funding all CAPs unless they are already well-funded compared to other appeals (<i>DAC example: Sweden</i>) - Alignment of CAP allocation with calendar years - Early disbursements to CAP (January-February), ideally set out in policy or directives (<i>Example of policy: UK</i>) - Development of country and regional programs based on</p>	<p><u>HPG progress review</u> - Consultation with UN Humanitarian Coordinator in the field on funding allocations  <u>Netherlands grant policy framework</u> - NGOs applying for donor funding required to coordinate with OCHA and be involved in development of CHAP if a CAP exists for the crisis [Denmark]</p>	<p><u>See also:</u> - GHD 12 (predictability and flexibility in funding) - DAC framework: 2(i)(v) How donor makes choices between multilateral and bilateral channels 2(i)(vii) Contribution to Consolidated Inter-agency Appeals and ICRC appeals 2(i)(viii) Support for formulation of CHAPs</p>
	<p><u>UK – DFID Public Service Agreement targets</u> - Increased percentage of unearmarked humanitarian funding</p>			
	<p><u>Global indicators</u> [See also global indicator 5 under GHD 6 (funding according to needs assessments)]  <u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u> [See also DRC 8 (burden sharing) and DRC 1 (flexible and timely funding) under GHD 5]  <u>Canada – domestic strategy</u> 2.2 Decrease in variation between percentage of total IHA responsive funding to country appeal and percentage of funds that the country appeal represents of the total CAP funds</p>			

<sup>7</sup> In other words, donor country allocations match CAP country appeals more closely.

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
	requested <sup>7</sup> <u>UK – DFID Public Service Agreement targets</u> - % of unfinanced UN consolidated appeals less than previous year - % gap between 5 most funded and least funded appeals less than previous year	CHAPs - Support for Montreux process on improving United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeals Process		
<i>(b) Promoting standards and enhancing implementation</i>				
15. Request that implementing humanitarian organisations fully adhere to good practice and are committed to promoting accountability, efficiency and effectiveness in implementing humanitarian action.	<u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u> <u>9. Established good practices are adhered to by humanitarian implementing partners</u> a) Sphere guidelines applied to CAP programs b) Basic humanitarian principles included in all humanitarian programs c) [see below – GHD 16] d) Donor participation in the elaboration of a common humanitarian framework guided by Good Humanitarian Donorship principles e) All partners (NGOs, UN agencies, donors, govt) participate in drafting a common humanitarian strategy and implement	- Applications for funding and evaluations of implementing organisations include an assessment of their adherence to guidelines - Development of practical tools to promote accountability, eg field guides - Support dissemination of standards and principles - Ensure that implementing organisations adhere to Sphere and other relevant standards [UK] - Encourage or require use of conflict analysis and relevant methodologies such as ‘do no harm’ [Sweden] ( <i>example: Netherlands grant policy framework</i> )	<u>EU study</u> - Publication of guidelines for NGOs on funding priorities and proposal requirements - Development of effective reporting systems for NGOs to monitor good practice - Common training programs on principles and good practice for government officials and NGOs - Dialogue between donors and NGOs on operationalising GHD	- Other relevant initiatives include Sphere Project (Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards for Disaster Response), Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International (HAP-I), People in Aid, Project Quality Compass and International Council of Voluntary Agencies  <u>See also:</u> - GHD 4 (promotion of humanitarian obligations) - GHD 21 (learning and accountability) - DAC framework 3(j)

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
<p>16. Promote the use of Inter-Agency Standing Committee guidelines and principles on humanitarian activities, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the 1994 Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief.</p>	<p>projects in accordance with the strategy.</p> <p><i>Canada - domestic strategy</i> 3.2 Messages on coordination, gender, RBM and protection as appropriate are raised in governing boards of UNHCR, OCHA, UNICEF, WFP, ICRC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- [donor country] priorities are reflected in agencies' policy and programming</li> <li>- Institutional frameworks / agreements developed with UNHCR and OCHA</li> <li>- Annual institutional performance assessments undertaken and fed into Departmental Performance Report</li> <li>- [see also indicator under GHD 16]</li> </ul> <p><i>DRC pilot impact indicators</i> 9. (cont'd – see also GHD 15) c) IDP country programs are consistent with and promote the Guiding Principles for Internal Displacement</p> <p><i>Canada - domestic strategy</i> 3.3 - Adherence to RC Code of</p>	<p>[See under GHD 15]</p>	<p><i>HPG progress review</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring of adherence to Red Cross / NGO Code of Conduct</li> <li>- Assessment of impact of Code of Conduct</li> </ul> <p><i>EU study</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requirement for NGOs to sign up to guidelines</li> </ul>	<p><i>See also:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 15 (good practice of implementing organisations)</li> <li>- DAC framework 3(j)</li> </ul>

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
17. Maintain readiness to offer support to the implementation of humanitarian action, including the facilitation of safe humanitarian access.	<p>Conduct, Sphere Humanitarian Charter, and IASC core principles reflected in IHA Due Diligence and Institutional Assessment</p> <p>- Monitoring undertaken by [donor aid agency and foreign affairs] field missions</p>	<p>- Procedures in place to ensure that civil-military interaction guidelines are respected</p>	<p>referred to in GHD 16 (<i>Example for Code of Conduct: Sweden</i>)</p>	<p><u>See also:</u></p> <p>- GHD 19 and 20 (civil-military interaction)</p> <p>- DAC framework 3(k)</p>
18. Support mechanisms for contingency planning by humanitarian organisations, including, as appropriate, allocation of funding, to strengthen capacities for response.	<p><u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u> <i>10. Safe humanitarian access is promoted</i></p> <p>a) New areas accessed and jointly assessed by humanitarian agencies/ x% of vulnerable population safely accessible by humanitarian workers</p> <p>b) x % of new beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex) accessing humanitarian assistance</p> <p>c) Outreach strategy articulated jointly with donors</p>	<p>- Funding for dedicated national agency for international disaster response (<i>DAC examples: Sweden, Switzerland, Australia</i>)</p> <p>- Clear lines of responsibility between national disaster response agency and other relevant government agencies</p> <p>- Support for national / regional emergency response stand-by</p>	<p><u>See also:</u></p> <p>- GHD 8 (strengthening capacities for response)</p> <p>- GHD 12 (predictability and flexibility of funding)</p> <p>- DAC framework 3(l): specifies capacities for response at local, national, regional and global levels</p>	

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
<p>19. Affirm the primary position of civilian organisations in implementing humanitarian action, particularly in areas affected by armed conflict.</p> <p>In situations where military capacity and assets are used to support the implementation of humanitarian action, ensure that such use is in conformity with international humanitarian law and humanitarian principles, and recognises the leading role of humanitarian organisations.</p>	<p><u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u>  <u>12. Military assets are used appropriately</u></p> <p>a) Regular coordination meetings held between MONUC<sup>8</sup> (civil and military affairs) and the international humanitarian community</p> <p>b) Clear understanding of MONUC support of humanitarian activities articulated</p> <p>c) [see below – GHD 19]</p> <p>d) Clear understanding exists of terms of interaction with domestic armed forces and any other armed groups.</p> <p>e) MONUC agenda for DDR/DDRRR<sup>9</sup> is coordinated with common humanitarian strategy.</p>	<p>mechanisms (<i>Example: Switzerland</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cooperation agreements with implementing organisations allowing rapid response [EU] (<i>DAC example: Sweden</i>)</li> </ul> <p>- Explicit policy statement on civil-military interaction (may be part of a broader policy) (<i>Example: Sweden</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular discussion on civil-military cooperation involving aid, diplomatic and military actors [EU, Australia, UK audit]</li> <li>- Aid agency advocates primary position of civilian organisations in humanitarian action</li> </ul>	<p><u>EU study</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Specific protocols between foreign affairs and defence ministries covering the principles, objectives and practical procedures of civil–military cooperation</li> </ul> <p><u>UK</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deployment of military assets for humanitarian purposes considered only as a last resort</li> </ul>	<p><u>See also:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GHD 4 (respect for humanitarian obligations)</li> <li>- DAC framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3(m) – first sentence of GHD 19</li> <li>- 3(n) – second sentence of GHD 19</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<p><u>Canada – domestic strategy</u>  <u>3.4 Military-humanitarian</u></p>			

<sup>8</sup> United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

<sup>9</sup> Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration / Disarmament, demobilisation, repatriation, reintegration, and resettlement.



Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
20. Support the implementation of the 1994 Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief and the 2003 Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets to Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies.	<p><i>interface</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- [Donor government] Guidelines finalized and disseminated to [military / foreign affairs / aid] missions/staff</li> <li>- Guidelines reflected in [defence ministry] training as appropriate and in pertinent policy, i.e. CIMIC policy</li> <li>- [Armed forces'] military objectives consistent with Guidelines notably with primary position with civilian organizations</li> </ul> <p><u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u>  <u>12. Military assets are used appropriately (cont'd)</u>  c) Use of military assets for humanitarian interventions in conformity with international humanitarian law and the MCDA Guidelines</p> <p><u>Canada - domestic strategy</u>  [see under GHD 19]</p>	- Recognition of 1994 and 2003 Guidelines in humanitarian policy statement ( <i>DAC example: Sweden</i> )	<u>Denmark</u> - Guidelines used as a basis for donor guidelines on civil-military interaction	<u>See also:</u> GHD 19 (civil-military interaction) - DAC framework 3(o)
<i>(c) Learning and accountability</i>				
21. Support learning and accountability initiatives for the effective and efficient implementation of humanitarian action.	<u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u> [partially covered by indicators for GHD 22]	- Donor participation in joint good practice initiatives, such as ALNAP - Consolidation and coordination of agency responsibilities for	<u>Burundi pilot lessons</u> - Coordinated support for awareness and implementation of GHD at field level	<u>See also:</u> - GHD 15 re accountability of implementing organisations - Stockholm Implementation Plan, point 1 (identifying one

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
	<p><u>Canada - domestic strategy</u>  <u>4.1 Agency accountability, efficiency, effectiveness</u>            - Follow-up on lessons learned and recommendations identified            - Increase in number of training and dissemination events held/ supported</p>	<p>humanitarian action            - Development of donor performance frameworks for humanitarian action covering GHD principles and practice [HPG, Australia, UK audit]            - Dissemination of learning across different agencies where several are involved in humanitarian action</p>	<p>- Regular strategy meetings among donors at field level</p> <p><u>EU study</u>            - Aid agency's commitment to whole-of-government performance targets linked to GHD</p> <p><u>Domestic strategies review</u>            - Humanitarian policy identifies target dates for implementation of GHD initiatives</p> <p><u>UK audit</u>            - Feedback to partner organisations on their performance</p> <p><u>UK</u>            - Support research and innovation that has a good chance of improving humanitarian response [Sweden, Switzerland]</p>	<p>crisis in which principles would be applied – the basis for the DRC and Burundi pilots), and point 2 (strengthening DAC's humanitarian coverage in peer reviews)            - Sphere Handbook, Common Standard 5 (monitoring) and Common Standard 6 (evaluation)            - HAP-I principles of accountability            - DAC framework: 4(q) – systems for learning and accountability; learning across departments and agencies when several arms of government are involved</p>
<p>22. Encourage regular evaluations of international responses to humanitarian crises, including assessments of donor performance.</p>	<p><u>DRC pilot impact indicators</u>  <u>13. Evaluate performances</u>            a) Standard evaluation criteria (linked to needs assessment criteria) for impact elaborated for x sectors (including IDPs) and evaluation(s) undertaken</p>	<p>- Adequate resourcing for evaluation systems and evaluations of donor performance</p>	<p><u>EU study</u>            - Operationally independent evaluation department            - Development of specific humanitarian evaluation guidelines            - Publication of evaluations</p>	<p><u>See also:</u>            - Sphere Handbook, Common Standard 6 (evaluation) – ALNAP annual reviews            - DAC framework:            - 4(p) Current scope of evaluations of humanitarian action; what activities recently evaluated; how are findings</p>

Principle / Good Practice measure (Stockholm text)	Formal indicators	Interpretations of good practice – DAC peer reviews	Interpretations of good practice – other docs	Cross-references and notes
23. Ensure a high degree of accuracy, timeliness, and transparency in donor reporting on official humanitarian assistance spending, and encourage the development of standardised formats for such reporting.	<p>b) x % of humanitarian activities evaluated based on standard criteria</p> <p><i>Canada - domestic strategy 4.2 Evaluations / learning</i> Undertake lessons learned /evaluations for at least one major crisis and implement findings</p> <p>- Participate, where appropriate in multi-donor / agency evaluations</p> <p><i>UK – DFID Public Service Agreement targets</i> - 100% evaluation coverage, (either by DFID or a partner) of all major humanitarian crises.</p>	<p>- Independent external evaluation of performance and impact of donor humanitarian action at thematic and system-wide levels, eg by parliamentary committee, national audit office [EU, HPG] (<i>Examples of committees: Germany, Ireland, UK; audits: Denmark, UK</i>)</p> <p>- Participation in multi-donor evaluations and DAC joint country assessments [HPG]</p> <p>- Dissemination of evaluations at inter-ministerial level</p> <p>- Evaluation recommendations reflected in policy development and programming</p>	<p><i>UK audit</i> - Build methods for improved data collection into funding contracts</p>	<p>and recommendations being used to shape policy and program decisions</p> <p>- 4(r) Encouragement and support for, and participation in, joint evaluations of international responses to humanitarian crises</p> <p>- 4(s) Involvement of beneficiaries in monitoring and evaluation [see also GHD 7]</p>
	<p><i>DRC pilot impact indicators 14. Report contributions in timely and accurate fashion</i></p> <p>a) All contributions reported to the FTS [OCHA Financial Tracking System] in a timely and accurate fashion</p>	<p>- Common definition of humanitarian action</p> <p>- Aid legislation / policy framework permits scope for harmonisation of reporting formats</p> <p>- Adoption of common donor reporting formats</p> <p>- Timely reporting of funding and activities to FTS [HPG]</p> <p>- Comprehensive annual reporting on official humanitarian assistance expenditure by donors</p>	<p><i>DRC pilot</i> - Donors encourage UN organisations and NGOs to improve their reporting to the FTS</p>	<p><i>See also:</i></p> <p>- GHD 3 (definition of humanitarian action)</p> <p>- Stockholm Implementation Plan point 3 (harmonisation of reporting requirements and management demands), and point 4 (common definition of official humanitarian assistance)</p> <p>- DAC framework 4(t)</p>

hpg

Humanitarian  
Policy Group

Overseas Development Institute  
111 Westminster Bridge Road  
London SE1 7JD  
UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 7922 0300

Fax: +44 (0)20 7922 0399

Email: [publications@odi.org.uk](mailto:publications@odi.org.uk)

Website: [www.odi.org.uk](http://www.odi.org.uk)

