





4

PART FOUR

Donor Profiles

Introduction

This section provides donor profiles showing the salient features of each donor's humanitarian assistance.

For each donor, there is a short summary describing the key actors involved in the delivery of its humanitarian aid programme, the policies guiding those actors, how the donor has incorporated the GHD Principles, and the donor's interaction with other humanitarian partners.

The spiderweb chart "HRI scores by pillar" shows the donor's scores on each of the five pillars of the Humanitarian Response Index (HRI) 2007, relative to the DAC average. In a Table "HRI results," the best five and worst five indicators are listed, under their corresponding pillars, giving a glimpse of a donor's strengths and weaknesses across the HRI.

Next, key figures of a donor's humanitarian aid for 2005 and 2006 are presented in the Table "Overview of humanitarian aid," which includes estimates for total humanitarian aid, made up of reported bilateral humanitarian aid and estimates of multilateral aid. Bilateral humanitarian aid for 2005 and 2006 was taken from the OECD-DAC database and is defined as "bilateral transactions ... undertaken by a donor country directly with a developing country." It includes all flows, regardless of the channel, for which "the donor effectively controls the disposal of the funds by specifying or "earmarking" the recipient or other aspects of the disbursement."¹

The data for bilateral humanitarian aid suffer from a number of drawbacks. First, it appears that the 2005 figures have largely been adjusted to conform to the recent decision by the OECD Working Party on Statistics to exclude the funding category "Refugees in donor countries" as of 2006. This category was henceforth no longer to be included as humanitarian aid (DAC 700), but, rather, counted against Official Development Assistance (ODA)-eligible expenses in donor countries (DAC 93010). However, this does not appear to be the case for the 2006 figures, as these are still preliminary and, therefore, not adjusted.

It is also not clear whether these data on bilateral humanitarian aid are consistent in their treatment of the

delivery of humanitarian aid by the military and of land mine clearance—both counted separately as code DAC 15250—and (in the case of EU countries) of contributions to ECHO. Because there was no OECD figure for multilateral humanitarian aid within its multilateral ODA category, it was estimated based on data supplied by UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, UNRWA, UN/OCHA, ICRC and IFRC, and captured receipts from a given donor of unearmarked or core funding.

The "Overview" Table also lists ODA, as well as funding to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), and other funds committed under flexible terms. It offers calculations of humanitarian aid per capita, both as a proportion of ODA and of gross national income (GNI). Donor data are shown as a share or average of the corresponding total DAC figures.

The Table "Response times by crisis type" shows the timeliness of a donor's funding. It estimates the average number of days a donor has taken to commit or disburse funds to natural disasters and to new and ongoing complex emergencies, all of which occurred in 2005 or 2006 and were subject to a Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP). The data are taken from OCHA/FTS, a real-time database (updated daily), and are based on an early May 2007 download.

For natural disasters, the dates of disbursement or commitment were compared to crisis onset, as defined by the International Disaster Database EM-DAT, compiled by the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) at the Université Catholique de Louvain. For complex emergencies, the dates of disbursement or commitment were compared to the UN Appeal launch dates. Consequently, funding for natural disasters also included funding flows outside the UN Appeal process as reported in the FTS, whereas for complex emergencies, only data on funding within the Appeal were used. The three categories included 82 natural disasters, 20 new complex emergencies, and 13 ongoing complex emergencies. When funding was committed or

disbursed before the launch of an Appeal or natural disaster, this was taken to be same-day funding, as was typically the case where a donor's unused funding to another crisis was being reallocated.

The pie chart in the Figure titled "Main channels of humanitarian aid" shows how a donor's 2006 humanitarian aid was apportioned to the UN, the Red Cross and NGOs, or other. The UN category encompasses humanitarian receipts by UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, UNRWA, and UN/OCHA, and includes CERF funding collected from these agencies, funds, and programmes. The Red Cross category encompasses humanitarian receipts by IFRC and ICRC based on their data. "Other" is a residual category and includes humanitarian flows to NGOs, governments, Red Cross national societies, intergovernmental organisations, NGOs, private organisations, and foundations. Shares are taken relative to the estimates of total humanitarian aid reported in the Table entitled "Overview of humanitarian aid."

For the UN category, the absolute number on which this share is based is likely to represent a fairly accurate reflection of the donor's funding to the UN agencies, funds, and programmes. However, the calculated share may be skewed, due to the inaccuracy of the estimate for total humanitarian aid, as described above. Moreover, the Red Cross category, based on data provided by the IFRC and the ICRC, is certain to be an underestimate of the funding the donor provides to the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, as it does not cover the amounts of official funding to respective Red Cross national societies based in donor countries, which, in turn, fund both the IFRC and other Red Cross national societies on a bilateral basis. To date, there is no accurate estimate available to capture these flows.

The next Table, titled "Funding per emergency," lists the top ten emergencies that received donor funding in 2006, based on OCHA/FTS data. It shows the amounts in US dollars and the percentage of funding to each emergency as a proportion of a donor's total 2006 funding reported in the FTS. For each emergency, it also provides a split of the funding channelled through an Appeal and outside an Appeal. The second pie-chart, called "Regional distribution of funding," shows the same data split across regions. The final bar chart, called "Sectoral distribution of funding," shows the same data apportioned across CAP sectors.

1 See OECD (2006), DCD/DAC/STAT(2006)11/FINAL, available at: <http://www.odamoz.org.mz/extra/DAC-CRSMannual.pdf>