Canada
HRI 2010 ranking: 12th

**Policy framework**
Canada's humanitarian aid is managed by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), within the Ministry of International Cooperation. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) is responsible for developing its humanitarian aid policy, and the International Humanitarian Assistance Directorate (IHA) for managing Canada's response to international humanitarian crises. The 2008 Development Assistance Accountability Act requires all humanitarian aid to prioritize poverty relief, international humanitarian law and beneficiary engagement. It also requires aid in crisis situations to be distributed rapidly, efficiently and transparently. It is Canada's policy to reduce earmarking at the country level, support pooled funding mechanisms, such as the CERF and in-country pooled funds, and provide funding in proportion to the size of appeals. Canada also stresses the importance of evaluating its response to major crises. In 2009, Canada's development cooperation budget dropped by about 18%, resulting in a lower ODA/GNI ratio of 0.30% compared to 0.33% in 2008. Humanitarian assistance represented 12.01% of Canada's ODA and 0.031% of its GNI.

Canada continues to play a central role in the Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) group and adheres to its GHD domestic implementation plan, adopted in 2005 and revised in 2006.

**Performance**
Canada ranked 12th in the HRI 2010. Based on the patterns of its scores, Canada is classified as a Group 2 donor. Donors in this group tend to perform around average in all pillars, with slightly better scores in Pillar 1 (Responding to needs), and somewhat poorer in Pillar 2 (Prevention, risk reduction and recovery). Other donors in the group include Australia, the European Commission, Germany, Greece, (based on quantitative scores only) Ireland, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Overall, Canada's performance is close to the OECD/DAC averages in all pillars. It also scored close to the Group 2 average in all pillars, with the exception of Pillar 5 (Learning and accountability) where it scored below average. Canada followed the pattern of other Group 2 donors in Pillar 1, receiving its highest pillar score here with marks close to the OECD/DAC and Group 2 averages. It departed from other Group 2 donors in that it received its lowest pillar score in Pillar 5, where Group 2 donors tend to perform well.

Canada did best compared to its OECD/DAC peers in the indicators on Funding of risk mitigation mechanisms, Timely funding to sudden onset disasters, Funding UN and Red Cross Red Crescent appeals, Participation in accountability initiatives and Funding based on level of vulnerability and to forgotten crises. It scores were lowest in indicators on Funding for accountability initiatives, Un-earmarked funding, Timely funding to complex emergencies, Reducing climate-related vulnerability and Funding for reconstruction and prevention.

Aid distribution by type of organisation

Source: OCHA/FTS October 2010.
Canada’s partners in the field consider it an average donor in terms of flexibility. However, it receives a very low score for the quantitative indicator Un-earmarked funding. Of all Canada’s humanitarian aid, only 15% was not earmarked. The OECD/DAC average for un-earmarked funding is 35%.

- Canada should review the flexibility and consider reducing the earmarking of its funding.

Canada is above the OECD/DAC average in its participation in accountability initiatives. It received its lowest score of the index, however, for its funding of them as Canada allocated only 0.09% of its humanitarian aid to support them. The OECD/DAC average, in contrast, was 0.46% and the Group 2 average, 0.36%. Group1, which performs the best in this indicator, allocated an average of 0.71%.

- Canada should consider finding ways of increasing its support for accountability initiatives.

For more information, please see www.daraint.org.

---

### Areas for improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Donor score</th>
<th>OECD/DAC donor average</th>
<th>% below average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding for accountability initiatives</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-earmarked funding</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely funding to complex emergencies</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>-56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing climate-related vulnerability</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for reconstruction and prevention</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>