Switzerland
HRI 2010 ranking: 7th

Policy framework
Switzerland’s humanitarian aid is provided by the Swiss Humanitarian Aid Unit of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) – which is part of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs. The Swiss Federal Law of International Development Cooperation clearly separates the objectives of humanitarian aid and development and their budgets. Switzerland’s humanitarian policy, outlined in the 2009-2014 Humanitarian Action Strategy, is grounded in both international humanitarian law and the Principles of Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD). The strategy calls for a restructuring of SDC to strengthen bilateral cooperation and Swiss presence in partner countries. The Humanitarian Aid of the Swiss Confederation: Strategy 2010 positions Swiss humanitarian action as an investment in sustainable development. The Humanitarian Aid Bill established a five-year (2007-2011) framework for Swiss humanitarian action, and sets a target of ensuring 20% of SDC’s budget is spent on humanitarian aid. Switzerland has a Swiss Rescue Team, a Rapid Response Team and a Humanitarian Aid Unit available for rapid deployment in emergency humanitarian and disaster relief operations. In 2009, Swiss ODA represented 0.47% of its GNI. Humanitarian aid comprised 13.7% of Swiss ODA and 0.05% of GNI.

Switzerland has been engaged in the GHD initiative since its inception and continues to play an active role with regard to donor coordination and cooperation with humanitarian actors. It convenes an annual retreat in Montreux which brings together major donors and humanitarian representatives. Switzerland is chairing the GHD group for 2010-2011. Switzerland was one of the first donors to have humanitarian assistance included in its OECD/DAC Peer Review in 2005 as part of the enhanced review process. Although Switzerland does not have a GHD domestic implementation plan, GHD commitments have been integrated into legislation and provide a solid basis for principled humanitarian action.

Performance
Switzerland ranked 7th in the HRI 2010. Based on the pattern of its scores, Switzerland is classified as a Group 1 donor. Donors in this group tend to do better overall in Pillar 3 (Working with humanitarian partners), Pillar 4 (Protection and international law) and Pillar 5 (Learning and accountability). Other donors in this group include Denmark, Finland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and Sweden.

Switzerland received its highest average score in Pillar 1 (Responding to needs), where it was close to the OECD/DAC and Group 1 averages. In Pillar 2 (Prevention, risk reduction and recovery), Switzerland was above the OECD/DAC average and close to its group average. In Pillar 3 and Pillar 4, it scored close to the OECD/DAC average and below the Group 1 average. In Pillar 5, it was above the OECD/DAC average and close to its group average.

Switzerland did best compared to its OECD/DAC peers in the indicators on International humanitarian law, Participation in accountability initiatives, Funding of risk mitigation mechanisms, Un-earmarked funding and Reducing climate-related vulnerability. Its scores were lowest in the indicators on Funding for reconstruction and prevention, Timely funding to complex emergencies, Human rights law, Funding to NGOs and Advocacy towards local authorities.

Aid distribution by type of organisation

Source: OCHA/FTS October 2010.

* The OECD/DAC average does not include scores for Austria, Greece or Portugal.
Switzerland

**Donor assessments**

Switzerland to NGOs, and Group 1 donors an average of 15%. Denmark led the way in this indicator, with 34%.

Switzerland should consider finding ways of channeling a greater percentage of its funding to NGOs.

Switzerland received the highest score of all OECD/DAC donors for *International humanitarian law*. However, it was among the lowest scored donors, and well below the OECD/DAC average, for *Human rights law*, an indicator measuring signature and ratification of human rights treaties, accreditation of national human rights institutions and funding to OHCHR, the primary guardian of international human rights treaties. Furthermore, its support of OHCHR, as guardian of international human rights treaties is 0.55% of every million dollars of its GDP, below the Group 1 average of 1.36%.

Switzerland should consider finding ways of channeling a greater percentage of its funding to NGOs.

Switzerland's partners generally consider it an average, or above average donor, with the exception of one indicator: *Advocacy towards local authorities*.

Switzerland should engage in dialogue with its partners to discuss their perceptions regarding Switzerland’s advocacy towards local authorities.

Switzerland should be praised for providing funding to so many non-Swiss NGOs: 89% of the NGOs it supports are international. However, Switzerland's total allocations to NGOs represented only around eight percent of its humanitarian aid, while the OECD/DAC average channeled an average of 13% to NGOs, and Group 1 donors an average of 15%. Denmark led the way in this indicator, with 34%.

Switzerland should consider finding ways of channeling a greater percentage of its funding to NGOs.

Switzerland received the highest score of all OECD/DAC donors for *International humanitarian law*. However, it was among the lowest scored donors, and well below the OECD/DAC average, for *Human rights law*, an indicator measuring signature and ratification of human rights treaties, accreditation of national human rights institutions and funding to OHCHR, the primary guardian of international human rights treaties. Furthermore, its support of OHCHR, as guardian of international human rights treaties is 0.55% of every million dollars of its GDP, below the Group 1 average of 1.36%.

Switzerland should review the human rights treaties it has signed and consider ways of increasing its support of human rights organisations such as OHCHR.

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

### Recommendations

- Switzerland is below average in its funding of crises with high levels of vulnerability. Group 1 provided an average of 49% of total humanitarian aid to these crises, and OECD/DAC donors an average of 53%. Switzerland, on the other hand, allocated only 35% to these emergencies.

- Switzerland should consider finding ways of allocating a greater percentage of its funding to crises with high levels of vulnerability.

Switzerland’s partners generally consider it an average, or above average donor, with the exception of one indicator: *Advocacy towards local authorities*.

- Switzerland should engage in dialogue with its partners to discuss their perceptions regarding Switzerland’s advocacy towards local authorities.

### Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Donor score</th>
<th>OECD/DAC donor average</th>
<th>% over average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International humanitarian law</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in accountability initiatives</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of risk mitigation mechanisms</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-earmarked funding</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing climate-related vulnerability</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 reconstruction and prevention</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely funding to complex emergencies</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>-41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights law</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding to NGOs</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy towards local authorities</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Distribution of donor funding to these sectors includes flows within and outside an appeal that has been reported to OCHA/FTS. This is compared to the “distribution of needs” based on the 2009 UN appeal budget allocation.

*Source: OCHA/FTS October 2010.*