United Kingdom
HRI 2010 ranking: 8th

Policy framework

The United Kingdom’s (UK) humanitarian assistance is managed by the Department for International Development (DFID). The 2006 Humanitarian Policy and the 2009 White Paper Eliminating World Poverty: Building our Common Future constitute its policy framework. DFID has an extensive regional and country level presence, in many locations with humanitarian staff. When a sudden onset crisis occurs, DFID can call on its stand-by capacity and is able to participate in coordination structures for rapid support. Its Conflict and Humanitarian Fund, created in 2006, helps provide NGOs with two- to five-year funding agreements, contingent on performance evaluations. DFID also has multi-year institutional strategies with a number of UN agencies and the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement. It regularly sets aside ten percent of its humanitarian budget for disaster risk reduction and continues to play a central role in promoting humanitarian reform components, such as pooled funding (CERF and CHF), the cluster approach, improved CAPs and strengthening the Humanitarian Coordinator system. DFID has also actively advocated for improved needs assessments, surge capacity for rapid response and donor coordination. In 2009, it spent 0.52% of its GNI on ODA, aiming to reach the 0.7% UN target by 2013. Humanitarian assistance represented 10.49% of its ODA and 0.040% of its GNI.

As a strong supporter of the Principles of Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD), the UK follows a GHD domestic implementation plan. DFID chaired the GHD group in 2006–2007 and in Sudan has taken the lead in initiatives to improve coordination among GHD donors.

Performance

The UK ranked 8th in the HRI 2010. Based on the patterns of its scores, the UK 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, Canada, the European Commission, Germany, Greece (based on quantitative indicators only), Ireland and the United States.

The UK received its highest score in Pillar 1, close to the OECD/DAC and Group 2 averages in this pillar. In Pillar 2 and Pillar 3 (Working with humanitarian partners) it scored close to the OECD/DAC averages but above the Group 2 averages. In Pillar 4 (Protection and international law), its score was similar to the OECD/DAC and Group 2 averages. Finally, in Pillar 5 (Learning and accountability) the UK scored above the OECD/DAC average and close to its group average.

The UK was best among its OECD/DAC peers in the indicators on Participation in accountability initiatives, Funding UN and Red Cross Red Crescent appeals, Funding of risk mitigation mechanisms, Funding based on level of vulnerability and to forgotten crises and Timely funding to complex emergencies. Its scores were relatively the lowest in the indicators on Funding for reconstruction and prevention, Funding for accountability initiatives, Un-earmarked funding, Refugee law and Appropriate reporting requirements.

Aid distribution by type of organisation

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

Source: OCHA/FTS October 2010.
Donor assessments

United Kingdom

The UK is highly supportive of the CERF and country-based pooled funding mechanisms. It also has multi-year funding arrangements with a number of UN agencies, the IFRC and ICRC. However, there are some issues related to flexibility. Un-earmarked funding comprised 25% of the UK’s aid, while the OECD/DAC average is 35%. Similarly, the UK scored well below the OECD/DAC average in the survey questions related to flexibility, conditionality of funding and appropriateness of reporting requirements.

The UK should review the flexibility of its funding and engage in dialogue with its partners to discuss their perceptions of its performance in this area.

The UK received one of the lowest scores of all OECD/DAC donors for the qualitative indicator on protection of civilians, indicating that its partners would like to see the UK more engaged in protection.

The UK should engage in dialogue with its partners to discuss their perceptions regarding its support for protection.

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

### Recommendations

**Of all pillars, the UK performs the best in Pillar 1, but within this pillar it could improve its performance by ensuring the independence and impartiality of its aid.**

The UK received one of the lowest scores of OECD/DAC donors in both the independence and impartiality indicators, which could indicate that partners do not generally perceive UK’s aid to be impartial and independent.

- The UK should engage in dialogue with its partners to discuss their perceptions regarding the independence and impartiality of the UK’s aid.

The UK’s performance in Pillar 2 was close to the OECD/DAC average and above the Group 2 average. However, it scored very low on the indicator of Funding for reconstruction and prevention, receiving its second-lowest score of the index. In 2008, the UK allocated 7% of its humanitarian aid to reconstruction and prevention. Group 2, in contrast, spent an average of 15% on this, while the best performing group, Group 3, allocated an average of 25%.

- The UK should consider finding ways to increase its support of reconstruction and prevention.

The UK is highly supportive of the CERF and country-based pooled funding mechanisms. It also has multi-year funding arrangements with a number of UN agencies, the IFRC and ICRC. However, there are some issues related to flexibility. Un-earmarked funding comprised 25% of the UK’s aid, while the OECD/DAC average is 35%. Similarly, the UK scored well below the OECD/DAC average in the survey questions related to flexibility, conditionality of funding and appropriateness of reporting requirements.

- The UK should review the flexibility of its funding and engage in dialogue with its partners to discuss their perceptions of its performance in this area.

The UK received one of the lowest scores of all OECD/DAC donors for the qualitative indicator on protection of civilians, indicating that its partners would like to see the UK more engaged in protection.

- The UK should engage in dialogue with its partners to discuss their perceptions regarding its support for protection.

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

---

**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>Participation in accountability initiatives</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding UN and Red Cross Red Crescent appeals</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding of risk mitigation mechanisms</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding based on level of vulnerability and to forgotten crises</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely funding to complex emergencies</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>18%</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>1.63</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for accountability initiatives</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-earmarked funding</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee law</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate reporting requirements</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>