


DENMARK

HRI 2011
Ranking
2nd






Group **1**
PRINCIPLED
PARTNERS

OFFICIAL
DEVELOPMENT
ASSISTANCE **0.90%**
of GNI

HUMANITARIAN
AID **6.2%**
of ODA

US \$32
Per person

HUMANITARIAN AID DISTRIBUTION (%)



GENDER RATING

POLICY

FUNDING

FIELD PERCEPTION

STRENGTHS

Pillar	Type	Indicator	Score	% above OECD/DAC average
5	QT	Funding accountability initiatives	10.00	+143.1%
5	QT	Participating in accountability initiatives	9.44	+111.1%
3	QT	Funding NGOs	8.40	+85.3%
5	QT	Funding and commissioning evaluations	7.59	+83.4%
3	QT	Funding UN and RC/RC appeals	7.21	+77.3%

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Pillar	Type	Indicator	Score	% below OECD/DAC average
2	QT	Funding reconstruction and prevention	3.01	-32.9%
1	QT	Timely funding to sudden onset emergencies	7.64	-5.2%
4	QL	Facilitating safe access	4.94	-3.0%
1	QL	Adapting to changing needs	6.12	-2.4%
5	QL	Appropriate reporting requirements	7.01	-1.1%

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

Denmark ranked 2nd in the HRI 2011, dropping one position from 2010. Based on the pattern of its scores, Denmark is classified as a Group 1 donor, "Principled Partners". This group is characterised by its commitment to humanitarian principles and strong support for multilateral partners, and generally good overall performance in all areas. Other Group 1 donors include Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

Denmark's overall score was above the OECD/DAC and Group 1 averages. Denmark scored above the OECD/DAC and Group 1 averages in all pillars, with the exception of Pillars 2 and 3. In Pillar 2 (Prevention, risk reduction and recovery) Denmark scored above the OECD/DAC average, yet below the Group 1 average.

Similarly, in Pillar 3 (Working with humanitarian partners) Denmark scored above the OECD/DAC and slightly below the Group 1 average. Denmark's performance stands out in Pillar 5 (Learning and accountability), where it scored well above both the OECD/DAC and Group 1 average scores.

Denmark did best compared to its peers in the indicators on *Funding accountability initiatives*, *Participating in accountability initiatives*, *Funding NGOs*, *Funding and commissioning evaluations* and *Funding UN and RC/RC appeals* - all quantitative indicators. Its scores were relatively the lowest in *Funding reconstruction and prevention*, *Timely funding to sudden onset emergencies*, *Facilitating safe access*, *Adapting to changing needs* and *Appropriate reporting requirements*.