


FINLAND

HRI 2011
Ranking
9th




Group **1**
PRINCIPLED
PARTNERS

OFFICIAL
DEVELOPMENT
ASSISTANCE **0.55%**
of GNI

HUMANITARIAN
AID **19.6%**
of ODA **US \$49**
Per person

HUMANITARIAN AID DISTRIBUTION (%)



GENDER RATING

POLICY

FUNDING

FIELD PERCEPTION

STRENGTHS

Pillar	Type	Indicator	Score	% above OECD/DAC average
2	QT	Funding reconstruction and prevention	7.17	+60.0%
4	QT	Refugee law	8.74	+55.5%
5	QL	Accountability towards beneficiaries	5.62	+29.7%
1	QT	Funding vulnerable and forgotten emergencies	8.47	+22.6%
4	QL	Advocacy for protection of civilians	6.58	+18.3%

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Pillar	Type	Indicator	Score	% below OECD/DAC average
5	QT	Participating in accountability initiatives	1.67	-62.8%
2	QL	Prevention and risk reduction	2.99	-33.8%
1	QT	Timely funding to complex emergencies	5.82	-26.4%
1	QL	Adapting to changing needs	4.76	-24.2%
2	QL	Strengthening local capacity	4.68	-19.0%

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

Finland ranked 9th in the HRI 2011, improving two positions from 2010. Based on the pattern of its scores, Finland 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 Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

Overall, Finland scored above the OECD/DAC average, yet below the Group 1 average. Compared to OECD/DAC donors, Finland scored above average in all pillars, with the exception of Pillar 3 (Working

with humanitarian partners) and Pillar 5 (Learning and accountability). It was below the Group 1 average in all pillars, except for Pillar 4 (Protection and international law), where it was above average.

Finland did best compared to its OECD/DAC peers in the indicators on *Funding reconstruction and prevention*, *Refugee law*, *Accountability towards beneficiaries*, *Funding vulnerable and forgotten emergencies* and *Advocacy for protection of civilians*. Its scores were relatively the lowest in the indicators on *Participating in accountability initiatives*, *Prevention and risk reduction*, *Timely funding to complex emergencies*, *Adapting to changing needs* and *Strengthening local capacity*.