

**INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP
57th MEETING**

**16-17 June 2004
Room XII
Palais des Nations, Geneva**

**Good Humanitarian Donorship: Principles and Good Practice of Humanitarian
Donorship-Impact Indicators for DRC Pilot (Revised 11 December 2003), and
Timetable of Activities**

Circulated: 10 June 2004

1) **Donor funding is flexible and timely:**

- a) x% of funding pledged to CHAP activities by January 2005
- b) x% of funding disbursed to CHAP activities in the first quarter 2005
- c) x% of funding disbursed to CHAP activities by the end of the second quarter / at the MYR
- d) x% of funding provided (either new funding or through re-allocation) to new activities and/or in newly accessible areas identified at mid-term review and CHAP revision

Note: need to make sure that humanitarian activities are not hampered by lack of available funds, yet no need that all donors disburse in the first month of the year; discussion of funding (intentions) should take place in December 2004

2) **Donors' and agencies' funding is allocated based on needs assessments**

- a) Standard needs assessment criteria elaborated and accepted for all priority sectors
- b) Donor funding for collection of baseline data, in particular number of beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex) and for needs assessments
- c) Joint (i.e. agencies, ngo's, beneficiaries, governments and donors) needs assessments conducted for all priority sectors and results used as basis for CHAP
- d) Priorities in CHAP fully funded to implementation capacity
- e) x% of funding provided for non-priority sectors

Note: it is considered of key importance that assessments be done on inter-agency basis; awaiting work by CAP-sub-working group on needs assessments; no separate funding proposals for doing needs assessments; unforeseen needs assessments (made possible by newly accessible areas) should be funded from EHI-like mechanisms under the control of the HC

3) Local capacities strengthened

- a) x capacity building activities for local NGOs and local institutions engaged in humanitarian activities included in CHAP and funded by donors
- b) Local capacity component increasingly included in agencies' and ngo's programs
- c) x activities handed over to local authorities and local ngo's for implementation by December 2005

Note: Value of "x" to be set during the CHAP process.

Best practices of funding local capacity building to be discussed at a later stage

4) UN leadership and coordination role supported by international community

- a) Portion of funds from all donors available for coordination activities
- b) Portion of funds from all donors available for security activities
- c) Coordination component included in all project reports
- d) % of coordination costs agreed to in CHAP are funded on time.
- e) Heads of UN agencies participate in drafting of common strategy.

5) Earmarking is reduced

- a) Percentage of funds pooled at country level;
- b) Percentage of funds agencies bring to country from donors unearmarked at the HQS level
- c) Percentage of funding at less specific level of earmarking, at least at organizational level

Note: prioritized activities in the CHAP must be fully funded, but recognition that no humanitarian organization will be able to reach 100% implementation rate; information on funding for non-priority sectors is necessary to analyze whether funding for non-priorities detracts from funding for priorities. Moving towards unearmarked funds will be directly related to the degree to which all partners can agree upon a common strategy and to which the strategy is based upon solid needs assessments.

6) Funding is made available on longer-term basis

- a) x % of agencies funded on multi-year basis for priority activities

Note: indicator measures percentage of agencies funded on multi-year basis, since multi-year funding for particular sectors is not yet feasible

7) Recovery and long-term development is linked to humanitarian programs

- a) Priorities identified in CHAP given adequate consideration in PRSP/UNDAF

- b) Development programs in place to encourage durable solutions for refugees and IDPs
- c) Extent to which needs are assessed based on vulnerability

Note: CHAP and PRSP/UNDAF should inform one another; same general analysis of country situation should serve as basis for both humanitarian and development programs. Goal is to have exit strategies by humanitarian implementers that are well coordinated with entry programs by development partners.

8) Funding requirements for assistance effort is shared equitably among donors (Does not apply to country pilots but rather to the global level)

- a) More donors providing funding, including x new (non-traditional) donors

Note: goal is to improve burden sharing among traditional and new (non-traditional) donors; all donors should adhere to the Stockholm-principles; improved burden sharing is also a way to decrease the degree to which agencies might be depending on one or a few major donors, which entails risks for their independence and for the sustainability of their programs

9) Established good practices are adhered to by humanitarian implementing partners

- a) SPHERE guidelines applied to CAP programs
- b) Basic humanitarian principles included in all humanitarian programs
- c) IDP country programs are consistent with and promote the Guiding Principles for Internal Displacement
- d) Donor participation in the elaboration of a common humanitarian framework guided by Good Humanitarian Donorship principles
- e) All partners (NGOs, UN agencies, donors, govt) participate in drafting a common humanitarian strategy and implement projects in accordance with the strategy.

Note: the Good Humanitarian Donorship principles (para 16) promote the use of Inter-Agency Standing Committee guidelines and principles on humanitarian activities, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement and the 1994 Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief; the IASC Guidelines on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse; and gender-mainstreaming.

10) Safe humanitarian access is promoted

- a) new areas accessed and jointly assessed by humanitarian agencies/ x% of vulnerable population safely accessible by humanitarian workers
- b) x % of new beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex) accessing humanitarian assistance
- c) Outreach strategy articulated jointly with donors

Note: See also Principle 1) d)

11) Contingency planning is supported by donors

- a) Programs exist and funding available for quick-dispersement of stocks/staff

12) Military assets are used appropriately

- a) Regular coordination meetings held between MONUC (civil and military affairs) and the international humanitarian community
- b) Clear understanding of MONUC support of humanitarian activities articulated
- c) Use of military assets for humanitarian interventions in conformity with international humanitarian law and the MCDA Guidelines
- d) Clear understanding exists of terms of interaction with domestic armed forces and any other armed groups.
- e) MONUC agenda for DDR/DDRRR is coordinated with common humanitarian strategy.

13) Evaluate performances

- a) Standard evaluation criteria (linked to needs assessment criteria) for impact elaborated for x sectors (including IDPS) and evaluation(s) undertaken
- b) x % of humanitarian activities evaluated based on standard criteria

Note: donor performance must be part of any evaluation of the DRC pilot; stock taking of various aspects of pilot could be done as soon as February 2005 with a baseline study done in Feb/Mar 2004.

14) Report contributions in timely and accurate fashion

- a) All contributions reported to the FTS in a timely and accurate fashion

Note: donors should also encourage agencies and ngo's to improve their reporting to the FTS

“Agencies” is defined as implementers in the field to include UN organizations and NGOs.

Prepared by: Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) DRC Pilot Working Group

TIMETABLE OF ACTIVITIES

**WORKING GROUP FOR
THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO**

| <u>Month</u> | <u>Venue/Organization</u> | <u>Activities</u> |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| October | Geneva (WG) | Identify impact indicators Comments on draft timetable Comments on proposed approach (see agenda) |
| November | Email | Comments/input from capitals/field To US/Belgium by 17 Nov. Final materials to WG by 19 Nov. |
| | Geneva (WG) | Meeting with RC/HC McLeod (24 Nov-to confirm) |
| | Capitals | Donors discuss funding availability/preliminary assistance strategies |
| | DRC (UN/NGOs) | Survey of existing needs assessments Survey of baseline data |
| December | Geneva (WG/UN) | Workshop on needs assessments (1 – 2 Dec hosted by UN) |
| | Bur/DRC (WG leads) | Field visit to brief /get input from UN/donors/NGOs/MONUC on pilots (8 – 16 Dec. – to confirm) |
| | Geneva | Revised indicators/workplan to field for comment (22 Dec.) |
| January 2004 | DRC | Comments to Gva on indicators/wkplan By 9 January 2004 |
| | Geneva | Brief donor group on mission; discussion of donor roles in pilot (13 January). |

Background document on the agenda item of Good Humanitarian Donorship

| | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | Kinshasa | Survey of existing needs assessments and And baseline data |
| | OCHA/ Sector facilitators | |
| | OCHA | Needs assessments workshop (??) |
| | OCHA/ Sector facilitators | Prepare schedule for needs assessments |
| Feb/Mar 2004 | Geneva | Montreux retreat (26 – 27 Feb.) Preliminary read-out |
| | Geneva | <u>Meeting on donor funding intentions for 2004 (29 March)</u> |
| | DRC (Field) | Joint needs assessments Compile data (Underway) |
| May | (Consultant) | Preliminary evaluation of donors using GHD criteria |
| | Field | Initial findings of needs assessment survey |
| | Field | Needs assessment matrix initial discussions |
| June | DRC (UN/et al) | GHD overview/Draft common strategy for 2005 (June 23 – 25) |
| October | Geneva (WG) | Preview of 2005 common strategy priorities |
| | Ottawa | GHD High level session Review of pilot's progress |
| November 2004 | Brussels/WDC? | 2005 CAP launched (??) |

Background document on the agenda item of Good Humanitarian Donorship

| | | |
|------------------|--------------|--|
| December 2004 | Geneva | Indications of funding for 2005 |
| February 2005 | DRC/Gva (WG) | Follow-up evaluation of donor behavior |
| Early 2006 | DRC/GVA | Evaluation of pilot |