



Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken

# Humanitarian aid

Organisation		Date			Reporting period			
Department for Stability and Humanitarian Aid, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Netherlands		June 2016			2015			
Activity Number	Name	2015 Actual expenditure	Implemented by Name organisation	Channel	Result area Result area	Rio marker Mitigation/Adaptation	Significant/principal	Gender marker Significant/principal
25483	UN OCHA contribution	5.000.000	UN OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis preparedness and linking relief to development	[...]	[...]	[...]
26381	WFP contribution	36.000.000	WFP	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
26432	UNHCR contribution	33.000.000	UNHCR	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
26392	UNRWA	13.000.000	UNRWA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
26410	Contribution to UNISDR	1.000.000	UNISDR	Multilateral organisation	Crisis preparedness and linking relief to development	[...]	[...]	[...]
27270	Contribution to ICRC	40.000.000	ICRC	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27270	Syria contribution	10.000.000	ICRC	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27463	START fund contribution	1.000.000	START	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27467	UN OCHA CERF contribution	55.000.000	OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27479	UNICEF contribution	15.000.000	UNICEF	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]

27750	Yemen contribution	2.000.000	OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27760	Yemen DRA Joint response I	2.850.000	CARE a.o.	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28014	Sport And Humanitarian Assistance project	1.566.137	UNICEF a.o.	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28157	Lebanon Crisis Response Plan 2015-2016	17.500.000	UNHCR, ERF, UNICEF	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28111	Syria 3RP (Regional, Refugee & Resilience) plan	40.000.000	UN OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28156	Jordan Response Plan	28.000.000	ERF, UNHCR, UNRWA, UNICEF, Child Cash Grant programme, UNICEF Informa	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28345	Support to Lebanon Vulnerable Host Communities through Municipalities UNDP	9.500.000	UNDP	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28367	Yemen DRA Joint response II	5.700.000	CARE a.o.	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
24753	Response Preparedness 2012-2016	1.000.000	Dutch Red Cross	NGO	Crisis preparedness and linking relief to development	[...]	[...]	[...]
26239	Syria cross border support	1.335.875	World Vision	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
26240	Syria cross border support	1.178.079	Stichting Vluchteling	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27156	Syria contribution	2.000.000	UNICEF	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27199	South Sudan DRA joint response I	3.835.955	Save the Children a.o.	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27200	Iraq DRA joint response I	2.300.000	Cordaid a.o.	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27206	Ebola DRA joint response	9.447.229	Oxfam Novib a.o.	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27411	South Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund	5.000.000	UNDP - OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27462	Contribution Artsen zonder Grenzen	5.000.000	Artsen zonder Grenzen	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27468	Ukraine contribution	1.500.000	WFP	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27478	DRC Common Humanitarian Fund	2.000.000	UNDP - OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27481	South Sudan Bentiu - Protection of Civilians site improvement	3.999.700	IOM	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27527	Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund	2.000.000	UNDP - OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27572	Contribution Netherlands Red Cross	15.000.000	Netherlands Red Cross	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27573	Syria contribution	18.000.000	UNHCR	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27575	Syria contribution	15.000.000	WFP	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27577	Security aid workers	1.485.000	INSO	NGO	Coordination and effectiveness	[...]	[...]	[...]
27602	Nigeria DRA joint response I	5.000.000	Save the Children a.o.	NGO	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27616	Vanuatu DRA joint response	2.040.000	World Vision a.o.	NGO	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27622	Syria DRA joint response I	11.290.000	ZOA a.o.	NGO	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27625	CAR DRA joint response	5.641.750	Cordaid a.o.	NGO	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27630	CAR Common Humanitarian Fund	4.000.000	OCHA	Multilateral organisation	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27642	Iraq contribution	4.000.000	UNICEF	Multilateral organisation	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27660	Nepal DRA joint response	3.800.000	Oxfam Novib a.o.	NGO	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27661	Syria contribution	2.000.000	UNRWA	Multilateral organisation	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27690	Nepal contribution	5.000.000	WFP	Multilateral organisation	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27850	Iraq contribution Humanitarian response plan	19.000.000	OCHA	Multilateral organisation	crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27855	Hope for Eritrean refugees in Ethiopia	2.375.000	ZOA and ICCO	NGO	Crisis preparedness and linking relief to development	[...]	[...]	[...]
27886	Big data innovation for humanitarian action	2.220.000	UN global pulse	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27891	Scaling up mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (mVAM)	990.000	WFP	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27908	Humanitarian Innovation Fund 2015-2017	1.038.062	Save the Children UK	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27925	Mehe school monitoring Lebanon	3.000.000	UNICEF	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
27955	Local Government Resilience Programme for the Middle East and North Africa	3.231.500	VNG	NGO	Crisis preparedness and linking relief to development	[...]	[...]	[...]
28009	Yemen contribution	10.000.000	OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28071	Contribution UNRWA	2.000.000	UNRWA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]

28101	Iraq joint response II	7.569.462	Cordaid a.o.	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28112	Contribution Humanitarian Response Fund Ethiopia	5.000.000	OCHA	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28182	Regional Refugee & Resilience plan – Turkey Plan 2015-2016, education	999.000	UNICEF	Multilateral organisation	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
28328	Ethiopia DRA joint response I	8.198.500	World Vision a.o.	NGO	Crisis response	[...]	[...]	[...]
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>514.691.249</b>		[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]
	Other < 1 mln	5.613.688		[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]
	Chronic crisis partners via stability	10.921.340		[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]
	<b>Total</b>	<b>531.126.277</b>		[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]	[...]

## Result Area 1

### Result Question 1a: To what extent has humanitarian assistance effectively been delivered?

#### Sub-goals

- 1.1 Appropriate types of Humanitarian Assistance timely delivered to beneficiaries by UN agencies and through UN-managed pooled funds
- 1.2 Appropriate types of Humanitarian Assistance timely delivered to beneficiaries by NGOs and the Red Cross movement
- 1.3 Humanitarian innovations increasingly used and scaled up in order to make humanitarian aid more effective and efficient

## Crisis response

2015 was a year of unprecedented humanitarian need. This need has increased dramatically as a result of long-term, usually conflict-related crises like those in Syria, Yemen, South Sudan, Iraq, the DRC, and the Central African Republic. Over 60 million people have fled their homes in search of life-saving support, protection and dignity. In addition to those who have fled, millions of people in need have stayed at home, unable or unwilling to flee. There are 6 million of them in Syria. Besides man-made crises, natural disasters also accounted for many people in need, although their numbers remained relatively stable compared to previous years. In 2015, an estimated 89.4 million people were affected by natural disasters (including the earthquake in Nepal, the cyclone in Vanuatu and rising food insecurity due to unprecedented drought and flooding caused by El Niño, mainly in Ethiopia and Southern Africa).

At the start of 2015, an estimated 77.9 million people were in need of humanitarian aid. 57.5 million of them were targeted for aid by the UN, which requested a total of USD 16.4 billion for this purpose ('Global Humanitarian Overview 2015', OCHA, 2014). Throughout the year, plans were adjusted to accommodate revised needs and developments such as new natural disasters and escalating conflict. For instance, the deepening crisis in Syria led to more refugees and internally displaced people, resulting in a plea for more assistance both in Syria and its neighbours Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan and in Europe, where more refugees arrived than anticipated.

Worldwide, USD 28 billion went to humanitarian aid. As different humanitarian agencies often reach the same people with different types of aid (e.g. with UNICEF providing education and WFP food aid to the same child), it is currently not possible to determine how many people in total have been reached with humanitarian aid. However, these figures are available for individual organisations or programmes. In 2015, UNHCR reached 50 million displaced people with aid, and WFP 77 million people. Furthermore, through its Humanitarian Response Plans the UN reached 4.4 million people affected by the Syrian crisis with non-food items and shelter support, 7.8 million people with emergency food and cash assistance in Yemen, and 3.1 million people with food and agricultural inputs in Sudan ('Global Humanitarian Overview 2016', OCHA, 2015, p.14). Unfortunately, beyond the number of beneficiaries reached, there is a lack of structural information on the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance. Although evaluations can offer insights into the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian programmes, the leading humanitarian organisations' annual reports and monitoring documents tend to focus on the number of people reached and contain little information on the effects this has on beneficiaries.

#### Sub-goals 1.1 & 1.2:

In 2015, as in other years, the bulk of the aid was delivered through UN agencies such as UNHCR, WFP and UNICEF, the Red Cross movement, and international NGOs. All of these organisations deliver aid either directly or indirectly to beneficiaries in the field. It is very difficult to say with certainty how much humanitarian aid was delivered and what quality it had. It is however possible to obtain a fair indication by referring to several indicators, both qualitative and quantitative: 1) the percentage of people reached by the Humanitarian Response Plans; 2) the amount and type of funding made available to aid organisations; and 3) organisations' timelines.

The percentage of people reached in the Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs): these HRP are in place for protracted or sudden-onset crises and articulate a shared vision of how to respond to the assessed and expressed needs of the affected population. Though information on percentage of beneficiaries reached based on the humanitarian

response plan is not easily available for all HRP, it is clear that the plans lack sufficient funding. In 2015, 100% of the HRPs were not fully funded. In most cases funding was lower than 60%. This required adjustments to the planned activities, coverage and number of beneficiaries. Consequently, the number of people reached and/or the amount of aid available decreased according to the availability of funding and options. For example, the Syria Strategic Response Plan (SRP) managed to reach 76.6% of targeted beneficiaries with 43.3% of the requested funds. The Yemen HRP reached 75.2% of targeted beneficiaries with 55% of the requested funds. Although most HRPs are able to reach more beneficiaries than one would expect based on their lack of funding, it is presumable that the quality of aid received is lower than planned.

The numbers of people that can be reached depend on many different contextual factors such as the accessibility of the population in need and the number and severity of crises in the world. The type and amount of funding available to aid organisations are also significant. Providing unearmarked funding to these organisations enables them to respond timely and adequately to emerging needs. In comparison to earmarked funding, pooled funds such as the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) are more flexible in getting more appropriate aid to those who need it most. The amount of unearmarked funding received by UN agencies fell from 24% in 2012 to 16% in 2014. In 2015, the percentage of unearmarked funding was well below 20% for most of the large humanitarian UN agencies, except for UNICEF.

Because speed is of the essence after a crisis, a second important indicator of the quality of assistance delivery is the timeliness with which aid is provided. There are two types of timeliness: timeliness of aid delivery (implementing organisations) and timeliness of financial resource distribution (funding organisations).

Implementation: Information from UN partners on timeliness of implementation is scarce; the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) was able to provide more information. In general, UN organizations and ICRC indicate that they are overall satisfied with the timeliness of their responses. Factors that contributed to timely implementation were: the availability of financial resources, logistical capacity, capacity to mobilise and deploy competent human resources, safe access and confidential dialogue with stakeholders. However, timely responses are sometimes hampered by security situations (e.g. Libya, Syria, Yemen, Ukraine and South Sudan), restrictions on staff movement and delayed or insufficient funding. Funding: In its 2015 Policy Review of Dutch Humanitarian Assistance, 2009-2014, the Dutch foreign ministry's Policy and Operations Evaluations Department (IOB) said it had been unable to find clear information about the speed with which humanitarian pooled funds transferred funding to implementing partners. This was due to a lack of clear definitions and poor databases. In 2015 this remains true. Upon request, most pooled funds are willing and able to share some information regarding their timeliness; however, their definitions differ greatly, hampering aggregation of this data. For example, the UN's Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) defines timeliness as 'the number of working days between the final submission of the proposal to CERF and the transfer of funds'. In 2015 this averaged eight working days. As their target is 12 working days, CERF seems on track. In contrast, the OCHA country-based pooled fund for South Sudan indicates that their fund allocation process (which precedes disbursement) took 40 calendar days, after which funds were distributed to UN agencies in 9 calendar days and NGOs in 17 calendar days. This illustrates how definitions vary between pooled funds.

#### **Sub-goal 1.3:**

Innovations in the humanitarian aid sector are key to enhance the efficiency and efficacy of aid delivery to people in need. By scaling up successful innovations, more people can effectively be assisted. According to the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP)'s 2016 report on innovation in humanitarian action, the humanitarian system only sporadically produces innovations, and struggles to take good ideas to scale. Due to this, the number of landmark innovations that have been integrated into the system has been frustratingly low and understanding of best practices for humanitarian innovation remains limited (More than Just Luck - Innovation in Humanitarian Action, ALNAP, 2016, p.6). However, as noted in ALNAP's report The State of the Humanitarian System (2015), the concept of innovation has taken root in the humanitarian system in recent years. UN humanitarian agencies have established new structures and processes in pursuit of innovative solutions and approaches. For example, UNICEF created innovation units in four of its offices, and 14 'innovation labs' around the world 'that bring together the private sector, academia, and the public sector to develop solutions for key social issues, and ensure we are always watching for new ideas from unexpected places.' Though it is expected that in the coming years tools will be developed to enhance humanitarian programming, progress may be slow. In the private sector, innovation is funded by investors who accept the risk of investment in anticipation of reward. In the humanitarian sector, by contrast, activities are funded by governments, which typically have a low tolerance for risk. This seriously impedes progress as, in the words of one private sector interviewee, 'innovation requires failure' (The State of the Humanitarian System, ALNAP, 2015, pp. 102-103).

\* Sum of sector totals.

\*\* As total beneficiary counts are not available for every Humanitarian Response Plan, the best available numbers are mentioned. CAR: sum of the highest quarter of the highest indicator of each sector. DRC: sum of people reached in quarter 1 and quarter 2. Ethiopia: highest number of people reached with food aid of the distribution rounds. Iraq: highest number of people reached in any sector (health cluster). Jordan: sum of highest indicator per sector. Lebanon: sum of sector totals. Syria: sum of sector totals.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Number of displaced people (refugees or IDPs) receiving protection or assistance (UNHCR)	Not set	Not set				±49.800.000 displaced people		UNHCR Annual Report
Number of children reached through humanitarian responses (UNICEF)	Not set	Not set				±61.100.000 people, of which ±35.900.000 children*		UNICEF Annual Results Report
Number of people reached with food assistance (WFP)	Not set	Not set				±76.700.000 people		WFP Annual Performance Report
Number of refugees reached with humanitarian assistance (UNRWA)	Not set	Not set				±1.200.000 refugees		UNRWA Annual Operational Report
Number of people reached with humanitarian assistance through UN Humanitarian Response Plans	Not set	Not set				CAR: ±4.800.000 people** DRC: ±4.200.000 people** Ethiopia: ±8.100.000 people** Iraq: ±4.030.000** Jordan: ±2.600.000** Lebanon: ±4.800.000** South Sudan: ±4.500.000 Sudan: ±4.600.000 Syria: ±32.000.000** Yemen: ±8.800.000		Financial reports WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF;
Percentage of funding received by UN agencies that is unearmarked	Not set	NA				WFP: 10% UNHCR: 15% UNICEF: 23% CERF: 100% (USD 402.184.995)		"The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need", 2016, Annex I Ear-marking modalities
Number of people reached (ICRC)	Not set	Not set				Food aid: ±13.100.000 Household items: ±5.600.000 Detainees visited: ±929.000		ICRC Annual Report
Number of humanitarian innovations (e.g. projects, initiatives) registered in the Global Innovation Exchange database	Not set	Not set				98		Global Innovation Exchange website

## Result Question 1b: To what extent have your programmes contributed to these results?

### Sub-goals

- 1.1 UN agencies are enabled to meet critical needs in a timely way during humanitarian emergencies
- 1.2 ICRC, Netherlands Red Cross, and NGOs are enabled to meet critical needs in a timely way during humanitarian emergencies
- 1.3 Partners are able to scale up tested innovations for delivering humanitarian aid and are engaged for collaboration

The Netherlands contributed EUR 535 million to humanitarian aid in 2015. According to Oxfam's Fair Share method, based on the size of its economy the Netherlands would have been expected to have contributed a minimum of 1.8% of the global appeal (Oxfam International). The Netherlands was the ninth largest donor of international humanitarian assistance in 2015, contributing more than 2.0% of total aid and thus surpassing its Fair Share percentage.

### Sub-goal 1.1 & 1.2:

Over 41% of Dutch funding was unearmarked, being transferred directly to the main humanitarian partners and funds: UNHCR, WFP, UNRWA, UNICEF, OCHA, ICRC, CERF, the Dutch Red Cross and MSF Netherlands. Around 56% was earmarked for a specific region/country or country-based pooled fund. The Netherlands was the second largest contributor to CERF and country-based pooled funds and the third largest donor of unearmarked funds to WFP and UNHCR. By providing unearmarked funding, the Netherlands helped deliver more effective and timely aid. IOB's Policy Review of Dutch Humanitarian Assistance, 2009-2014 (2015), concluded that 'Dutch humanitarian assistance is greatly appreciated by the UN aid agencies, given its predictability and continuity and the extent to which it is non-earmarked. Non-earmarked aid is of particular significance, since unlike earmarked aid, it enables the agencies in question to plan aid operations at an early stage and to respond flexibly to unexpected events and changes.'

Some concrete examples of the added value of unearmarked funding for UN agencies and ICRC in 2015 were:

- UNHCR: unearmarked funding was used to pre-finance emergency assistance in Yemen when the crisis broke out. Once earmarked funding started arriving in response to the crisis, UNHCR was able to reassign it to pre-finance assistance for the next emergency: Burundi.
- WFP: unearmarked funding has been used to e.g. buy food when market prices are favourable and diminish the effects of large fluctuations in donor contributions (especially important for logistical and operational costs).
- ICRC: unearmarked funding enables the ICRC to maintain a long-term presence in high-risk countries. The organisation was therefore able to retain a presence in Yemen and could act swiftly when the crisis broke out in 2015.

The Netherlands aims to keep the percentage of unearmarked funds at the same level or higher in the coming years.

Since a large portion of the Dutch humanitarian contributions is unearmarked and receiving organisations only produce annual reports based on their total budget, expenditures and results, exact figures for the number of people reached with Dutch support are unavailable. Based on the Netherlands' support for Humanitarian Response Plans and UN organisations and the total number of people reached through these plans and organisations, an estimated number of people reached with Dutch contributions in certain crises or sectors can be calculated (% Dutch contribution x # people reached).<sup>3</sup> For example, based on this calculation, the Netherlands reached ±2,250,000 people through the Syria Response Plan (7.0% of ±32,000,000 people) and ±194,000 people through the Yemen Response Plan (2.2% of ±8,800,000).

In addition to unearmarked or softly earmarked funding<sup>4</sup>, the Netherlands aims to provide timely funding to implementing agencies so they can deliver timely aid based on actual needs, seasonal conditions and other criteria. In 2015 the Netherlands revised internal procedures to decrease the gap between pledge and actual payment. Indicators and targets will be set to make it easier to track internal timeliness, gain insight into delaying factors and assess timeliness.

### Sub-goal 1.3:

In 2015 the Netherlands set its innovation policy for 2016 and further, discussing with its partners needs and gaps and ways of using innovation to make humanitarian aid more effective and efficient. The Netherlands also got involved with two innovative projects (WFP's Food Security Monitoring project (mVAM) and a UN Global Pulse project), reviewed several proposals for innovative projects, and signed a contract with the Humanitarian Innovation Fund and Open House. Moreover, the Dutch Coalition for Humanitarian Innovation (DCHI) was set up in 2015. To make humanitarian aid more effective and efficient, the humanitarian sector strives to work together more with knowledge institutes and the private sector. To this end, the DCHI strives for break-through innovations to overcome the challenges faced by the humanitarian sector. The Netherlands has actively contributed to the establishment of this coalition and in doing so worked with representatives of the humanitarian sector, knowledge institutes, and private companies.

\*\*\* As most of the Dutch humanitarian aid contributions are unearmarked to UN organisations or pooled funds, and thus do not require donor-specific reporting and tracking, the Netherlands does not know exactly how many people it has reached through these contributions. However, to give some indication of the Dutch contribution to humanitarian aid, the following calculation is used for UN organisations: % Dutch contribution to total funding x total number of people reached with total funding. Furthermore, for the number of people reached through Humanitarian Response Plans, all contributions towards that plan are added up to make the same calculation, be it through direct HRP contributions to UN agencies, through contributions to country-based pooled funds, or through funds allocated by CERF (Dutch share of CERF funding to HRP).

\*\*\*\* Grand Bargain classifies the following contribution types as unearmarked: (A) Fully flexible core funding; (B) Fully flexible core contribution to the CERF; or (C) core contribution to an organisation. All other contributions are classified as earmarked, with distinctions between softly earmarked, earmarked, and tightly earmarked.

\*\*\*\*\* Please note that in these calculations, the numbers provided in section 1A are used. Thus, the same caveats apply (see footnote 2).

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Number of displaced people (refugees or IDPs) receiving protection or assistance (UNHCR) due to Dutch core contributions	Not set	Not set				Dutch core contribution is 1,1%, thus: ±548.000 displaced people***		UNHCR Annual Report; UNHCR Letter to MinBuZa
Number of children reached through humanitarian responses (UNICEF) * due to Dutch core contributions	Not set	Not set				Dutch core contribution is 1,0%, thus: ±359.000 children***		UNICEF Annual Results Report
Number of people reached with food assistance (WFP) due to Dutch core contributions	Not set	Not set				Dutch core contribution is 0,8%, thus: ±613.600 people***		WFP Annual Performance Report; WFP Audited Annual Accounts website
Number of refugees reached with humanitarian assistance (UNRWA) due to Dutch core contributions	Not set	Not set				Dutch core contribution is 1,2%, thus: ±14.400 refugees***		UNRWA Annual Operational Report; UNRWA Unaudited Financial Statements
Number of refugees reached with humanitarian assistance (UNRWA) due to Dutch core contributions *****	Not set	Not set				CAR: Dutch contribution is 1,0%, thus: ±47.000 people*** DRC: Dutch contribution is 1,0%, thus: ±42.000 people*** Ethiopia: Dutch contribution is 8,9%, thus: ±725.000 people*** Iraq: Dutch contribution is 3,2%, thus: ±131.000 people*** Jordan: Dutch contribution is 3,2%, thus: ±83.000 people*** Lebanon: Dutch contribution is 3,3%, thus: ±160.000 people*** South Sudan: Dutch contribution is 0,7%, thus: ±31.000 people*** Sudan: Dutch contribution is 0,9%, thus: ±44.000 people*** Syria: Dutch contribution is 7,0%, thus ±2.250.000 people*** Yemen: Dutch contribution is 2,2%, thus ±194.000 people***		Annual Reports; Contact with OCHA country offices
Percent of Dutch funding to UN agencies that is unearmarked (according to Grand Bargain classification system****)	Not set	Not set				Unearmarked: 37% Softly earmarked: 35% Earmarked: 24% Tightly earmarked: 7%		DSH-HH Records; "The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need", 2016, Annex I Earmarking modalities
Percent of total unearmarked funding to UN agencies that is funded by The Netherlands (level A-C in Grand Bargain classification system) received by UN agencies	Not set	Not set				WFP: 11,8% (rank 3) UNHCR: 11,4% (rank 3) UNICEF: 1,8% (rank 16) CBPFs: 18,4% (rank 2) CERF: 14,7% (rank 2)		UN Annual Reports; DSH-HH Records; "The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need", 2016, Annex I Earmarking modalities
Number of people reached (ICRC) due to Dutch core contributions	Not set	Not set				Food aid: Dutch core contribution is 2,8%, thus: ±367.000 people Household items: Dutch core contribution is 2,8%, thus: ±157.000 people Detainees visited: Dutch core contribution is 2,8%, thus: ±26.000 detainees		ICRC Annual Report
Number of people reached due to Dutch funding via the Dutch Relief Alliance (NGOs)	Not set	4.000.000				±4.300.000		DRA Reports
Percent of funding to ICRC that is unearmarked	Not set	Not set				Unearmarked: 80% Earmarked: 20%		DSH-HH Records; "The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need", 2016, Annex I Earmarking modalities
Number of innovative projects funded by Dutch contributions (UN agencies and NGOs)	Not set	Not set				1		DSH-HH Records
Number and type of projects that have come out of coalitions (Global Alliance for Humanitarian Innovation and Dutch Coalition for Humanitarian Innovation)	Not set	Not set				0		DSH-HH Records
Amount of funding tightly earmarked for (upscaling) innovation	Not set	Not set				EUR 3.450.000		DSH-HH Records
Number and types of organisations represented in coalitions of partners for innovation	Not set	Not set				6: Red Cross, NGO's, (local) government, VNO-NCW		Dutch Coalition for Humanitarian Innovation website

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 1	Crisis response
Assess achieved results compared to planning:	A. Results achieved better than planned
Reasons for result achieved:	<p>Prior to 2015, there was no formal framework for results. This complicates the assessment as there are no targets with which to compare the results. Nonetheless, based on plans outlined in the letter of 23 February (DSH-2015.53943), the total amount spent on humanitarian aid was significantly higher (EUR 535 million) than originally planned (EUR 376 million). This means that more people have been reached and the overall goal to save more lives, restore dignity and enhance resilience has been achieved. The main reason for this budget increase is the additional EUR 110 million pledged to the Syria region, in response to emerging needs and the call for better support for refugees in the region (e.g. Lebanon and Jordan). General needs also increased. This was covered by additions to the relief fund.</p> <p>Providing most of the funding unearmarked, or only earmarked to a specific fund or region, enabled the implementing organisations to respond quickly and flexibly to emerging needs.</p> <p>Timeliness of payments has been below target. The main reasons are (1) strict internal procedures that are not yet fully compatible with emergency funding targets and (2) limited human resources compared to the size of the humanitarian aid budget.</p> <p>In 2015 the Netherlands laid the foundation for its humanitarian innovation policy. This involved signing contracts for several innovative projects, setting up innovative coalitions and participating in seminars and conferences with knowledge institutions and private companies. So far this approach has proved to be successful, and in 2016 it should yield tangible results on the ground.</p>
Implications for planning:	<p>The overall goals for 2016 are unchanged; saving lives, restoring dignity and enhancing resilience, as the budget allows. Global needs will most likely continue to increase, meaning more requests for funding and support. The Netherlands will therefore continue to support aid innovation to support those in need today and to prepare for supporting those in need in the future, through more effective and efficient aid delivery based on tested and scaled up innovative initiatives.</p> <p>In 2015, the Grand Bargain was launched, resulting in 2016 in a clearer definition of earmarking. According to this new definition, the Netherlands contributed 41% of its budget unearmarked. The level of unearmarked Dutch funding should increase from 2018.</p> <p>To improve timeliness of payments, internal procedures will be reconsidered and where possible adjusted to allow more flexible and timely funding. Improvements are expected from 2018.</p>



**Result Area 2** **Crisis preparedness and linking relief to development**

**Result Question 2a: To what extent has the link between humanitarian and development assistance improved and were countries better prepared to cope with crisis?**

- Sub-goals**
- 2.1 Improved capacity of national government and national NGO emergency response agencies (e.g. organizational, response and prevention)
  - 2.2 Strengthened UN, Red Cross and INGO willingness and commitment to work with national (humanitarian aid) organizations and structures
  - 2.3 Increased development agency awareness and interest in working on linkages between Humanitarian and Development Aid

Crisis preparedness and the link (nexus) between humanitarian and development assistance are key for more sustainable support in crises, in particular in the case of protracted crises. Humanitarian crises like those in South Sudan, Somalia and Yemen require a different set of aid instruments than emerging needs triggered by natural disasters. Combining the strengths of multiple aid actors involved in protracted crises, including local actors, renders aid more effective and more durable. The Netherlands therefore aims to improve the nexus between humanitarian and development assistance, and to improve the resilience of the people affected. In the event of natural disasters, enhancing the preparedness of local actors is key to enable them to respond adequately. Since crisis preparedness and the link between relief and development are very hard to measure quantitatively, qualitative indicators are used. This is especially true for improvements in national governments' capacity for Response Preparedness. Many countries are working to improve their disaster preparedness, for example in earthquake prone areas. This section will therefore not report on results at global level. For the results of projects and programmes funded by the Netherlands in this area, see section B (sub-goal 2.1).

**Sub-goal 2.2:**  
 The main UN humanitarian agencies are committed to working with national implementing partners. Since no benchmarks have been set, it is impossible to analyse whether this is producing improvements, deterioration or neither. The aim of the UN's country-based pooled funds (CBPFs) is to work directly with local implementing organisations. In 2015 this applied to 16% of pooled funding. This figure does not take into account the fact that local organisations can receive funding from CBPFs indirectly through UN agencies or international NGOs. In the light of the Grand Bargain, in which aid organisations and most donors committed to a target of 25% of humanitarian funding for local and national responders by 2020. Qualitative indicators:  
 Cases of successful integration of humanitarian and development assistance:  
 • In 2015, the World Bank launched a strategy for the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) aimed at peace and stability, with special attention for the refugee problem. The MENA Strategy is based on four pillars, including resilience and reconstruction. It enhanced actors' ability to create innovative financial instruments for releasing additional resources in the region, for example through interest rate buy-downs. In 2015 the instrument was set up and results will be visible from 2016. These financial instruments are expected to help strengthen local capacity as well as longer-term investments, which are critical for the countries concerned.  
 • UNDP was involved in drafting and monitoring the 3RP (Regional Refugee & Resilience Plan) in response to the Syria crisis. This was the first large integral local response plan that addresses the resilience component. It is an important step towards a more integrated response. National governments and NGOs involved in transition:  
 • VNG International, the International Agency of the Association of Netherlands Municipalities, aims to work in an innovative way to provide more sustainable humanitarian aid. By strengthening self-reliance of refugees living in camps and host communities, improving the capacity of local and national authorities, and improving the living conditions of the local population. In 2015, VNG advised e.g. local governments in Jordan and Lebanon on waste management and urban planning.  
 • In 2015, local governments took up their responsibility in drafting response plans together with aid organisations, such as the 3RP for the countries neighbouring Syria.  
 • NGOs were closely and actively involved in the preparations for the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016, for example through active participation in the preparatory meetings and consultations.

**Sub-goal 2.3:**  
 Number of Humanitarian Response Plans (in protracted crises) including a resilience and/or transition component:  
 About 14 response plans include transition/resilience. Since there was no baseline, it is difficult to say whether this is an increase. The UN seems serious about making response plans more comprehensive and about strengthening the resilience component. The best example is the 3RP for the Syria region. In drawing up this plan, Syria's neighbours also each drafted a national response plan to supply the resilience component of the overall plan. Although the quality of the resilience component could be improved, it is a tangible step towards more comprehensive plans.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Number of national partners of UN humanitarian organizations	Not set	Not set				WFP: 841 UNHCR: 580		Annual Reports; Information requested
Percent of humanitarian aid channelled directly to local and national NGOs	Not set	Not set				Local and national NGOs combined received 2.3% of all direct funding to NGOs in 2015, compared with 0.9% the previous year; and their share of the total assistance reported to UN OCHA FTS increased from 0.2% in 2014 to 0.5% in 2015		Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2016
Percentage of Humanitarian Response Plans (in protracted crises) with a resilience and/or transition component included in the design	Not set	Not set				58% (14 of 28)		Humanitarian Response Plans; Financial Tracking Service 2015 website

**Result Question 2b: To what extent have your programmes contributed to these results?**

**Sub-goals**

- 2.1 Dutch funding used for enhancing capacities of local aid organizations
- 2.2 DSH-HH and partners lobby on multiple fronts for increased use of local structures
- 2.3 Partners engaged to discuss integration of Humanitarian Aid and development aid

The extent to which the Netherlands contributed to the results mentioned above is different in each case and is detailed below.

Cases of successful integration of humanitarian and development assistance, thanks to NL:

- The Netherlands is one of the states seeking tailor-made solutions to help increase the resilience of countries dealing with large refugee flows. In 2015, the Netherlands foresaw a role for the World Bank Group in financial support for the countries involved in refugee issues, in close cooperation with the UN and regional development banks, without compromising support for poorer countries. The Netherlands supported the World Bank's efforts to develop innovative financial instruments for releasing additional resources in the region, for example through interest rate buy-downs. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) loans are then converted to concessional loans, reducing the interest expense through gifts from donors. Concessional loans, for which only the least developed countries normally qualify, will also be available to countries like Jordan and Lebanon that have to deal with massive numbers of refugees.
  - The 3RP for the Syria region includes national response plans, drafted by the countries themselves, to supply the resilience component of the overall plan. The Netherlands' aim for 2015 was to provide humanitarian aid and increase the refugees' resilience. To this end the Netherlands supported the response plans with a contribution of in total EUR 108.5 million.
- National governments and national NGOs involved in transition, thanks to NL:
- DRA: In 2015 the Dutch Relief Alliance was formally launched. The DRA is a consortium of Dutch NGOs functioning as an NGO response mechanism, enabling them to respond quickly and efficiently during a crisis and enhance response quality and effectiveness by working together. In 2015, the DRA acted together in both acute crises (Nepal and Vanuatu) and protracted crises (e.g. Syria and South Sudan). The Dutch NGOs worked together with local partner organisations and were part of international networks.
  - VNG: The Netherlands contributes to VNG International's Local Government Resilience Programme for the Middle East and North Africa. The programme aims to relieve the pressure placed on public services in Jordan, Lebanon and other countries in the region by the Syrian refugee crisis, encouraging self-reliance and resilience among Syrian refugees in Jordan and Lebanon, helping national and local governments in Jordan and Lebanon to absorb the refugees, and improving the living conditions of the local population.

**Sub-goal 2.1:**

Amount of money earmarked to build the capacity of local aid organisations:

In 2015 the ministry's Stabilisation and Humanitarian Aid Department (DSH) funded two projects on preparedness: the Netherlands Red Cross Response Preparedness-I program (RP-I) and MapAction. RP-I builds the capacity of local Red Cross/Crescent associations. Local staff will often be the first on site when a disaster occurs, providing immediate assistance in the first critical phase. By building local capacity the Dutch Red Cross seeks to close the gap between current community-based resilience programmes and broader Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) programmes.

MapAction is an organisation that maps the scale and effects of natural disasters in their immediate aftermath. This significantly increases the efficiency of aid, providing invaluable insight into affected areas and people.

**Sub-goal 2.2:**

Lobbying:

- The Netherlands is committed to reducing the funding shortage for emergency relief. A lasting solution is unfeasible, however, without a fundamental change in the emergency funding system as a whole. In 2015 the Netherlands supported the work of the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing appointed by the UN Secretary-General. Under the leadership of European Commission Vice President Kristalina Georgieva, the panel made three recommendations: reduce needs, increase funding (by attracting new donors in particular), and adopt the Grand Bargain. The Netherlands played an active role in the Grand Bargain, emphasizing greater support and funding for local and national responders.
- The Netherlands has regularly argued in international forums and bilateral meetings that local capacity needs to be built. During the Ebola crisis, for example, the Netherlands repeatedly called for strengthening the affected countries' health systems.
- Where appropriate, the Netherlands has stressed the importance of quickly generating additional resources for the reception of refugees in the Syria region in its dealings with all stakeholders (donors, development banks and the UN).

**Sub-goal 2.3:**

Discussions with partners:

- In 2015 the Netherlands actively participated in the preparations for the World Humanitarian Summit. In February 2015 the Dutch Humanitarian Summit took place, an event organised by a large number of Dutch humanitarian NGOs to prepare input for the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016.
- The Netherlands has actively participated in board meetings of various UN agencies and UN coordination meetings, which regularly discuss the need to improve the link between humanitarian and development actors.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Amount of money earmarked towards enhancing capacities of local aid organizations	Not set	Not set				EUR 1.178.920		DSH-HH records
Percent of emergency responses of the Dutch Relief Alliance implemented by local partners	Not set	Not set				5-50%		DRA Reports

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 2	Crisis preparedness and linking relief to development
Assess achieved results compared to planning:	A. Results achieved better than planned
Reasons for result achieved:	<p>No targets had been set for 2015. The overall conclusion on crisis preparedness and linking relief to development is that the focus has sharpened on improving the nexus among humanitarian and development actors, concentrating more on resilience.</p> <p>The international community's focus on the resilience among refugees and host communities has sharpened because of the many Syrian and Afghan refugees risking a dangerous journey by sea to Europe rather than remaining in their current situation. It became apparent that the international community needed to step up its efforts not just to provide humanitarian aid, but also to work on enhancing the resilience of both the refugees and their host communities and on providing them with prospects. The Netherlands donated EUR 108.5 million to the national response plans under the 3RP for the Syria region and over EUR 1 million to disaster risk reduction, and supported local capacity through projects with different partners. As well as financial support, the Netherlands also lobbied for more focus on resilience and a better link between humanitarian and development aid.</p>
Implications for planning:	<p>Resilience has increasingly become an integral part of humanitarian aid organisations' agenda. It is now almost a requirement in humanitarian response plans. The same applies to humanitarian NGOs. The next step is to ensure the quality of the resilience component. The Netherlands will be discussing this with its partners. To ensure sufficient funding for these resilience components, development organisations need to allocate more financial resources. The Netherlands will continue to engage with all actors to lobby for additional long-term resources.</p>

## Result Area 3

### Result Question 3a: To what extent has coordination, accountability and leadership increased in the global humanitarian response system?

#### Sub-goals

- 3.1 UN leadership and coordination role strengthened and increasingly valued by UN agencies, donors, NGOs
- 3.2 Increased number of instances of joint needs assessment, planning, and implementation among and between Dutch NGOs, national NGOs, private sector, national governments and UN agencies
- 3.3 Increased ability of UN agencies, NGOs, Red Cross to increase transparency and clearly demonstrate output and outcome results of their humanitarian aid interventions to donors and beneficiaries

## Coordination and effectiveness

As resources for humanitarian aid are scarce and humanitarian response plans are frequently underfunded, it is of vital importance to use the available resources as efficiently as possible. Effective use of resources can be stimulated by improving coordination, leadership and accountability.

#### Coordination and leadership

Coordinating humanitarian aid is key to effective aid delivery. Coordination and leadership enable a coherent response to emergencies, and can simplify data and information management and reporting and raise their quality. Furthermore, increased contact with local structures will improve preparation for emergencies and help save lives when disaster strikes.

It is difficult to measure how much leadership and coordination is valued and/or improved. The tri-annual State of the Humanitarian System Report draws conclusions in the fields of coordination, joint assessments and planning based on its own comparative findings. Similar conclusions are also drawn in the IOB evaluations:

- Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNOs) have been published by UN agencies and NGOs, under the leadership of OCHA, for the majority of countries (60%) in the UN appeal system. A joint Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) was published for all countries where an appeal was launched. The number of NGO partners differs from country to country. OCHA has developed dashboards for 80% of appeal countries, where progress in funding appeals and in implementation is regularly updated. However, the quality of information and frequency of updating differ from country to country. For example, in 2015 the Central African Republic humanitarian response published four dashboards, while the Yemen response only published one.
- HNOs and HRPs both contribute to coordination and avoidance of overlap in the implementation of programmes. Generally speaking, coordinated implementation is the responsibility of partners within the HRP. Each partner is responsible for its own budget and programme implementation. An HRP is not a joint programme document under joint programme management.
- Humanitarian Coordinators (HC)/Resident Coordinators were in place in 32 countries (covering 21 of the 28 appeal countries) and 3 Regional Humanitarian Coordinators in 3 chronic crisis regions (Sahel, Syria, Yemen), covering 10 countries in regional appeals. There are also HCs in a number of disaster-prone countries that were not included in the 2015 appeals. HCs only had to be brought in to flash appeal countries like Vanuatu, Honduras and Guatemala. It is highly likely that their presence of HCs helped with coordination. The overall contribution that a Humanitarian Coordinator makes to the improved coordination of the humanitarian response varies. For example, there may be inconsistencies in the quality of HRPs, including the level of detail incorporated in the plan's objectives and the link between these objectives and subsequent plans.
- Less progress has been made on systemic joint monitoring and reporting on HRPs and on joint evaluation of responses to the most severe, large-scale humanitarian crises – those classified as Level 3 crises by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). Only one joint Periodic Monitoring Report (for the occupied Palestinian Territories) was published. Only one Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation (for South Sudan) was published for a Level 3 emergency, of which there were five in 2015.

#### Accountability

Upward accountability (to donors and public): all implementing organisations publish annual reports. Most organisations report results at the level of outputs and in terms of reach. However, only some organisation reports on differences between plans and results (reach versus intended reach; outputs versus planned outputs). In fact few annual reports discuss outcomes. Internal reports do however contain more detailed information.

Downward accountability (to beneficiaries): all organisations organizations have committed themselves to the principles of accountability to beneficiaries. However, the public annual reports contain very little information on how this is put into practice.

#### Qualitative indicators:

Proportion of humanitarian agency budgets and human resources committed to monitoring and evaluating humanitarian assistance portfolios: it is difficult to gain a clear picture of the resources committed to monitoring and evaluation (M&E). For example, UN implementing agencies rarely make details of their M&E budgets available. UN country-based pooled funds occasionally provide information on their own M&E budgets, but are unaware of much is spent on M&E by the implementing organisations that they fund. Furthermore, the organisations that could provide the statistics often have different definitions and ways of calculating these figures, seriously hampering aggregation and comparison. This information is however more readily available for projects directly funded by the Netherlands, due to stricter reporting requirements. For each joint response, the Dutch Relief Alliance spends approximately 1-3% of its total project budget on monitoring and evaluation.

Agencies that compare planned outputs and outcomes with the results achieved: Many UN organisations' annual reports only publish information on activities/outputs and reach and give examples of aid, and do not offer a comparison with the intended reach of results. Programme reports do however provide more details. For example, the UNRWA 2015 Health Department report gives more detailed information on outcomes and impact (e.g on mortality rates, malnutrition).

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Number of joint Humanitarian Needs Overviews	Not set	Not set				58%		Humanitarian Response website
Number of joint Humanitarian Response Plans	Not set	Not set				100%		Humanitarian Response website
Number of countries/regions with a functioning humanitarian dashboard	Not set	Not set				Countries: 68% Regions: 33%		Humanitarian Response website
Number of joint Periodic Monitoring Reports (PMR)	Not set	Not set				1		Humanitarian Response website
Number of joint Evaluations	Not set	Not set				1		Humanitarian Response website
Number of emergencies with an OCHA coordination structure or HC in place	Not set	Not set				Regular: 28 of 28		UN OCHA website

**Result Question 2b: To what extent have your programmes contributed to these results?**

**Sub-goals**

- 3.1 OCHA provided with political, operational and financial support by the Netherlands and allies to take on its intended role
- 3.2 Dutch monies allocated to joint and common approaches to humanitarian aid planning and implementation
- 3.3 Lobby and advocacy work conducted to increase the level of UN, ICRC, INGO, NRK, AZG, Dutch Relief Alliance agency accountability and transparency

The Netherlands highly values efforts to coordinate humanitarian responses, based on actual needs and sound analysis, in the interest of more efficient and effective aid delivery. It aims to further improve coordination by pursuing the following three-pronged strategy: 1) funding OCHA to enable it to act as coordinator; 2) supporting pooled funds managed by OCHA and stressing to UN agencies the importance of coordination and leadership; and 3) promoting the One UN approach.

- 3.1 OCHA funding and support: In 2015, the Netherlands gave unearmarked funding to OCHA (EUR 5 million), contributing to the expansion of the Humanitarian Coordinators (HC) network in all countries with a humanitarian appeal in place in 2015. The HC plays a key role in leading and coordinating humanitarian response, and enables OCHA to lead and coordinate the development of joint Humanitarian Needs Overviews and joint Humanitarian Response Plans. The Netherlands also provided operational assistance. In 2015, Dutch UN Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) experts participated in missions to support HCs with disaster response and needs assessment. A new UNDAC member was trained last year, bringing the total of Dutch UNDAC experts to seven.
- 3.2 Funding pooled funds: In 2015 the Netherlands continued to be a major donor to pooled funds (the second largest donor, at EUR 155 million). The IOB Policy Review of Dutch Humanitarian Assistance, 2009-2014 (2015), confirmed the hypothesis that management by pooled funds, if substantial, results in better and more effective coordination and planning.
- 3.2 Dutch Relief Alliance: In all projects funded by the Netherlands through the Dutch Relief Alliance, NGOs are required to work together wherever possible. They are also expected to coordinate their response with the OCHA country office, if possible aligning their projects with the Humanitarian Response Plan.
- 3.3 Advocacy: The Netherlands continues to raise the issue of coordination with UN agencies in numerous meetings at ministerial, management and staff level. The Netherlands' track record on coordination advocacy is confirmed by the IOB evaluation, as is the fact that coordination within the humanitarian system, especially of response to natural disasters, has improved.

Qualitative indicators:

- Advocacy and lobbying efforts and follow-up activities: The leadership of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs at several levels (ministers, the Director-General for International Cooperation, other directors and senior mission staff) have stressed the importance of coordination and leadership in discussions with all relevant UN agencies. The Netherlands has also raised this issue in at least two OCHA donor support group meetings in 2015 and, together with other donors, in UN agency board meetings.

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2017	Result 2012	Result 2013	Result 2014	Result 2015	Result 2016	Source
Amount of financing provided to OCHA						Core: EUR 5 million CBPFs: EUR 155 million		DSH-HH records
Percentage of Dutch NGO joint responses funded by the Netherlands that make use of joint implementation / joint programming						9%		DRA Reports
Amount of money allocated to common/collective approaches to Humanitarian Aid						DRA proposals: 11 DRA financing: EUR 60.103.434  START proposals: 1 START financing: EUR 999.999  Other proposals: 1 Other financing: EUR 2.375.000		DSH-HH records

Assessment of results achieved by NL across the entire Result Area 3	Coordination and effectiveness
Assess achieved results compared to planning:	B. Results achieved as planned
Reasons for result achieved:	<p>Humanitarian Coordinators led the process of Joint Needs Assessments and joint response planning in all countries and regions where UN appeals were launched. Joint Humanitarian Response plans were developed. Less progress has been made in joint monitoring of and reporting on these plans, with only one joint Periodic Monitoring Plan published. The same applies to joint evaluations: of the five Level 3 crises for which an Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation should have taken place, only one was actually published. All partners publish reports and results. These are generally presented as executed activities and as outputs. Few partners' public reports refer to what was planned and the intended outcomes.</p> <p>The Netherlands has actively contributed to better leadership and coordination by funding OCHA's leadership role in response coordination and management of pooled funds, and last but not least by continuously advocating for improvements in coordination and leadership and systemic results reporting.</p>
Implications for planning:	<p>The Netherlands will continue to support OCHA's role as coordinator in the humanitarian system and will put greater emphasis on improvements in reporting on results. The Netherlands has taken a leading role on transparency in the lead up to the World Humanitarian Summit. The Netherlands will continue to advocate for more progress in joint Periodic Monitoring of the Humanitarian response Plans.</p>