Annex 5: Current context review

Secondary data for this Feasibility Study was gathered through a systematic desk-based review of the current context. This annex summarises some of the findings of this review, looking first at recent developments in the donor accountability environment, and then at existing monitoring mechanisms.

Recent developments in the donor accountability environment

The five years since the discontinuation of the HRI have borne witness to a number of developments, ranging from changes in the humanitarian operational context to substantial policy adjustments.

The gap between total humanitarian needs and available funding[1]

The types and contexts in which the most pressing humanitarian needs are found have changed in the past decade and increasingly so in the past five years. Protracted and recurring crises have now become the norm. Displacement has continued to rise reaching an all-time high of 59.5 million of people forcibly displaced at the end of 2014 (UNHCR, 2015), more than a 28% increase from 2011. Whereas until 2012, displaced populations were largely within sub-Saharan Africa, in mid-2014, 95% of those displaced were in Low and Middle-Income Countries. Since early 2011, the war in Syria has been the "single largest driver of displacement" (UNHCR, 2015), impacting neighbouring Middle Eastern countries and beyond. At the same time, after a relative decrease of people affected by natural hazards in 2010 and 2011, numbers have since been rising. Far East Asia has been the most affected with flooding, drought and storms in China and the Philippines.

Given these trends, the overall number of people targeted by international assistance has almost doubled in the last decade, leading to a 430% increase in total global funding requirements between 2004 and 2013 (UN OCHA, 2014, p. 11). While international humanitarian assistance consistently increased from 2013 to a record US$ 28 billion in 2015 (Development Initiatives, 2016, p. 36), such amounts were neither enough nor equally allocated. The funding gap for humanitarian action was estimated at US$ 15 billion as of the end of 2015 (High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, 2015, p. 2). Similarly, both geographical and sector-based discrepancies in funding allocations have been noted. On the one hand, in fact, crises such as the ones in the Central African Republic, Burundi and South Sudan were severely under-funded as opposed to those in Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan. On the other hand, sectors such as emergency agriculture, protection, and safety and security of humanitarian staff and operations continued to receive consistently less funding than the others (High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, 2015, p. 39).

The number and type of donors[2]

The increase in the overall humanitarian funding envelope is also the reflection, among others, of the broadening of the group of government donors that provide funding to humanitarian responses. In the past five years, the role of governments outside of the OECD/DAC has continued to increase substantially, with their share more than doubling between 2011 and 2013 – from 6% to 14% (Development Initiatives, 2014, p. 25). This group is quite diverse comprising countries who were

---

[1] Most of the information presented in this section refers largely to UN-coordinated funding appeals. While these do not represent by far the entirety of the humanitarian system, they represent the current main collective measure of humanitarian needs and estimated response costs.

[2] While the focus in this section is on donor governments, the increasing importance of private funding in the last few years is not to be underestimated.

previously or are currently aid recipients (as in the case of Nigeria); countries that respond to disasters domestically, such as India and Turkey, and those who have been long-time donors (as in the case of UAE). Especially in response to the crisis in Syria, Gulf countries have raised their level of financial contributions to humanitarian responses. Contributions from the Gulf states have historically accounted for a significant proportion of all humanitarian assistance from non-DAC donors. Contributions from Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the UAE accounted for 35% of the total contributions from non-DAC donors for the period 2009 and 2013 (Development Initiatives, 2014, p. 35). While non-DAC donors' aid has become increasingly visible with many donor countries reporting their aid to the OECD DAC and OCHA's FTS, only a few have moved towards a more multilateral approach. In 2010, for example, Brazil became the thirty-sixth member of the GHD group, committing to the '23 Principles and Good Practice'.[3] As of mid-2016, 13 non-OECD/DAC member states[4] had joined in total.

The Grand Bargain

Faced with increasing resource constraints and a widening gap between needs assessed and resources available, the humanitarian community has sought to identify new ways of working in the past five years. Hailed as one of the main achievements of the World Humanitarian Summit held in May 2016 in Istanbul, a new 'Grand Bargain' was brokered as an agreement between some 15 major donor governments and most of the world's largest international humanitarian agencies and networks. The agreement is meant to take forward the recommendations from the UN Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing, which includes for donors to give more and better funding against new approaches to aid delivery, through greater transparency in the use of funds, more cash-based support, more impartial and independent assessments of needs, more resources and decision-making by national and local organisations, concrete progress in putting people affected by crisis at the centre of the response, and better linking up humanitarian and development efforts.

Accountability policies

Since the suspension of the HRI, the issue of accountability within the humanitarian sector has continued to bear witness to significant calls for reform. While efforts such as the Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP) had allowed for the establishment of programme quality standards across specific humanitarian activities, it was increasingly recognised that they did not adequately address essential issues, such as accountability to aid recipients and humanitarian leadership. As recent efforts to remedy this, the UN-led Transformative Agenda and the NGO-led Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS),[5] deserve particular mention.

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) decided in 2011 to give new momentum to the 2005 Humanitarian Reform by adopting the so-called Transformative Agenda. With the ultimate objective of enhancing accountability to affected populations,[6] the Transformative Agenda recognised that "we need to focus not on the process of implementing change, but on the impact of change".[7] Concrete priority actions included an enhanced accountability for the achievement of collective results, based on an agreed performance and monitoring framework, and a strengthened accountability to affected communities, to be implemented at field level through a defined inter-agency operational framework.[8] Upon recent review, the Transformative Agenda has been found to have had some "positive effects"—for example in tightening accountability between lead-actors in humanitarian response—but to have

---

[3] The purpose of the GHD is to improve the coherence and effectiveness of humanitarian aid implementation.

[4] Out of these 13, 9 are EU member states.

[5] See https://www.corehumanitarianstandard.org/.

[6] See IASC Transformative Agenda, Chapeau and Compendium of Actions.

[7] Key Messages: the IASC Transformative Agenda, § 5.

[8] Key Messages: the IASC Transformative Agenda, § 6.

HERE-Geneva

closing the gap between policy and humanitarian practice

"led to little or no change in areas such as the humanitarian country team's collective leadership, accountability to affected populations, security and protection." (Krueger, Derzsi-Horvath, & Steets, 2016, p. 8). A lack of representation of non-traditional relief agencies, emerging donors, and national and local actors arguably meant that "[w]hile mutual formal accountability for UN agencies increased […] similar changes were not introduced for donors or NGOs and there was no systematic progress in the inter-agency monitoring of results in the field, despite evolving guidance" (Krueger, Derzsi-Horvath, & Steets, 2016, p. 27). Progress was found lacking particularly in the area of accountability to affected populations, largely caused by "unchanged donor practices" (IASC EDG, 2015).

The NGO-led CHS was launched in December 2014. In view of harmonisation, it built linkages between the 2010 HAP Standard,[9] People In Aid's Code of Good Practice,[10] and the Sphere Project's Core Standards.[11] Groupe URD also became a partner in the development process, committing to integrate the CHS criteria in its Quality COMPAS.[12] The CHS puts forward nine commitments that organisations and individuals involved in humanitarian response can refer to in order to improve the quality and effectiveness of their work. The premise behind the standard is that by knowing what humanitarian organisations have committed to, communities and affected populations will be better able to hold those organisations to account. The standards are also seen to by definition result in more targeted, timely, and needs-based responses.[13] As a voluntary initiative, organisations can choose to align their own internal procedures with the CHS, or it can be used as a basis for the verification of performance. While the push for the CHS has come from NGOs, several governments and donor agencies have expressed their support for it, for example Danida, Irish Aid, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, the German Federal Foreign Office, and the UK government.[14]

Detailed overview of existing monitoring mechanisms

Existing mechanisms for the review of humanitarian action can be considered in terms of four different types: data reporting platforms, general assessment reports, assessment reports on specific commitments, and existing indices.

Reporting platforms

- **OECD/DAC**: the 29 members[15] are obliged to report their humanitarian assistance to the DAC systems, as part of their official development assistance. Some other governments, and many bigger multilateral organisations also report to the DAC, but on a voluntary basis.

- **UN OCHA's Financial Tracking Service (FTS)[16]**: open to all humanitarian donors and implementing agencies, and concerns humanitarian assistance specifically. The FTS records voluntarily reported international humanitarian aid contributions, with a specific focus on humanitarian response plans and appeals. The FTS is particularly noteworthy in that it is a universal, real-time data-base, and it

---

[9] The 2010 HAP Standard in Accountability and Quality Management, http://www.alnap.org/resource/8125. HAP adopted the CHS in its Strategic Plan for 2014-2016, and did not actively promote its standards as of January 2015.

[10] The 2003 People In Aid Code of Good Practice, https://drc.ngo/media/2113064/people_in_aid_code_of_good_practice.pdf. People In Aid had no active promotion of its Code after January 2015.

[11] The Sphere Project Core Standards, http://www.spherehandbook.org/en/. The CHS will replace the Core Standards of the Sphere Handbook when Guidance Notes and Indicators are finalised.

[12] The Quality COMPAS, http://www.compasqualite.org/en/index/index.php.

[13] See https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/the-standard.

[14] See https://corehumanitarianstandard.org/the-standard/statements-of-support.

[15] http://www.oecd.org/dac/. DAC members are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxemburg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States.

[16] See www.fts.unocha.org.

HERE-Geneva
closing the gap between policy and humanitarian practice

offers a series of standard tables that show humanitarian aid flows in various formats, and also allows users to produce custom financial tables on demand. It is not a review mechanism *per se,* but can arguably serve "to analyse aid and monitor accountability among humanitarian actors".[17] Significantly, the OCHA FTS also publishes on its website a ranking of the top donors to existing response plans. It is noteworthy however that any reporting to the FTS remains voluntary, and all donors do not consistently report their contributions to the FTS.

- **International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI)**: a voluntary, multi-stakeholder initiative, centred around the IATI Standard, a format and framework for publishing data on development cooperation activities. The idea is that all organisations in development—including government donors, private sectors organisations, and national and international NGOs—implement IATI by publishing their aid information on IATI's agreed electronic format. The information is then linked to the IATI Registry, which acts as an online catalogue and index to the raw data. Since 2011, over 450 organisations have published data on the IATI Standard. Many donor countries also publish data using the IATI Standard, though not all.[18] Again, IATI is not a humanitarian donor review mechanism in itself, but by making information about aid spending easier to access, use, and understand, it aims to allow citizens in both donor and recipient countries to better hold their governments accountable.[19]

- **Publish What You Fund**[20]: a global campaign for aid transparency that was launched in 2008. Among the initiatives undertaken by Publish What You Fund is an online platform, the **Aid Transparency Tracker**, which collects data from a survey, a review of donors' implementation schedules, and an automated assessment of data published to the IATI Registry.[21] The Tracker highlights what information donor organisations have committed to publish in their implementation schedules, as well as what they are currently publishing.

- **AidData**: works to "help international development organizations to more effectively track, target, coordinate, and evaluate their investments".[22] AidData was formed in 2009 as a partnership between three institutions – the College of William & Mary, Development Gateway and Brigham Young University, and since 2016 it functions as a stand-alone development research lab at the College of William and Mary. AidData undertakes data collection and value addition activities, and publishes a series of data-products along two distinct lines: aggregate data, and project-level data.[23]

Overall assessment reports

- **The State of the Humanitarian System (SOHS)**[24]: published once every three years, the SOHS intends to give an overview of trends and performance in the humanitarian sector, from the perspective of those who receive aid as well as from those who work to provide it. The SOHS's assessment is based on four performance categories, drawn from the OECD-DAC evaluative

---

[17] See www.fts.unocha.org/pageloader.aspx?page=AboutFTS-Introduction.

[18] Donors that are using the IATI platform include Austria, Canada, Denmark, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States.

[19] See http://www.aidtransparency.net/about.

[20] See http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/.

[21] See http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/our-work/aid-transparency-tracker/.

[22] See http://aiddata.org/about-aiddatas-work.

[23] A full description of AidData's activities and products can be found here: http://aiddata.org/sites/default/files/dmp_public_version1.0_signed.pdf .

[24] The SOHS was piloted in 2010 (http://www.alnap.org/resource/8746), and has since been published in 2012 (http://www.alnap.org/resource/6565), and 2015 (http://www.alnap.org/what-we-do/effectiveness/sohs).

criteria, and adapted by SOHS to the specific humanitarian context:[25] coverage/sufficiency (is humanitarian aid covering needs?); effectiveness and relevance/appropriateness (was the response timely, and do interventions address priority needs?); efficiency, coordination and connectedness (do outputs reflect the most rational and economic use of inputs?); and coherence/principles (does the intervention adhere to core humanitarian principles and align with broader peace and development goals?.) These criteria are then considered in regard to four different functions of humanitarian action: response to massive sudden onset disasters, support to populations in chronic crisis, support resilience, and advocacy for crisis-affected people. The study compiles the latest statistics on the size and scope of the humanitarian system, synthesising the findings of formal evaluations, key informant interviews, and surveys. The four functions are also illustrated through four in-depth case-studies. Overall, the SOHS maps and assesses international humanitarian assistance at the system level, but it does not look at specific donors individually and systematically.

- **The Global Humanitarian Assistance (GHA) report:** conceived as "a leading resource for understanding financing for humanitarian crises globally",[26] it assesses the international financing response to humanitarian crises, looking at how much the response amounted to, where the financing came from, where it went, and through which channels it got there. The report also considers the extent to which the financing response measures up to identified humanitarian needs. The analysis in the GHA draws essentially on data reported to the OECD DAC, and to the FTS, but it also considers a range of other data sources, recognising their variation in the criteria for what can be included as humanitarian assistance, as well as the reported volumes (Development Initiatives, 2016, p. 84).[27] Significantly, following the new Sustainable Development Goals and the World Humanitarian Summit, the GHA 2016 is framed as a "contribution" to the process of putting these commitments into practice, by "making complex data and information on poverty, crises and the financial resources to tackle them clearer, more accessible and easier to act on" (Development Initiatives, 2016, p. 10). In light of this feasibility study, it is noteworthy that over the years, the GHA has increasingly endeavoured to undertake an assessment that also looks at qualitative aspects of aid.

Reporting on specific commitments

- **OECD-DAC peer review**: DAC members also agree to submit to a regular Peer Review of their development cooperation, undertaken by the DAC and the OECD/DCD. The objectives of DAC peer reviews are to improve the quality and effectiveness of development cooperation policies and systems, and to promote partnerships for better impact. This is achieved among other things through "holding DAC members accountable for the commitments they have made". Since late 2004, the OECD DAC Peer Reviews have a specific section on humanitarian assistance, which looks at efforts made by member to fulfil the GHD Principles.

- **Review of GHD Indicators:** As regards the monitoring of humanitarian donor commitments, the Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative continues to provide an informal forum facilitating the

---

[25] The OECD-DAC evaluative criteria are available at http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/50584880.pdf). See also SOHS 2015, Chapter 4.1: Assessment of performance.

[26] See http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/reports/. The first issue of the GHA was published in May 2000. The latest issue is the GHA 2016: http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/GHA-report-2016-full-report.pdf.

[27] A full list of the datasources in the GHA 2016, can be found on p. 88 of the report.

HERE-Geneva
closing the gap between policy and humanitarian practice

collective advancement of the GHD principles.[28] Mid-2012, GHD Initiative members agreed to undertake a self-assessment of donor performance against the GHD principles. The initial Review of GHD Indicators was completed in 2012, and it is now a regular function of GHD's co-chairmanship.[29] The self-assessment is based in a questionnaire, the results of which are then collated, and provided in the form of an indicator tracking table, and a compendium of good practices."[30]

- **CHS Verification Scheme** [31]: can be used by organisations providing humanitarian assistance to measure the extent to which they have successfully applied the CHS requirements. The Verification Scheme is managed by the CHS Alliance, and it offers four options of varying degrees of rigour and confidence in the results: self-assessment, peer review, independent verification, and certification. Each option is stand alone, but all four use the same indicators.[32] The **Humanitarian Quality Assurance Initiative (HQAI)** offers quality assurance services intended to demonstrate measurable progress in the delivery of humanitarian assistance, for example third party verification, and certification against the CHS.[33] Significantly, as the CHS is a voluntary initiative, independent verification or certification is not mandatory.

- **The Senior Transformative Agenda Implementation Team (STAIT)**: not a monitoring body *per se,* the STAIT was Created by the Emergency Directors Group (EDG) in 2014, to provide peer support to Humanitarian Coordinators and Humanitarian Country Teams in order to make the humanitarian response in the field more effective. In doing so, the STAIT focuses particularly on strengthening the three pillars of the Transformative Agenda, i.e. leadership, coordination, and accountability of affected people, and it does so through Operational Peer Reviews, sharing of learning and good practice, and informing policy processes.[34]

- **The European Commission evaluation of the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid: t**he European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid Consensus came with an Action Plan running from 2008 to 2013, the implementation of which was evaluated in a final report that came out in June 2014 (ADE & Humanitarian Futures Programme, 2014). As the evaluation confirmed the validity of the approach, a new implementation plan was finalised in November 2015, and it now serves as the framework for actions undertaken in the field of humanitarian aid by the European Commission and Member States. As such, the implementation plan emphasises three priorities, namely: upholding humanitarian principles and International Humanitarian Law; a stronger needs-based approach; and enhancing coordination and coherence.

Indices and rankings[35]

---

[28] See http://www.ghdinitiative.org/.

[29] See the latest such review (2015 Review of Good Humanitarian Donorship indicators, 16 May 2016), available at http://www.ghdinitiative.org/assets/files/Annual%20Reports/GHD-Indicators-questionnaire-2015-other-and-good-practices---final-may-1....pdf.

[30] See http://www.ghdinitiative.org/ghd/gns/activities/review-of-ghd-indicators.html. See also (GHD, 2013).

[31] See http://www.chsalliance.org/what-we-do/verification.

[32] The indicators can be found in the *Verification Framework, Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability, 11 March 2016,* available at http://www.chsalliance.org/files/files/CHS_Verification_Framework.pdf.

[33] See http://hqai.org/.

[34] See the STAIT website, http://www.deliveraidbetter.org/.

[35] There are a number of indices that measure aspects of the humanitarian environment, but that do not include an accountability evaluation aspect. For example, the Index for Risk Management (inform-index.org) provides an evidence base for risk analysis in view of supporting decisions about preventions, preparedness and response, and the CAF World Giving Index (https://www.cafonline.org/about-us/publications/2015-publications/world-giving-index-2015) measures charitable behaviour across the world, focusing on volunteering and charitable donations.

- **The Commitment to Development Index (CDI)**[36]: compiled by the Centre for Global Development since 2003, the CDI ranks 27 of the world's richest countries on policies that affect the more than five billion people living in poorer nations. Foreign aid is only one of seven components of the CDI.[37] The objective is framed as intended to educate and inspire the public and policymakers, and to spark debate, and a "race to the top".[38] The index is supported by the CDI Consortium, which in 2015 included the following countries: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. It is noteworthy that the 2008 issue of the HRI contained an article which looked at the history of the CDI, and the lessons it would offer for the HRI (Roodman, 2009). Roodman points to what he calls the "inherently impolite" nature of an index, and recommends that index makers develop two-way relationships, engaging with policy-makers and welcoming commentary. He also highlights that it is important that indices are clear in expressing their goals and limitations, and that their structure is accessible. They should also be able to capitalise on change while achieving stability.

- **The Humanitarian Commitment Scorecard**: launched by the International Rescue Committee "as the next step in a line of efforts to show what is and isn't happening along the lines of progress."[39] Using publicly available data from OCHA, the World Bank, and the OECD, the Scorecard measures current practices on commitment areas that have been publicly reported, focusing specifically on financing and resettlement. With regard to financing, it ranks countries in regard to humanitarian aid funding (in total and as a percentage of GNI) and in regard to their commitment to 'Better Aid'. Such commitment is captured through their work in terms of cash transfers, pooled funding, disaster risk reduction, and transparency, and in terms of whether or not they have signed up to the Grand Bargain. In order to allow for data consistency, the Humanitarian Commitment Scorecard only considers OECD-DAC members, and it focuses primarily on established and systematic quantitative indicators, while "recogni[sing] that there are many qualitative data points on policy changes" which it is hoped can be explored in future versions.[40]

- **The Aid Transparency Index (AIT)**: published for the first time in 2011 by the above-mentioned Publish What You Fund initiative.[41] By assessing the state of aid transparency among major donors, the Aid Transparency Index purports to track and encourage progress, while holding donors to account. AIT uses 39 indicators to monitor both the availability of aid information and the format it is published in.[42] The data used to compile the index is collected via the Aid Transparency Tracker.[43] The 2016 Aid Transparency Index[44] assessed 46 organisations, including 29 bilateral agencies, 16 multilateral organisations, and one philanthropic organisation. The donors were selected if they met at least two of three criteria: their annual spend is more than USD 1 billion; they have a significant role and influence as a major aid agency and engagement with the Busan agenda; and/or they are an institution to which government or organisation-wide transparency commitments apply.

---

[36] See http://www.cgdev.org/cdi-2015.

[37] The six other components are aid, trade, finance, security, technology, migration, and environment.

[38] See http://www.cgdev.org/cdi-2015.

[39] See https://medium.com/rescue-aid/the-humanitarian-commitment-scorecard-1c65a813d61c#.uepzjshp2.

[40] *Ibid.* The datasources and methodology for the Humanitarian Commitment Scorecard can be found at https://rescue.app.box.com/s/6exdmm53v1pt0tjyi7bkyhklc503887q.

[41] See http://ati.publishwhatyoufund.org/.

[42] See the full methodology for the 2016 Aid Transparency Index here: http://ati.publishwhatyoufund.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Technical-paper-2016-FINAL.docx . See also the full list of indicators, and how they are weighed here: http://ati.publishwhatyoufund.org/approach/indicators/.

[43] See the section on reporting platforms above. See also http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/our-work/aid-transparency-tracker/.

[44] See http://ati.publishwhatyoufund.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/ATI-2016_Report_Proof_DIGITAL.pdf.

- **Punctual rankings of donor aid quality**

  o In a report entitled "**Quality of Official Development Assistance Assessment**" (Birdsall, Kharas, Mahgoub, & Perakis, 2010), Birdsall *et al* look at aid effectiveness from the angle of the measures that aid agencies control. They consider 30 indicators, across four pillars of aid: maximising efficiency; fostering institutions; reducing burden; and transparency and learning. Their sources are academic literature and consensus in the development community. Significantly, the authors highlight that they specifically "exclude consideration of humanitarian aid because it serves a different purpose from development assistance and because a Humanitarian Response Index already measures how countries do against a set of agreed-upon principles" (Birdsall, Kharas, Mahgoub, & Perakis, 2010, p. 4). Nonetheless, they go on to recognise that "[m]any of our indicators are of course also relevant to the quality of humanitarian assistance" (Birdsall, Kharas, Mahgoub, & Perakis, 2010, p. 4).

  o In 2010, the World Bank Development Research Group published an index by Knack *et al,* in an article entitled "**Aid Quality and Donor Rankings**" (Knack, Rogers , & Eubank, 2011). Knack *et al* offer new measures of aid quality covering 38 bilateral and multilateral donors They also discusse the robustness and usefulness of such measures, albeit from a development rather than humanitarian viewpoint. Using 18 underlying indicators derived from the OECD-DAC's Survey for Monitoring the 2008 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the abovementioned AidData database, and the DAC aid tables, the authors suggest an overall aid quality index. Interestingly, the authors argue that the indicator set they provide is more comprehensive and representative of donor practices than previous donor rankings,[45] for example by increasing the validity of the aid quality indicators by adjusting for recipient characteristics, and donor aid volumes. Nonetheless, the authors also caution against over-interpreting such indices, since alternative plausible assumptions regarding weights or the inclusion of additional indicators can produce marked shifts in the ranking of some donors. In the article, the authors provide one overall ranking on aid quality, and four sub-indices (on aid selectivity, alignment, harmonisation, and specialisation), and they find that since the performance of some donors varies significantly across the sub-indices, these may be more relevant than the overall index when it comes to identifying relative strengths and weaknesses of donors.

  o In an article from 2011 entitled "**Rhetoric versus reality: the best and worst of aid agency practices**" (Easterly & Williamson, 2011), Easterly and Williamson take measure of donor's (including bilateral, multilateral, and UN agencies) adherence to best practices, as defined by aid agencies and based on aid transparency, specialisation, selectivity, ineffective aid channels, and overhead costs. They then rate the absolute performance of donors, using equal weightings and accounting for trends over time. Again, the focus of this index is essentially on development aid, though they do also take into account for example food aid, recognising that it is often given for humanitarian purposes as opposed to development purposes (Easterly & Williamson, 2011, p. 52).

- **Access to Medicine Index**[46]: published bi-annually since 2008, this index independently ranks pharmaceutical companies' efforts to improve access to medicine in developing countries. The access to medicine problem is multifaceted, just like the access to aid problem, and the responsibility of pharmaceutical companies to work towards an improved access to medicines can be seen as analogical to that of donors, and their role in view of a better humanitarian response. The idea behind the Access to Medicines Index is to provide pharmaceutical companies with a

---

[45] The authors make no mention of the HRI.

[46] See http://www.accesstomedicineindex.org/what-index.

HERE-Geneva
closing the gap between policy and humanitarian practice

transparent means by which they can assess, monitor, and improve their own performance, and also to provide a basis for multi-stakeholder dialogue. The Index uses a weighted analytical framework to capture and compare data from the top 20 research-based pharmaceutical companies, across a set of countries, diseases, and types of products. The framework looks at seven areas of focus, which cover areas that experts have deemed the most important for access to medicine. For each of these seven areas, each company is then assessed for four aspects of action: commitment, transparency, performance, and innovation.[47] While the Access to Medicine Index is clearly different from a potential HRI 2.1 in view of its subject matter, it is interesting to bear in mind as an HRI could be conceived as an "Access to Aid Index", evaluating the commitment, transparency, performance, and innovation of donors regarding specific areas deemed significant by experts.

---

[47] See the most recent index methodology, available at
http://www.accesstomedicineindex.org/sites/2015.atmindex.org/files/methodology_report_2013_for_the_2014_access_to_medicine_index_6.pdf.

HERE-Geneva
closing the gap between policy and humanitarian practice