

EN



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 9.7.2008

SEC(2008) 2236

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**

**Annex to the  
REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION**

**Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid – ECHO**

**Annual Report 2007**

**{COM(2008) 449}**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PART I COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1. ACP Countries .....	4
2. Eastern Europe, Russian Federation, Southern Caucasus, Central Asia, including Mongolia .....	39
3. Mediterranean and Middle East .....	44
4. Asia .....	50
5. Latin America .....	66
6. Disaster preparedness activities (including dipecho).....	71
<b>PART II. POLICY ISSUES.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>PART III. RELATIONS WITH OTHER EU INSTITUTIONS, MEMBER STATES, MAJOR HUMANITARIAN PARTNERS AND NON-EU DONORS .....</b>	<b>79</b>
1. EU Institutions and Member States .....	79
2. Relations with international organisations and non-EU major donors .....	80
<b>PART IV. OTHER ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>81</b>
1. Experts in the field .....	81
2. Security issues.....	81
3. Thematic funding and Grant Facility .....	82
4. Finance and Audit .....	83
5. Communication and information .....	83
6. Training initiative.....	84
<b>PART V. EVALUATIONS AND OUTSIDE ASSESSMENTS.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>PART VI. FINANCIAL TABLES .....</b>	<b>87</b>
1. DG ECHO budget and decisions for Humanitarian aid 1993 - 2007.....	87
2. Evolution of Humanitarian Aid's budget over the last 10 years .....	88
3. DG ECHO's finalised contracts 1998-2007* .....	89
4. Geographical breakdown of funding decisions 2002-2007 – Global overview.....	90
5. Funding decisions for humanitarian aid in 2007.....	98
6. Partners in DG ECHO's humanitarian assistance .....	100
<b>PART VII. LIST OF ACRONYMS .....</b>	<b>130</b>

## PART I COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY OVERVIEW

This synopsis of EC funded humanitarian operations is presented on a geographical basis, organised around the six regions of the world where DG ECHO funds humanitarian actions.

Each of these geographical sections has the same structure to permit parallel reading:

- (1) Each of the sections starts with an overview of the funding per country (region) and/or per humanitarian crisis in which DG ECHO intervened. For all types of interventions, humanitarian aid is implemented through Commission funding decisions and grant agreements with partners, who implement the specific humanitarian operations in the field. The overview tables provide the amount of funding decisions taken for that year and of the grant agreements that have been concluded in the year concerned. Since grant agreements are concluded using funds from funding decisions of the current and of the previous year, the amount of funding decisions in 2007 and of the grant agreements concluded are two distinct issues.
- (2) For each of the countries (regions) a description is given of the humanitarian needs that were identified, the main objectives and achievements and, where applicable, the transition between emergency and development "LRRD<sup>1</sup>".

This country-by-country overview includes all countries/crises for which funding decisions were adopted in 2007 and also those for which funding was made available in previous years but the implementation was still on-going in 2007.

In sections I.6 and IV.3 further information is provided on two types of horizontal funding: in I.7, **disaster preparedness activities** undertaken in 2007 in order to reduce both vulnerability and exposure of people to risks and disasters as well as to reduce the economic costs of such disasters and in IV.3, capacity building actions financed in 2007 through **thematic funding and the grant facility**, with a view to improve the institutional capacities of partner humanitarian organisations in some specific areas, so that these organisations are better able to respond quickly and efficiently to emergencies

The figures in this chapter are given to provide general overview and/or to illustrate the content of the chapter. The reader will find exhaustive financial information in Chapter VI.

---

<sup>1</sup> Linking relief, rehabilitation and development

## 1. ACP COUNTRIES

In 2007, humanitarian and food aid interventions were funded in 33 countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (ACP)<sup>2</sup>, through the adoption of 40 funding decisions and 299 grant agreements for a total amount of more than €422,760,000<sup>3</sup> which represented 55% of the total budget committed by DG ECHO.

### 1.1. AFRICA

The first ten countries in terms of humanitarian and food aid provided were in order in 2007: Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Chad, Zimbabwe, the Sahel (including, in addition to Chad, Burkina Faso, Mali, Mauritania and Niger), Uganda, Ethiopia, Burundi, Somalia and Liberia.

In addition to continued assistance provided to vulnerable populations in countries affected by ongoing humanitarian crises, emergency interventions were funded in response to: floods and cyclones in Madagascar and Mozambique; drought-related food shortages in Lesotho and Swaziland; floods in Burkina Faso, Ghana and Togo; hurricane Dean in Belize, Dominica, Haiti, Jamaica and St. Lucia; tropical storm Noel in Haiti and the Dominican Republic, as well as a tsunami in the Solomon Islands.

Furthermore, DG ECHO (1) supported drought preparedness activities in the Greater Horn of Africa (Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda), (2) funded an ECHO Flight for humanitarian operators in DRC and for emergency interventions in other areas, (3) responded to epidemics and (4) contributed to vaccination campaigns in West Africa.

In 2007 as in previous years, Africa was by far the region which received most of EC humanitarian aid funding (around 55% of the annual budget). The main areas/countries of intervention are listed below:

Country (Region)	Funding Decisions adopted in 2007			Agreements signed in 2007		
	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL
<b>All Africa</b>	<b>2.000.000</b>		<b>2.000.000</b>			
<b>HORN of AFRICA/EASTERN AFRICA</b>	<b>111.500.000</b>	<b>106.450.000</b>	<b>217.950.000</b>	<b>128.999.205</b>	<b>98.508.590</b>	<b>227.507.795</b>
<b>Chad</b>	20.500.000	10.000.000	30.500.000	15.795.344	9.999.998	25.795.342
<b>Eritrea</b>	6.000.000		6.000.000	7.757.456		7.757.456
<b>Ethiopia</b>	5.000.000	15.000.000	20.000.000	7.171.433	13.649.800	20.821.233
<b>Kenya</b>	5.000.000	4.000.000	9.000.000	8.650.000	4.000.000	12.650.000
<b>Somalia</b>	14.000.000	4.000.000	18.000.000	14.000.000	3.300.000	17.300.000
<b>Sudan</b>	45.000.000	65.450.000	110.450.000	59.784.972	59.558.792	119.343.764
<b>Uganda</b>	16.000.000	8.000.000	24.000.000	15.840.000	8.000.000	23.840.000

<sup>2</sup> Belize, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Ivory Coast, Democratic Republic of Congo, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Solomon Islands, Somalia, St; Lucia, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

<sup>3</sup> €220.91 M humanitarian aid budget line; €169.65 M food aid budget line; €4 M Dipecho; €28.2 M B-envelope 9th European Development Fund.

Country (Region)	Funding Decisions adopted in 2007			Agreements signed in 2007		
	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL
<b>GREAT LAKES/CENTRAL AFRICA</b>	<b>65.500.000</b>	<b>24.000.000</b>	<b>89.500.000</b>	<b>70.959.752</b>	<b>22.492.591</b>	<b>93.452.343</b>
Burundi	15.000.000	4.500.000	19.500.000	14.434.133	4.500.000	18.934.133
Central African Republic	4.000.000	4.000.000	8.000.000	3.680.560	2.992.650	6.673.210
Congo (Dem. Rep.)	32.000.000	10.500.000	42.500.000	33.915.059	9.999.941	43.915.000
Echo-Flight DRC	7.500.000		7.500.000	7.500.000		7.500.000
Tanzania	7.000.000	5.000.000	12.000.000	11.430.000	5.000.000	16.430.000
<b>WEST AFRICA</b>	<b>32.600.000</b>	<b>14.000.000</b>	<b>46.600.000</b>	<b>30.933.442</b>	<b>11.775.940</b>	<b>42.709.382</b>
Regional West Africa	2.000.000		2.000.000	700.000		700.000
Ivory Coast		500.000	500.000		500.000	500.000
Guinea	2.000.000		2.000.000	1.980.000		1.980.000
Liberia	13.600.000	3.000.000	16.600.000	11.819.643	3.000.000	14.819.643
Sahel	15.000.000	10.500.000	25.500.000	16.433.799	8.275.940	24.709.739
<b>SOUTHERN AFRICA / INDIAN OCEAN</b>	<b>27.200.000</b>	<b>23.200.000</b>	<b>50.400.000</b>	<b>18.711.170</b>	<b>22.805.376</b>	<b>41.516.546</b>
Regional Southern Africa		5.819.167	5.819.167		5.819.167	5.819.167
Mozambique	7.000.000		7.000.000	7.028.419		7.028.419
Zambia	2.000.000		2.000.000	2.126.689		2.126.689
Zimbabwe	15.200.000	15.000.000	30.200.000	6.556.062	1.996.770	8.552.832
Madagascar	3.000.000	2.380.833	5.380.833	3.000.000	14.989.439	17.989.439
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>238.800.000</b>	<b>167.650.000</b>	<b>406.450.000</b>	<b>249.603.569</b>	<b>155.582.497</b>	<b>405.186.066</b>

### 1.1.1. All Africa

Communicable diseases are highly endemic in African countries. According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), more than two new epidemic outbreaks occur each week. The vaccination coverage of the populations is generally low and the risk of transmission of infections is thus increased. Poverty, lack of basic sanitation facilities, low hygienic standards and malnutrition in post-emergency or structurally weak countries increase vulnerability to communicable diseases. Meningitis, cholera, and various viral hemorrhagic fevers are responsible for major epidemics in African countries which pose great risks to the health, lives and livelihoods of people in the region with increasing risk of international spread.

#### *Humanitarian needs*

Meningitis is endemic in Sub-Saharan Africa, an area known as the “Meningitis Belt” running from Senegal to Ethiopia. During the dry season there is a significant increase in the number of cases, in some countries reaching epidemic proportions. Due to an existing international shortage of vaccine, preparedness for the next meningitis epidemic outbreaks is particularly important. The adequate immunization of at-risk individuals could avert an epidemic in which, in a worst case scenario, as many as 160,000 people could be infected and 16,000 killed in just one epidemic season. There is an urgent need to make meningitis vaccines available for emergency immunization.

Cholera is also affecting Africa. Almost all global deaths were reported from the African continent and in 2006, 99% of worldwide cases of cholera were reported in Africa. In 2007, there were outbreaks of cholera (or acute watery diarrhoea - AWD) in Ethiopia, Uganda, DRC and Angola.

In recent years, Africa has also seen a significant number of outbreaks of Viral hemorrhagic fevers (VHF), among these Yellow fever and Lassa fever in West Africa, and Ebola fever, Marburg fever and Rift Valley fever in the Horn of Africa and in Eastern and Central Africa. In 2007, outbreaks of Ebola Fever occurred in DRC, Marburg Fever in Uganda, and Yellow Fever in Sudan.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The main funding objective was to reduce morbidity and mortality rates related to outbreaks of meningitis, cholera and viral haemorrhagic fevers epidemics in the African countries, signatories to the Cotonou Convention and to maintain case-fatality rates below internationally recognized thresholds. It aimed at contributing to an adequate response to sudden major threats to public health, such as epidemics with a potential trans-national impact.

The funds (€ 2,000,000) were used for emergency planning, management of vaccines and pharmaceutical stock piles, international cooperation and early warning systems.

The containment and control of confirmed epidemics requires provision of effective medicines to most affected people, prevention of additional cases and control of potential expansion through immunization and awareness campaigns.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Not relevant.

#### ***1.1.2. Horn of Africa and Eastern Africa***

A total amount of €217,950,000 was allocated to the countries/areas of the Horn of Africa and Eastern Africa.

Sudan remained the main crisis for DG ECHO. In addition to providing assistance to the IDPs in Darfur, the return and reinstallation of hundreds of thousands of people was assisted in South Sudan and the transitional areas, where humanitarian needs remain considerable, in the absence of very basic services to the population. Support to IDP camps around Khartoum was decreased. A response was provided to outbreaks of diseases, as well as to floods and droughts.

In Chad, assistance focussed on IDP and refugee camps in the East (Sudanese) and the South (Central African), as well as on vulnerable local populations.

Despite an increasingly difficult environment due to administrative constraints, DG ECHO partners were able to maintain a certain implementing capacity in Eritrea, in the health/nutrition and water/sanitation sectors.

A multi-sector response strategy was applied in order to address the humanitarian needs of people affected by internal instability, acute food shortages and repeated climatic hazards in the Somali Regional State, the Southern Regions, Oromya and Afar in Ethiopia, where an ECHO office was opened.

In Kenya, DG ECHO responded to the high level of chronic malnutrition rates in the North-east through health/nutrition and water/sanitation interventions. It also supported protection activities. Assistance was also provided to Somali refugees.

The humanitarian situation further worsened in Somalia, where open conflict and instability continued to prevail generating overwhelming humanitarian needs that are aggravated and compounded by cyclical droughts, floods and epidemic outbreaks. Despite numerous security incidents affecting the humanitarian community, DG ECHO was able to maintain a substantial engagement through various partners, providing assistance in Central and Southern Somalia in the sectors of shelter, food relief items, health/nutrition, emergency food assistance, water and sanitation, as well as co-ordination.

The overall humanitarian and security situation improved in Uganda, which prompted an initial return process for a number of Internally Displaced People (IDPs). However, needs remained considerable in the transitional phase. DG ECHO continued to support the most vulnerable populations in camps, whilst progressively shifting the focus, in a LRRD perspective, to new return areas.

Finally, a Regional Drought Preparedness programme was funded in order to assist more than 8 million pastoralists and/or agro-pastoralists, with particular focus on water and animal health.

## *Sudan/Chad*

### *a) Sudan*

#### *Humanitarian needs*

The four-year long conflict in Darfur has led to around 4,000,000 people in need of humanitarian assistance, including more than 2,500,000 IDPs, 280,000 refugees in Chad, as well as resident communities and nomads. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) signed in January 2005, putting an end to the 20-year civil war between the North and the South, was positive. However the political and security equilibrium remains precarious in Southern Sudan and the transitional areas, leading to regular fighting and insecurity. With the CPA, thousands of refugees and IDPs started returning to areas where nutrition, health, water and sanitation and public health and hygiene continue to be the source of major concern, thus generating further humanitarian needs. Since the signing of the Darfur Peace Agreement in May 2006, the situation has further deteriorated and humanitarian access has been drastically reduced. The ongoing fighting, the rising insecurity, as well as the bad food security situation, have led to 600,000 new IDPs between May 2006 and December 2007, to additional violations of International Humanitarian Law and to an increased dependence of the most vulnerable to international assistance in terms of food aid, health, nutrition, water and sanitation, shelter and emergency support.



Furthermore, the whole of Sudan is regularly affected by severe natural disasters such as floods and droughts, as well as by a series of disease outbreaks.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Over the past 5 years, DG ECHO's engagement in Sudan has increased with the eruption of the Darfur crisis in 2003 which became the biggest humanitarian crisis in the world. In parallel, with the signature of the CPA, DG ECHO's support to Southern Sudan and the transitional areas started focusing on the return and reinstallation of hundred of thousands of people in areas totally lacking basic services, whereas the support in the IDP camps around Khartoum was steadily decreasing. DG ECHO has responded swiftly to outbreaks of diseases such as yellow fever, meningitis, cholera and hemorrhagic fever, as well as to the floods and droughts that have regularly affected several regions of Sudan. Since 2007, DG ECHO sharply increased its support to food aid and emergency food insecurity in Sudan and particularly in Darfur where food aid assistance represents 2/3 of the international aid. In the last 5 years, large parts of Sudan required a continued substantial level of engagement to assist the most vulnerable populations.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The main objective for 2007 was to reduce excessive mortality and morbidity rates among highly vulnerable populations in Sudan through integrated assistance. In addition, DG ECHO support aimed at improving humanitarian and operational environments through support to special mandates, as well as common services including the humanitarian air service. The main sectors of intervention were food aid, health and nutrition, water and environmental sanitation, emergency preparedness and response, household food security, protection and operational support.

DG ECHO continued covering the whole territory with a neutral approach and according to needs in strict respect of internationally recognised humanitarian principles. In addition to the €45,000,000 programmed for 2007, the country has benefited from €16,000,000 out of a decision amounting to €17,000,000 mobilised in December 2006 to respond to the worsening of the security, access and humanitarian situation in Darfur and Chad. An amount of €65,450,000 coming from the two separate global food aid decisions have also been allocated to Sudan, to address food aid and emergency food security needs.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

DG ECHO continued to assist the Sudanese population in need, affected by conflict and by natural disasters, as long as alarming humanitarian indicators appeared. With a more stable situation in the North and in certain parts of Southern Sudan, rehabilitation and sustainable development assistance are gradually taking over and building upon the relief work provided for decades. LRRD possibilities have increased since the resumption of formal cooperation with the European Commission in 2005, especially in the food security sector. Thus, DG ECHO has been decreasing its support to operations in North Sudan, while identifying bridging operations in Southern Sudan and the transitional areas. However, needs are so overwhelming notably in Southern Sudan and the transitional areas, that both humanitarian and development assistance will have to go hand in hand for a long while. Hopefully, in the next few years, LRRD *continuum* will become effective, contributing to a gradual process of recovery through the enhancement of self-reliance.

## ***b) Chad***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

From April 2003 to end 2007, some 280,000 Sudanese refugees from Darfur poured into the Eastern Chadian frontier, an area that has suffered from decades of civil conflict. This politically and economically marginalised region suffers from chronic food insecurity and lacks the necessary resources and capacity to accommodate large numbers of displaced people, and the Sudanese refugees are completely dependent on international aid. Furthermore, about 180,000 people have been internally displaced in south-east of Chad at the border with Darfur most of which have been displaced in 2007, and more than 50,000 Chadian have found refuge in Darfur. These displacements are the result of an armed conflict between the government and rebel groups, incursions by neighbouring Sudanese militia and growing violence between different communities. In addition, the Southern provinces are hosting some 18,000 refugees from the Central African Republic since 2003, a number that rose to 48,000 in 2005. In 2007 the deployment of a European peace keeping operation in Chad and RCA (EUFOR) has been approved, as well as the deployment of a UN mission (MINURCAT). These deployments should contribute to the securitisation of the camps and of the places of origin of the displaced populations and initiate the first voluntary returns. However, a general mass return of IDPs cannot be envisaged unless it is accompanied by a reconciliation process and the return of the rule of law.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

DG ECHO is supporting relief operations in Eastern Chad since September 2003 when an emergency decision was taken to assist the first refugees coming from Darfur. With the rising number of refugees, IDPs, and host communities affected by the Darfur conflict, the Chadian conflict and insecurity, DG ECHO remained and increased its support to Eastern Chad. In parallel, in 2005, DG ECHO started assisting the refugees coming to Southern Chad, fleeing insecurity in Central African Republic. Projects aimed at promoting economic security and maintaining nutritional levels have been carried out outside the camps and where vulnerability of the local populations is very high.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

Through its operational partners, DG ECHO maintained multi-sector assistance to refugees and IDPs in the camps of Eastern and Southern Chad, supporting food aid, food security, health and nutrition, water and sanitation and protection operations, as well as shelter and non food item distributions. Although most needs of the local Chadian population are not linked to the presence of refugees and IDPs, the increased pressure on natural resources in structurally weak and under developed regions, made quick impact projects, food security, health and nutrition operations, necessary to mitigate tension between refugees, IDPs and the local population.

A Global Plan of €15,000,000 was adopted in 2007. An allocation of €17,000,000 was released in December 2006 for Darfur and Chad, including €1,000,000 for UNHCR in Chad. In July 2007, an EDF<sup>4</sup> decision of €5,500,000 was approved to strengthen ECHO support to the humanitarian air service and to activities aiming at reducing vulnerability and malnutrition. An additional €10,000,000 from the first global food aid decision was allocated to Chad to address food aid and emergency food security needs.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

With a view to facilitating the link between relief, rehabilitation and development, pre-rehabilitation operations have been carried out in the South of Chad where partner organisations are putting exit strategies in place. Discussions with other relevant Commission services have intensified with a view to further promote LRRD through the various complementary initiatives and instruments available in Southern Chad. However any attempt to develop sustainability of the operations and LRRD is at stake if conflict and related insecurity in the sub-region last.

## ***Eritrea***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

The protracted, unresolved border dispute with its neighbour, Ethiopia, has continuously led to decline in many sectors: livelihoods, health, food security, engendering greater levels of poverty. Eritrea has faced challenges posed by years of chronic drought, desertification, poor infrastructure and continued insecurity along the border with Ethiopia. Economic decline has led to worrying humanitarian indicators. Although these have not been measured for a couple of years, the malnutrition rates remain very high and admissions to specialised feeding programmes have increased.

The penury and poor quality of water, resulting from successive years of drought, insufficient and unbalanced distribution of rains, lack of water points and weak maintenance, are directly responsible for the worrying water-borne disease morbidity rates commonly found in rural areas. Losses of livestock have been commonly reported over the past years, leading to asset depletion and less and less resilience on the part of the rural communities to cope with harsh periods. An estimated 40% of the Eritrean population relies on livestock as its main source of income.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

A total amount of €16,920,000 has been allocated to Eritrea from 2003 to 2007. Following the 1998-2000 war with Ethiopia, the country has been affected by several droughts and a continuous decline in livelihoods due to the economic crisis. DG ECHO interventions have progressively shifted from a water and sanitation support to a more comprehensive strategy including health, nutrition and protection. At the same time, the implementing capacity has continued to decrease due to the progressive reduction of the number of NGO.

---

<sup>4</sup> European Development Fund

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

A funding decision of €6,000,000 from the humanitarian aid budget adopted in 2007 has been implemented. Despite an overall difficult environment due to administrative constraints and Government policies, partners have been able to maintain an acceptable implementing capacity. The country has also benefited from the Regional Drought Preparedness Decision (see related text below).

DG ECHO's strategy was to provide support to civilian population trying to overcome the humanitarian consequences of a protracted serious crisis context. DG ECHO interventions targeted two main sectors, health - including nutrition - and water and sanitation. As a result, 47,000 persons throughout the country have had improved access to safe drinking water, thousands of animals received water in order to maintain a minimum livelihood level for targeted households. About 17,000 children under the age of 5 and pregnant and lactating women received nutritional care, including 1,500 severely malnourished children that have recovered or are in the process of recovering. More than 200,000 persons have had the opportunity to receive primary and/or secondary health care in remote rural areas of the country. It is estimated that 175,000 persons benefited from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) nationwide protection activities.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

In the current context comprehensive LRRD is difficult to apply. However, DG ECHO funded projects coordinated with the interventions of the EDF, especially in the nutrition and water and sanitation sector.

## ***Ethiopia***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Insecurity in parts of Somali Regional State (SRS) continued to be a bottleneck for humanitarian operations. The pastoralist and agro-pastoralist lowland areas of the country have been suffering from insufficient rains in the last consecutive two seasons, leading to food insecurity because of pasture scarcity, water shortage and low crop production. Acute watery Diarrhoea (AWD) has become endemic in the country and the level of response has been limited as the government refused to recognize it as cholera. The insecurity in SRS led to further deterioration of the humanitarian situation because of lack of access for humanitarian agencies after the Chinese oil workers were attacked in April 2007. The ongoing operation of the Ethiopian Defence Force (EDF) imposed strict control on humanitarian workers including UN agencies and International NGOs. The ICRC was forced out of the region, other NGOs were asked to temporarily suspend their operations, although some were later allowed to resume their activities on a case-by-case basis. Among other issues, a trade embargo was imposed in the five Zones of military operations, which is the primary reason for the further aggravation of the situation.

The Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Agency (DPPA)<sup>5</sup> appealed in 2007 to donor agencies to address 207,353 severely malnourished under five children, 6.3 million moderately malnourished under five children and 1.4 million pregnant and lactating women. DG ECHO responded to the appeal on the basis of assessments of the situation. Need increased because of insufficient rains, particularly in lowland areas of the country, although the country witnessed a bumper harvest during 2006. Health threats like AWD, measles, malaria and meningitis were the main humanitarian needs of the year.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

From 2003 to 2007, DG ECHO has allocated €39,000,000 in favour of vulnerable people in Ethiopia. Initially, the interventions were focused on the follow-up of the 1998-2000 war with Eritrea. Successively, DG ECHO has enlarged its support with the aim to provide humanitarian aid in favour of the most vulnerable populations affected by climatic threats and local conflicts, mainly in health, water and sanitation and protection sectors.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

DG ECHO carried out two financial decisions in 2007. Through a humanitarian aid decision, DG ECHO allocated €5,000,000 from the humanitarian budget line and €15,000,000 from the food aid budget.

The aims of the funding were to provide humanitarian assistance in areas of health, water and sanitation, protection, IDPs as well as food aid, nutrition and food security. A multi-sector response strategy was pivotal in addressing emergency needs of the people affected by internal instability, acute food shortages over and above the chronic structural food deficit, and other climatic hazards.

In 2007, DG ECHO's support has benefited more than 4,700,000 people in food security, 2,250,000 in nutrition, 200,000 in health and 650,000 in water and sanitation. Spatially, the major beneficiary regions were Somali Regional State (SRS), Southern Regions, Oromya and Afar.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

DG ECHO mainstreamed LRRD in the country and ensured that the short term emergency response is properly linked to partners' long-term development programmes. In order to provide technical capacity in the field, DG ECHO opened an office in Ethiopia in 2007, which is currently working closely with the Rural Development and Food Security Section of the EC Delegation to ensure the Linkage of Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD), and sustainability of its actions.

---

<sup>5</sup> DPPA is a government agency responsible for the coordination and licensing of humanitarian operation in the country.

## ***Kenya***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Vulnerable populations affected by drought and a livelihoods and nutritional crisis were supported through the Kenya Country Programme and the Regional Drought Decision. Somali refugees were supported through an allocation to WFP. Although 2007 bore witness to a recovery period following the severe drought in 2005/2006, malnutrition rates remained high albeit below 15% Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM). Needs in the nutrition, public health and water sectors remained high during the year.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Over the past 5 years DG ECHO's engagement has become more focused in Kenya, tackling severe drought in pastoral areas as well as aspects of human health. A total amount of €23,850,000 has been committed from 2003 to 2007.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

DG ECHO's objective for 2007 was to respond to the high level of chronic malnutrition rates in the North-East through health/nutrition and water/sanitation projects as well as to focus on the protection sector in the light of continuing insecurity in the sub-region. This objective was largely accomplished, although primary health care activities. Health expert early in the year, have been largely excluded from the remit of partners' interventions. 2007 in Kenya bore witness to a continuation of the recovery from the previous drought; malnutrition rates declined albeit never below 15% GAM, highlighting the cyclical fluctuations in rates linked most likely to livestock availability.

In 2007, the EC support for humanitarian projects in Kenya amounted to €9,000,000, covering: (a) €5,000,000 of humanitarian aid to vulnerable populations in northern Kenya affected by drought and facing a livelihood and nutritional crisis and targeting 3,500,000 beneficiaries; (b) €4,000,000 of humanitarian aid for Somali refugees in Kenya. Moreover, €5,500,000 allocated in 2006 for areas of northern Kenya as part of a regional drought preparedness programme for the Horn of Africa was implemented in 2007. DG ECHO support provided in 2006 to UNHCR was implemented in 2007 and led to the improvement of health infrastructure, *inter alia*, in the camps.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

The elections at the end of 2007 led to violence in Western Kenya, Nairobi and coastal areas. Discussions with other relevant Commission's services intensified with a view to further promote LRRD through the various complementary initiatives and instruments available. Links with the Drought Management Initiative of the EC Delegation in Kenya have been reinforced.

## ***Somalia***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

For the past 17 years Somalia has remained a country of open-ended conflict and instability with overwhelming humanitarian needs that are aggravated and compounded by worsening cyclical droughts, floods and various epidemic outbreaks.

Violence escalated between insurgents and Ethiopian forces. Some of the worst fighting since the civil war of the early 1990s occurred, with hundreds of civilians killed and thousands more injured. The conflict caused massive displacement from Mogadishu. There were an estimated 700,000 new internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Somalia, joining an estimated 400,000 long-term IDPs. The largest numbers of IDPs were moving to areas where host communities were already in a food and nutrition crisis and could not support them.

The spring and autumn rains performed poorly, especially in Hiran and Central Regions. The combined effects of poor rains, conflict, displacement and diarrhoeal diseases severely exacerbated the food security situation and caused an alarming rise in acute malnutrition rates, particularly in regions that absorbed large numbers of conflict-related IDPs. Parts of Somalia were also experiencing hyperinflation with dramatic price increases putting basic food items beyond the budget of the most vulnerable.

Repeated security incidents against the humanitarian community such as kidnapping threats, harassment, roadside bombs, and administrative interference and hindrances placed a burden on humanitarians and restricted their ability to operate.

The main humanitarian needs identified were shelter and non food relief items, health and nutrition, emergency food assistance, water and sanitation, and coordination.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Each year, from 2003 to 2006, the Commission adopted humanitarian aid financing decisions for a total yearly amount of about €10,000,000. In 2007 following the resumption of violence in the country and the intensification of the humanitarian crisis, the Commission adopted several humanitarian aid decisions for a total of €18,000,000. The principal objective of the aid remained the same throughout all the years: *"to assist the victims of insecurity and climatic hazards in Somalia"*. The main sectors of intervention in response to the needs were health, water and sanitation, food security, and non food items.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements in 2007***

In 2007, the European Commission adopted humanitarian aid financing decisions for €18,000,000 to address the victims of the ongoing insecurity and climatic hazards. These were allocated through three main funding decisions: a global plan of €10,000,000, an emergency funding decision of €4,000,000 in response to the conflict and €4,000,000 from food aid allocation. These funds were allocated to operations focusing on health, nutrition, water and sanitation, food security, multi sector support across the Central and Southern areas of Somalia in favour of the new IDP caseloads.

DG ECHO supported access to health care through nutrition interventions and primary health care support: out patient consultation and treatment, and in patient treatment, including specialised mother and child health care, paediatrics and surgery.

In water and sanitation sector, DG ECHO promoted access to water and hygiene through the rehabilitation of water points and ground surface dams, through the building of latrines, and through hygiene awareness campaigns.

Food security interventions included support to veterinary services that had been able to vaccinate and treat in excess of 1,500,000 head of livestock. This reduced the morbidity rate from critical livestock diseases and kept the mortality rate below the normal thus contributing significantly to protecting people's livestock herds and livelihoods. Livestock-related interventions also included training community animal health workers, income generation and support for agricultural interventions through the provision of small ruminants to pastoralists and seeds and tools to riverside communities respectively in key areas.

DG ECHO provided food, non food items including shelter, and essential household kits to IDPs and host communities, and supported water and sanitation interventions, basic health care, distribution of seeds and tools. Moreover some protracted IDPs were supported to undertake income generating activities.

The above-mentioned interventions have, over the past year, been able to impact the lives of approx. 3,066,500 Somalis.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

LRRD is currently a major challenge for the EC as a whole, not least because of the different geographic coverage of the EC Delegation and DG ECHO in programming, but also because of the high levels of insecurity that characterise Somalia. Nevertheless, the EC Delegation remains firmly committed to Somalia and especially in the Rural Development and Social Services sectors.

### ***Uganda***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

During the year 2007, the humanitarian and security situation in Uganda has greatly improved. This achievement is mainly due to the promising peace talks between the Government and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) and the significant reduction in LRA hostilities since the signature of the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement in August 2006.

Even though the overall situation still remains largely dependent on the, so far, inconclusive Juba peace talks, and many IDPs (especially in the Acholi region), these positive changes have prompted an initial return process, accelerating the movement out of the camps of the original 1,500,000 IDPs and resulting in substantially improved access to land.



This return process is part of a transition phase, which, still continues to experience large scale humanitarian needs. Humanitarian and transition needs will coexist for at least the next 18-24 months with a progressive increase of the latter as return movements intensify.

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years*

Since 2004 DG ECHO has greatly contributed to providing a continuous and effective relief response in LRA-affected areas; the response to basic needs such as water and sanitation, health, NFIs, and, last but not least, food security as well as protection and coordination, have been scaled up significantly. Humanitarian access due to insecurity and sub-optimal coordination has been the main constraint.

Although humanitarian indicators in northern Uganda still remain below Sphere Standards across several sectors and regions, former humanitarian operations have definitely shown a positive impact. The increased supply of water, latrine coverage, food intake, health services and hygiene promotion resulted in a healthier population able to use a variety of coping mechanisms.

During 2003 €8,000,000 was released. In response to the worsening of the humanitarian crisis, DG ECHO increased funding to €18,620,000 in 2004, €14,000,000 in 2005 and in two separate decisions in 2006 released €15,000,000 and €4,000,000 respectively. In 2007 further support has been secured releasing altogether €21,000,000 (including €8,000,000 of food aid).

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

DG ECHO's priority in 2007 was to continue supporting the needs of the most vulnerable populations in the IDPs camps, while progressively shifting the focus to new return areas. Water and sanitation, health, non-food items, food security and food aid, camp management and planning, protection and coordination, have been the main sectors of interventions. This approach in Uganda has been consistent with DG ECHO's 2007 strategy (Needs based, LRRD, mainstreaming of Children and HIV/AIDS), which included three specific objectives: 1) In the framework of the current IDPs return and transitional phase, to provide adequate support and assistance to returnees, while continuing to assist the most vulnerable population in IDP camps, with minimum basic services in water and sanitation, health, livelihoods and food security, Non Food Items, protection, training and education; 2) To strengthen the management and coordination of humanitarian response among multilateral and bilateral agencies and non governmental agencies in Uganda and 3) To maintain a technical capacity in the field and to assess needs, appraise project proposals and to co-ordinate and monitor the implementation of operations.

Partners focused on outputs, improved coordination and streamlined their activities accordingly. Main achievements include: (1) Health: with support to hospitals, Health Centres (HC), financing of mobile clinics and fight against Malaria and HIV/AIDS; (2) Water and Sanitation: maintenance of water systems in camps and increased focus on rehabilitation and construction of water systems, integration of hygiene promotion across all funded water and sanitation programs; (3) Food security: increasing self-reliance of IDPs through livelihood security programmes and income generating activities; (4) Food Aid: over 1,000,000 IDPs were assisted with food aid ; over 450,000 beneficiaries have been engaged in food-for-work and food-for-training projects.

Mother Child Health and nutrition programme have been continued and over 300,000 beneficiaries (newborns, pregnant and lactating mothers) were assisted with supplementary food rations.

Protection: Over 2,000 children under five in Kitgum district were provided with day care through early childhood centres in order to address protection issues related to unattended children in camps. Over 500 Formerly Abducted Children received assistance and were reintegrated into their communities. Other extremely vulnerable children and women received similar assistance and about 100 adolescents were provided psychosocial support through Interpersonal Therapy for Groups (IPTG). Legal aid for IDPs in Kitgum and Pader districts has been financed through Information, Counselling and Legal Assistance (i.e. total of 362 cases were closed between March and October 07);

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

LRRD continued to be at the forefront of DG ECHO's strategy in Uganda. In 2007, DG ECHO has continued to reinforce its LRRD strategy with the different Commission services as well as DG ECHO's implementing partners. Exit strategies by DG ECHO partners have been implemented since 2006 where collaboration with local and sub-county authorities has been continuously strengthened. Interventions, to the extent feasible are aligned to District Development Plans provided that these plans correspond to and respond to the needs in the area. The EC Delegation is also re-focusing its attention on LRRD and favourably contributing to this process through various funding instruments/programs (NUREP, Water Facility, 10th EDF etc.).

### ***Regional Drought Preparedness***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

Approximately 12,000,000 pastoralists are at risk of morbidity and mortality in the Greater Horn of Africa (GHA). Because of the specific nature of nomadic pastoralists and its linkages with natural resource and land management, the needs arise as a result of environmental and institutional policy failures. One of the most important traditional coping mechanisms for nomadic communities, the opportunistic use of natural resources, or the ability to move with herds to areas with better pasture and water during periods of stress, has been progressively eroded.

#### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

The €10,000,000 decision adopted in 2006 was the first one adopted by the Commission to mitigate the effects of the recurrent drought in the Horn of Africa. The evaluation of the impact of this kind of preventive approach was very successful and DG ECHO has decided to continue and reinforce the regional drought preparedness programme with €30,000,000 allocated in 2008.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

An 18-month funding decision was adopted in July 2006 and entirely committed for an amount of €10,000,000. 2007, therefore, saw the continuation of projects financed in 2006 in 5 countries (Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda). Projects were not implemented in Somalia due to insecurity. This was the first initiative of its kind undertaken in Kenya over the past 5 years.

Some 8,290,160 pastoralists and/or agro-pastoralists have been targeted by operations funded through this Decision. The principal sectors were water and animal health. Drought Cycle Management methodology has been used (community-based low-cost technologies, contingency planning supported, and reinforcement of existing Early Warning Systems). In line with previous objectives, the emphasis was placed on close monitoring as well as making sure that the projects were adapted to reflect changes on the ground (e.g. Eritrea and the Ogaden region of Ethiopia). As foreseen, a mid-term evaluation was carried out (May-August 2007). It welcomed DG ECHO's community-based regional approach, recommended intensification of success stories, wider geographical scope, a broader range of sectors, as well as an increase in the budget for the 2008 programme. A Stakeholders' Meeting was held in Nairobi mid-September 2007 to gather partners' opinions on the programme and to brainstorm future strategy.

### *LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country*

LRRD was intensified with EC Delegations on the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> EDF (Drought Management Initiative, Kenya; NUREP (Northern Uganda Rehabilitation Programme) and Food Security activities, Ethiopia) as well as with regards to the ACP-EU Water Facility. The Horn of Africa Initiative began its preliminary work during 2007. In collaboration with other EC Services, DG ECHO continued working on an LRRD strategy seeking complementarities between projects financed in the Horn of Africa through their different instruments (10<sup>th</sup> EDF, the Horn of Africa Initiative and ECHO's Drought Preparedness Programme).

The countries, except Djibouti, targeted also benefited from separate country allocations and in some cases, food aid allocations.

#### *1.1.3. Great Lakes and central Africa*

Needs have been contrasted in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) where, on one hand, some one million IDPs were assisted to return home and regain self-sufficiency, whilst on the other hand renewed conflict in North Kivu uprooted some 300,000 people who were thrown in urgent need of medical care, water, food and shelter. Violence against women and children remained a major problem, particularly in the East. DG ECHO contributed to contain mortality and morbidity rates and to support the resettlement and stabilization process.

ECHO Flight was maintained in order to serve humanitarian operators mainly in DRC. It was also used for emergency operations elsewhere (e.g. floods in Mozambique).

More than 200,000 people were displaced in the Central African Republic as a consequence of the action of domestic and foreign rebel groups and banditry in the North. DG ECHO assisted IDPs, refugees, returnees and vulnerable host communities with an integrated package including water and sanitation, food security, education, health and protection activities.

A chronic complex emergency persisted in Burundi, affected by 10 years of civil war, population displacements, and an ever precarious security situation. Furthermore, the country hosted three camps of Congolese refugees. DG ECHO provided assistance to IDPs, returnees, refugees and vulnerable host communities, covering the health/nutrition sector, delivering food aid, promoting sanitation and funding protection activities, with focus on children, adolescents and women, and within a LRRD perspective as much as possible.

Tanzania continued to host the largest refugee population on the African continent, almost entirely dependent on international aid. However, in the course of the year the repatriation of Burundian and Congolese accelerated, and there are at the moment a total of some 212,000 refugees whose return will largely, though not exclusively, depend on developments in their countries of origin. The Government of Tanzania maintains its objective to close all camps. Whilst maintaining a certain degree of assistance for camps care and maintenance, DG ECHO focussed more on interventions aimed at facilitating the repatriation process.

## ***Burundi***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Burundi has been a chronic complex emergency resulting from the previous 10 years of civil war and population displacements. However, following the latest peaceful elections and formation of a new government, measures are being taken to prepare for a major repatriation exercise. Living conditions for the population remain difficult, with the country having experienced a decade of war and displacement, restricted access to healthcare and reduced quality of available health services. Burundi currently occupies the first place in DG ECHO's vulnerability rankings

Burundi also hosts three camps for more than 20,300 Congolese refugees and also around 13,000 registered refugees living as urban caseload. This group needs care and maintenance support. The country is also vulnerable to the effects of regional pressures and instability. On the one hand, over 110,000 registered Burundian refugees are still in Tanzania and are supposed to return home with re-integration in 2008-2009.

Generally, the displaced, orphans, children and female-headed households, as well as the Batwa minority (1%), are among the most vulnerable groups within Burundi society. In addition to this, the past years have seen the need for rapid interventions for recurrent epidemics of cholera and meningitis in several provinces.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Burundi has emerged from several years of conflict. The assistance required has concomitantly evolved from a life saving emergency humanitarian aid to rehabilitation and development. Chronic poverty independent of the conflict has left and will for the foreseeable future leave, many Burundians in a very vulnerable position. The return of refugees, though positive, has added to this vulnerability and implied a continuing need for humanitarian assistance despite growing development aid support.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

The principal objective is to save and preserve life in the aftermath of a ten-year civil war in Burundi, entailing major loss of life, physical, psychological or social suffering and material damage.

With a total funding of €19,500,000 in 2007, DG ECHO's intervention strategy was focused on the following specific objectives: (1) **Returnees/Refugees:** to provide multi-sectoral humanitarian assistance to vulnerable populations, comprising displaced persons, returnees, refugees and host communities in areas directly affected by conflict. Special attention has been given to children, adolescents and women; (2) **Special mandates:** to support international agencies in the execution of their special mandates.

This assistance was channeled through a multi sector program (health: 23.18%; food aid: 23.53%; nutrition: 14.34%; sanitation: 6.89%, protection: 15.72%) implemented by NGOs, United Nations agencies and the ICRC.

The impact of the programme has been considerable. In the health sector, 4 provinces with both first and secondary level of care have been supported during the course of the year. In addition, more than 400,000 people received seeds and seed protection food aid. DG ECHO also supported the implementation of the CTC approach to deal with the high chronic malnutrition that is present in Burundi. Within the framework of the fight against cholera, two districts alongside the Tanganyika Lake were provided with potable water and specialized treatment centres as well as receiving hygiene education. Lastly, 50,000 people benefited from DG ECHO supported protection activities. These beneficiaries are Burundian IDPs and repatriated refugees, Congolese refugees and Rwandan asylum seekers.

### *LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country*

In 2007, some water and sanitation activities previously financed by DG ECHO have been taken over by the EC Delegation's "Water Facility" programme and the Belgium cooperation.

A two-year financing proposal in the health sector, funded from the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF B-envelope, has been decided in 2007. This funding of €7,800,000 will focus on support for ten health zones as defined in the Public Health Ministry's National Plan. This support will also cover supervision of health teams, purchase of medicines and aid for the destitute.

The EC Delegation prepared a two year programme with UNICEF and UNHCR (€10,000,000 to be started on 1 January 2008) in order to facilitate the initial phases of reintegration after the return of refugees or expelled people from Tanzania, in addition to a grant that started in September 2007 (€2,000,000). This complements the return package and logistical support provided by DG ECHO in the return process, and it will allow a link with the long term programmes that the EC Delegation started in the areas of return.

## ***Central African Republic***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

At the end of 2006, the actions of rebel groups as well as the increase in the number of bandits ("coupeurs de routes") in the north have exacerbated the humanitarian situation by creating a climate of fear which has led to the displacement of over 200,000 people, many of them to the bush and forest, where people have become even more vulnerable to disease and insecurity. Some have also fled as refugees to neighbouring countries (notably Chad). In their absence, the little infrastructure that existed has been damaged or looted. Crop, seed stocks and tools have been lost. Thus, even if security improves sufficiently to allow a return home, little is left for people to rebuild a livelihood.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

DG ECHO intervened in the country in 2003 and 2004 through the adoption of two decisions targeting needs in the health sector.

At the end of 2006 the northwest and northeast of the country have been severely affected by the increasing activity of domestic and foreign rebel groups. Fighting between government forces and rebels has led to the destruction of hundreds of homes. Human rights abuses including summary executions, rapes and the recruitment of child soldiers have been recorded. Following the deterioration of the living conditions of the displaced and local population, DG ECHO decided to re-engage in the country by funding operations for €7,000,000 starting mid 2007.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The total funding in 2007 amounted to €8,000,000 (€4,000,000 food aid and €4,000,000 on EDF). The principal objective of DG ECHO strategy was to provide assistance to displaced people, refugees, returnees and vulnerable host communities affected by the conflict in order to reduce excess mortality and to promote stabilisation and resettlement. The specific objective aimed at providing them with an integrated multisectoral assistance package.

Achievements are difficult to measure at this point in time since DG ECHO funded operations started in the second half of the year and outcomes will thus be known by mid-2008 only. However, DG ECHO's contribution enabled to target approximately 200,000 beneficiaries (IDPs, refugees, returnees and host communities) in the Northern provinces who are benefiting from water and sanitation, food security, education and protection activities and receiving health services.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

DG ECHO has, as far as possible, focused its activities in areas and sectors already earmarked for future EDF development projects. The EDF has already identified resources for the first phase of their intervention. Discussions are on-going so as to streamline the upcoming DG DEVELOPMENT funding plans with projects funded by DG ECHO. However DG ECHO has decided to remain engaged in the country until mid 2009 in order to better ensure successful LRRD.

## ***Democratic Republic of Congo***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Despite successful elections the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) has not returned to complete peace and stability. Some areas, such as Ituri, Katanga and South Kivu enjoyed calmer times sufficient to attract back refugees and IDPs but in North Kivu renewed conflict has caused fresh suffering and more displacement of populations. There have also been a series of epidemic outbreaks most notably of Ebola virus.

Needs have been quite contrasted. On the one hand, some one million displaced people have had to be assisted to return home and regain their self-sufficiency. Essentially this has required the re-establishment of basic social services and food security. Unfortunately on the other hand some 300,000 people were uprooted by the new conflict in North Kivu and were thrown into urgent need of medical care, water, food and shelter. For the first time in many years displaced people's camps had to be set up.

Tragically violence against women and children has remained a particular problem in DRC, particularly in the East. The victims have required urgent medical and psychological assistance and DG ECHO will continue to target the most vulnerable, particularly women and children.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Humanitarian needs have been in direct relationship with the conflict. At the height of the fighting (1996-2003) development aid was suspended and DG ECHO had a significant programme covering the whole country. With the various peace accords the major fighting subsided increasing humanitarian needs and allowing development aid to resume. This has enabled DG ECHO to reduce its level of assistance but not entirely as patchy conflict has persisted in the East creating continued need for emergency assistance.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The principal objective of DG ECHO's strategy was to contain the mortality and morbidity rates among the targeted population groups within emergency thresholds and to support the resettlement and stabilization process where possible. DG ECHO also wished to continue to be a major contributor to programmes that assist women and children who are victims of sexual violence. In order to achieve this DG ECHO developed a Global plan for €30,000,000 and €10,500,000 input from the food aid decision. In the last quarter of the year, an Ad Hoc decision of €2,000,000 sourced from 9<sup>th</sup> EDF non programmable aid funds, was launched to provide additional assistance to the victims of the North Kivu conflict.

In 2007, DG ECHO funded programmes such as support to health zones, providing care for 12,500 victims of sexual violence; survival kits to 60,000 displaced families; seeds and tools support to 80,000 households; nutritional support to 20,500 children; providing access to schools and schooling material for 35,000 children; rehabilitation of 700 KM of vital access roads; repatriation of 50,000 refugees from neighbouring countries and providing food aid assistance to 1,2 million beneficiaries (through the food aid decision allocation of €8,000,000 to WFP).

In terms of impact an increasing number of partners have shown by local surveys that malnutrition levels and mortality rates have decreased. In most areas they are now below emergency levels (10% Global acute malnutrition and Crude mortality rates of <1.5/10,000/month for adults and 2.5/1000/month for children <5years). They remain directly linked to the security environment and poverty levels. However the most significant statistic is that over 700,000 IDPs and 43,000 refugees have successfully returned home in the course of 2007.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

DG ECHO has continued to hand over health programmes to development partners in those areas that have stabilised. However in North Kivu the process was reversed with several health districts having to turn temporarily back to DG ECHO for extra support to face the increased needs. Despite the elections Government services have been slow to return but development funds are now visibly present, even in the east, where they now surpass emergency funds.

### ***ECHO Flight***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

In DRC there is no safe and reliable linkage between the supply and personnel entry points and the main humanitarian destinations. Overland travel is dangerous and time consuming, or even impossible due to security constraints or absence of infrastructure. Following the improvement in the security situation in DRC, DG ECHO has, also in geographic terms, expanded its engagement in the country. This has created an additional need for air transport.

The use of ECHO Flight services enables humanitarian NGOs to reduce inventory stockpiles at field locations which often run the risk of confiscation or theft by armed bandits or local militia. It increases productivity of field personnel due to the ability to plan rest and recreation rotations at an appropriate frequency; and it increases the quality of humanitarian operations as supervisory visits can be conducted more frequently.

In addition, an airborne stand-by evacuation capacity remains for many agencies a *sine qua non* for continuing project implementation.

#### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Not relevant.

#### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The principal objective of the funding (€7,500,000) was to facilitate the implementation of humanitarian and post-emergency development projects in difficult or inaccessible areas. The specific objectives have been (1) to provide safe, reliable, efficient and cost-effective humanitarian air transport capacity and (2) To create a technical assistance capacity in the field, to assess needs, appraise operational proposals and to coordinate and monitor the implementation of operations.



After a tender process DG ECHO entered into a service agreement with DAC aviation, a private operator, to provide suitable aircraft and operate a safe and reliable hub and spoke service to meet the objectives. This was achieved using three aircraft operating a mixture of a fixed and a flexible schedule. The first year of contract allowed the transportation of 3,427 passengers and 347,772 Kg of cargo. These figures are growing due to additional connexions and partners using the service, resulting in the following score for 2007 the second year of the contract: 8,500 passengers and 850,000 Kg of cargo.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

There are no current plans to hand over this operation to DG Development/EC Delegation but may eventually become a possibility.

## ***Tanzania***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Tanzania continues to host the largest refugee population on the African continent. The refugees are almost entirely dependent on humanitarian aid for survival. At the beginning of 2007 there were 284,975 refugees mainly from Burundi and DRC living in 11 camps in Western Tanzania under UNHCR protection. During 2007 five camps were closed and the refugee population decreased by approximately 72,000, mainly due to Burundian and Congolese repatriation. Despite major improvements in the refugees' countries of origin, most refugees were not yet able to return home. Humanitarian needs include food, water, shelter, protection and health care.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

The relative stabilisation of the political situation in its neighbouring countries has, over the last few years, allowed a staunching and even a reversal of the flow of refugees into Tanzania. Both Burundian and Congolese refugees are now going back to their countries of origin in significant numbers enabling the closure of camps and thus a reduction in the funds required to support care and maintenance activities. The Government of Tanzania hopes to see complete closure of all camps by the end of next year.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The total funding approved for Tanzania was of €12,000,000 in 2007. DG ECHO's first aim was to continue the support it had provided for several years to this refugee "Care and maintenance" operation. The second aim was to support facilitated repatriation of refugees to transit centres in their country of origin.

Programmes were supported in the sectors of water, sanitation, transport, health, food aid, shelter, protection and repatriation. Specific efforts were made to target vulnerable groups, such as unaccompanied minors, disabled people and elderly persons without family support. Attention was paid to gender-related problems, via the Sexual and Gender-Based Violence Programme. Reproductive health services continued to receive support, with Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission of HIV programmes running in every camp. In the sphere of repatriation, the programme was well organised, using the Project Profile registration system as much as possible and achieving the goal of voluntary return in safety and dignity.

In 2007 Burundians and Congolese were repatriated. The general and under-5 mortality rates remained below 1/1000/month and vaccination coverage was over 99%.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

This has been partially addressed by EDF expenditure in three areas: the Special Programme for Refugee-Affected Areas (SPRAA, €2,000,000 - 2001-2007), Article 73 Cotonou support for the longer-term camp sectors of education, environment, health and water/sanitation (€4,000,000 - 2003-2005) and the transfer of food aid to the EC Food Security Budget Line, administered by EuropeAid Co-operation Office (since the end of 2003).

#### ***1.1.4. West Africa***

The repatriation process was completed in Liberia, where DG ECHO focused its support on resuming livelihoods at community level through food assistance and water/sanitation interventions. Good progress was registered in terms of LRRD in the health and food security sectors.

DG ECHO's engagement was substantial in the Sahel, where interventions aimed at addressing the causes of acute malnutrition ranged from therapeutic and supplementary feeding programmes to measures aimed at improved access to primary healthcare and clean water and activities to strengthen coping mechanisms and protect livelihoods. Particular attention was devoted to promoting LRRD.

Activities were funded in Guinea aimed at assessing the nutritional situation, in particular in Conakry, as well as treating acute malnutrition, providing an emergency response to cholera outbreaks, rehabilitating emergency wards and training of medical staff.

Very minor residual activities were funded in Ivory Coast from where DG ECHO completed its exit strategy in 2007.

Emergency response was provided to floods in Togo and Ghana, whereas vaccination campaigns were funded in Liberia and Togo.

### ***Regional West Africa (floods)***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

In August and September 2007, West Africa experienced well above normal rainfall and in some areas, extreme rainfall over very short periods of time. Torrential rains that often exceeded the magnitude of events that recur every 20 years hit, in particular, the south of Burkina Faso and the northern regions of Togo and Ghana in the last weeks of August and early September.

Serious flooding was quickly experienced in the entire Volta river catchment area, especially the Oti river basin and the White and Black Volta basins, causing enormous suffering for the population in the most affected areas. Over a hundred people were reported dead, with many hundreds injured and tens of thousands displaced. Thousands of hectares of farmlands were damaged and many villages became temporarily inaccessible as bridges and roads were washed away.

The mostly mud brick rural houses collapsed and many households lost most of their belongings. Coping mechanisms and livelihoods were seriously affected with the loss of crops, food stocks and farm animals. Wells were flooded and polluted, increasing the high risk of water borne diseases.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Not relevant

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements in 2007***

An emergency financial decision of €2,000,000 has been adopted covering Burkina Faso, Ghana and Togo. Around 350,000 persons have benefited from multi-sector relief and recovery assistance such as emergency shelters, food and emergency food security measures, or non food items, water, sanitation and environmental health interventions.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

The respective EC Delegations have requested funds from the 9<sup>th</sup> EDF B-envelope for food security measures and rehabilitation, linking our emergency response to specific medium term recovery measures.

## ***Ivory Coast***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

The overall humanitarian situation has been improving since last year because of a better political stability and efforts from the stakeholders to improve the situation. The remaining humanitarian needs are now covered by development and governmental actors.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Since 2002, DG ECHO has supported the most vulnerable populations with a special emphasis on health, food security, protection and humanitarian coordination. The resolution of conflict has allowed the re-establishment of main governmental functions in most parts of the country. Since then, the humanitarian situation should improve if the election process follows in due course.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

DG ECHO has finalized its conflict related actions on June 2007. Nevertheless, with the remaining funds from the 2006 decision and €500,000 additional funding from the food aid decision, DG ECHO has pursued its assistance in protection, health access, support to children and women affected by the conflict, nutrition activities and humanitarian coordination in the most vulnerable areas.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy from the sector and/or country***

The EC Delegation has increasingly supported the recovery process through large emergency rehabilitation programme, taking over some of DG ECHO's core activities such as health, water or sanitation. DG ECHO is now monitoring the humanitarian situation from the Dakar RSO.

## ***Guinea***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

The deterioration of the internal situation in Guinea has been a source of immediate concern for the whole of West Africa and the country has been close to a civil war. At the beginning of 2007 a third open-ended strike has been supported by an important part of the population in all the country, accompanied by demonstrations in the streets and uncontrolled revolts. The strong reaction from the government through the police and military forces led to between 137 and 183 civilian deaths and over 1,500 wounded during the events of January and February. On 12 February the country was declared to be in a state of siege effectively transferring control of the state to the military. Weeks of strikes and violent demonstrations followed.

Access to food and to essential services was disrupted during these months with a very negative impact on the humanitarian situation of the most vulnerable. Food supplies were not guaranteed in markets and prices were too high for many people. Health centres collapsed as their capacities were overstretched. The 2007 cholera (endemic in Guinea) epidemic was worst than normal due to the higher vulnerability during this year, with a total of 8,546 cases with 310 deaths reported (lethality rate of 3.6%). The degradation of the health status and the poor access to food had had also had a negative impact on the nutritional status of children.

The last Liberian refugee camps in Guinea have been closed during 2007 and most of the refugees have been returned to Liberia but some of them have stayed and opted to be integrated within the local communities.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years***

Not relevant

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In June 2007, a €2,000,000 ad hoc decision with a duration of 12 months was adopted for Guinea to assist the most vulnerable population affected by the internal crisis and the events of January and February. This decision covers four major sectors: (1) Improvement of the analysis of the humanitarian situation through the assessment of the nutritional situation in the country and particularly in Conakry, (2) Improvement of the system to treat acute malnutrition through launching and implementing a new protocol at national level including community-based therapeutic care and use of ready-to-use food, (3) Emergency cholera response through the treatment of cholera caseloads and through the integration of prevention measures in the frontline of the response and (4) Reinforcement of the medical emergency system by rehabilitating emergency wards and training of staff in the 10 major hospitals and by reinforcing the capacity of the Guinean Red Cross in terms of first aid.

In December 2006, a €2,000,000 ad hoc decision had been adopted – and implemented in 2007 - for Liberia and Guinea, out of which €400,000 was earmarked for Guinea to maintain assistance to refugees and vulnerable populations during 2007. The amount allocated to Guinea was used to guarantee the essential health and water and sanitation services for the refugee population still living in the camps before the closure, but also to adapt these services to those who will be finally integrated in the camps and to transfer the rest of the services and facilities to the local communities.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

The European Commission has finally started to implement a project of €12,000,000 (9<sup>th</sup> EDF) to support community rehabilitation, peace building and income generating activities in conflict-affected areas of the country. These actions are including the areas where the refugees were settled as well as the areas where refugees are being integrated.

On the other hand, discussions are in progress to see how the actions funded by DG ECHO in response to the overall degradation of public services in the country can be considered for funding from other programmes of the European Commission with a longer term approach. These actions are focused on the reinforcement of the capacities for emergencies, the treatment of children suffering acute malnutrition and an integrated approach to respond to cholera.

### ***Liberia***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

Since the end of the conflict in Liberia, the humanitarian needs in the country have evolved greatly. 5 years of continuous support from the international community have enabled the return of IDPs and more than 110,000 refugees in their communities. Over these five years, important efforts have been made to support the resumption of the population access to basic services and to provide support to restart farming activities.

Today still important efforts are still being made to foster re-integration. However the challenges were great and the situation in the country is still very difficult: (1) full substitution remains the main characteristic of the health sector in the country despite all the efforts of a committed Ministry of Health ; (2) the situation in the water and sanitation sector has improved in areas of return but a lot remains to be done in numerous rural communities as well as in urban areas especially Monrovia, where regular cholera outbreaks occur and (3) food insecurity is still prevalent in numerous counties though efforts have been made to improve the situation. Furthermore acute and chronic malnutrition rates are confirming a very slow evolution of the situation in numerous counties while in Monrovia the very difficult living conditions in large parts of the city have led to a worrying rise in the global acute malnutrition rate i.e. 17% while the alert level for emergency intervention is 15%.

In terms of geographical coverage, the country can be divided into different parts:

- 1) The counties considered as the food-basket of the country namely Lofa, Nimba and Bong. These counties have had to deal with a large number of returnees but have been supported by the International Community. It is very likely that support will be pursued in these counties since they represent important development opportunities.
- 2) Most of the others counties, except Montserrado, (the capital county which has its own features), are facing a difficult situation since humanitarian needs can be considered as chronic. This is particularly true for the south east of the country which has been long forgotten.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Humanitarian aid has evolved from direct support to repatriation of both IDPs and refugees and the attempt to resume access to basic services, to activities more focused on reintegration and restoration of livelihoods.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

2007 has seen the end of the repatriation process of refugees and has focused on initiating the resumption of livelihoods at community level through food assistance and water and sanitation interventions. In the health sector the objective was to continue the provision of support and to attempt to secure the basis for a proper hand over of our support. A total of €16,600,000, including €3,000,000 for food aid, was allocated in support of vulnerable Liberian populations.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

The achievements of the project supported in 2007 have laid interesting basis to envisage 2008 as the year for the phasing out of humanitarian aid in Liberia. The main features of DG ECHO support in 2008, was support for mainly ongoing partners to consolidate previous interventions and to mainstream the targeting of the 'forgotten' most vulnerable into the development agenda within the maximum potential contract duration of 18 months.

Despite the difficulties encountered with the inadequate staffing in the EC Delegation in Monrovia blocking progress to secure a proper LRRD strategy, some improvement can be noted: (1) in the health sector, ongoing discussions are taking place, to secure a link between DG ECHO supported interventions and the 10<sup>th</sup> EDF. The final outcome of these discussions should determine whether humanitarian aid can be phased out in 2008; (2) the LRRD strategy in the food security sector has been completed and DG ECHO should be able to phase out from this sector at the end of 2008. A first €4,000,000 call for proposals to be funded from the LRRD's budget line of the FSTP (Food Security Thematic Programme) has been launched by the EC Delegation. This should be followed in 2009 by the launching of a second and last call for €6,000,000 and (3) in the water and sanitation sector, DG ECHO has contributed to a consortium of 5 NGOs which defined a 5-year strategy supported by various donors. This intervention enabled the mainstreaming of remaining humanitarian needs into a 5-year plan whose global objective is geared towards development.

### ***The Sahel region***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

Lessons learned from the nutritional crisis in 2005 in Niger and Mali, massive concern over the continued very high Global Acute Malnutrition rates throughout the Sahel (regularly over the 15% emergency threshold) and the hangover of the damage done to the coping mechanisms of the most vulnerable households from the 2005 crisis led to the preparation and implementation of a Sahel Global Plan for a total of €25,000,000 (€15,000,000 from the humanitarian budget and €10,000,000 from the food aid budget) for action to reduce acute malnutrition and infant and maternal mortality in 5 Sahel countries (Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania and Niger). UNICEF estimate that 4 million children until the age of 5 years suffer from chronic under nutrition with under nutrition being held responsible for 56% of all child deaths. This translates into the harsh calculation that half (300,000) of the 600,000

children who die before reaching 5 years of age do so from malnutrition or related causes. Infant and maternal mortality rates in the Sahel are amongst the worst in the world and without swift and sustainable action the Sahel will not reach the Millennium Development Goals (MDG).

The causes of acute malnutrition in the Sahel are multi-sector and therefore action to deal with it needs to be equally multi-sectoral. DG ECHO partners were invited in early 2007 to submit concept papers on their actual or proposed work to tackle malnutrition in the Sahel. A total of 81 such papers were received which showed the extent of the problem and demonstrated the large interest amongst humanitarian actors in action to try and resolve this enormous "silent" emergency. It was clear that an integrated approach involving both humanitarian and development aid instruments was needed. DG ECHO's Sahel Global Plan was designed as a LRRD (Linking Relief Rehabilitation and Development) strategy from the beginning.

Interventions funded in 2007 ranged from therapeutic and supplementary feeding programmes to measures to improve access to primary health care and clean water and activities to strengthen coping mechanisms and protect livelihoods.

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years*

Experience with activities to respond to the 2005 nutritional crisis in Niger and Mali provided DG ECHO with good indicators for a road map to deal with the similar problems in the other countries of the Western Sahel region in 2007. In Niger, hundreds of thousands of children were treated in more than a thousand feeding centres. Modern nutritional protocols, approaches and products especially the new RUTF (ready to use therapeutic foods) such as Plump Nut were introduced and have become nationally adopted. The Government adopted a waiver of healthcare user fees for the <5's and pregnant and lactating women which has since become national policy, obligatory since March 2007. International funding levels to sustain the massive outside response effort gradually lessened towards the end of 2006, prompting a transition of humanitarian programmes into national structures.

The inadequate nature and scope of early warning analysis and response systems, that had failed to recognise the full nutritional scope of the crisis, was another fundamental subject of the crisis that has become a focus for improvement.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

Around 800 nutritional facilities treated close to 300,000 children < 5 in 2007 in Niger, receiving important support from DG ECHO (half of the €25,000,000 mobilised under the 2007 Sahel Plan, 70% of which for direct nutritional care). In order to improve early warning information, livelihoods analysis methodologies that are more sensitive to acute under nutrition were introduced and regional linkages developed with expert organisations. In 2007, appropriate quality nutrition responses and the required specialised nutritional inputs (such as Plump Nut) were scaled up and expanded from Niger to the other 4 main Sahel countries. This includes the promotion of lessons learned, the support of effective regional, national and local coordination of programmes and information as well as donor coordination, involving notably the EC Delegations, the EU Member States and other missions such as the World Bank as well as regional bodies (ECOWAS, CILSS).

## ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Malnutrition can only be dealt with in a sustainable way through an integrated and articulated aid strategy involving all aid instruments. DG ECHO's Sahel strategy was therefore designed from the onset as an LRRD strategy involving the Commission's humanitarian and development aid instruments. A DG ECHO antenna was set up in the EC Delegation in Niamey, Niger and another is planned for the EC Delegation in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.

During 2007, a particular effort was therefore made to work closely with the EC Delegations and Headquarters services to ensure the inclusion of humanitarian concerns such as malnutrition and high infant and maternal mortality rates in the Country Strategy Papers (CSP) and National Indicative Programmes (NIP) being prepared for financing under the 10<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund. This was achieved with varying results.

A continued and sustained effort will be needed to ensure that commitments taken in the CSP translate into concrete actions funded in the NIP. For the Sahel states, progress towards achieving Millennium Development Goal (MDG) n° 1 (reduction of hunger) and MDG n° 4 and 5 (reduction of infant and maternal mortality) will depend on the success of this articulated approach involving short term action (humanitarian aid) to save lives today while at the same time building capacity and allocating long term resources (development aid) to tackling under-nutrition in a sustainable way.

## ***Epidemics (regional)***

### ***Humanitarian Needs***

West African countries are highly vulnerable to communicable diseases because of their structural weakness, poverty, lack of basic sanitation facilities, low hygiene standards and malnutrition. Some of these countries are still struggling with the aftermath of conflict situation. They are particularly prone to epidemics of Cholera, Meningitis, Lassa and Yellow Fever and Hepatitis E. The region is also seeing an increased risk of avian influenza epidemic with confirmed animal cases in Niger, Ivory Coast, Burkina Faso, Benin, Ghana and Nigeria where the first human case was confirmed in January 2007.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In February 2006, a €1,250,000 decision (ECHO/-WF/BUD/2006/01000) was taken to respond in a timely and effective way against epidemics in West Africa. This decision lasted for 18 months, until August 2007, covering 1 dry season and 2 rainy seasons.

In 2007, Burkina Faso was ravaged by a large meningitis epidemic reporting more than 26,000 cases; the WHO operational response to the epidemic was funded partially through this decision. During the 2007 rainy season, cholera outbreaks occurred in various countries including Guinea Conakry, Sierra Leone and Liberia. Lassa fever cases were reported in Liberia and Sierra Leone. None of them required DG ECHO support within the epidemics decision. In Togo, DG-ECHO supported WHO for the implementation of a vaccination campaign against Yellow Fever. In Liberia, after years of vaccination programme disruption, a high risk of measles epidemic was contained due to DG-ECHO support to the measles vaccination campaign of UNICEF. Rapid evaluation and timely response are important to epidemics containment and reducing the risk of becoming major humanitarian emergencies. In this perspective, DG-ECHO funded WHO for the third consecutive year for conducting



rapid field risk assessments during the initial phases of the epidemics facilitating the operational response and resources mobilization.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Most African countries still need external support to respond in a timely manner and/or to prevent recurrent epidemics. Outbreak detection and control intervention have been improved in certain countries mainly due to better epidemic surveillance and Early Warning Systems but, the availability of donor support has been reduced and Governments contingency plans are rare or not sufficiently funded. Health systems still have neither the capacity to absorb the increased number of patients nor the resources to respond to the epidemics using public health measures.

Certain epidemics require a high level of expertise which is not available at the country level. As such, the recurrent health emergencies in most of the African countries need considerable and sustainable efforts in terms of coordination, including information management, of technical support and of resource mobilization.

#### ***1.1.5. Southern Africa and Indian Ocean***

The socio-economic collapse in Zimbabwe was further compounded by problems common to Southern Africa, like high rates of HIV/AIDS, declining soil productivity and erratic rainfall. Against this background, DG ECHO's objective was to reinforce the coping mechanisms of the vulnerable populations, including orphans and other vulnerable children, in particular in the areas of food security at household level, access to safe water and basic sanitation facilities, as well as HIV/AIDS prevention.

Emergency decisions were adopted in response to floods and cyclones affecting Madagascar and Mozambique.

The return of some 60,000 Congolese to DRC was assisted from two camps in Zambia.

Drought-related food shortages were addressed in Lesotho and Swaziland.

### ***Lesotho / Swaziland***

As a result of severe drought-related food shortages in the countries concerned, a total of €5,819,167 was mobilised from the food aid budget line for food aid, emergency food security and nutrition interventions.

### ***Mozambique***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

Mozambique is a country with an extremely high level of chronic vulnerability affecting a large proportion of the population. This vulnerability is compounded by the effects of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, as well as various climatic phenomena such as erratic rainfall patterns, cyclones, floods and drought. As in neighbouring Madagascar, floods and cyclones were a major problem in the first part of 2007.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Not applicable (emergency)

#### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

A €2,000,000 primary emergency funding decision, adopted in February 2007 provided support to alleviating the effects of cyclone Favio in central Mozambique by funding health, water and sanitation, food aid and logistics interventions. An emergency funding decision, also for €2,000,000 and adopted in February, provided support to emergency relief, water and sanitation, health and food aid interventions for vulnerable populations affected by flooding in the lower Zambezi Valley. This was followed by additional funding of €3,000,000 in August, with the objective of supporting the recovery of flood-affected populations.

### ***Zambia***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

Zambia has been one of the major host countries for refugees in Africa. With the improvement of the political situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo, it became possible to launch the phased repatriation of some 60,000 Congolese refugees from two camps in northern Zambia. The repatriation was interrupted by incidents in Goma in August 2007, but resumed thereafter and is foreseen to continue in 2008.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in 2007***

Not applicable (emergency)

#### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

A funding decision for €2,000,000, adopted in August 2007, aimed to support the logistics and transport of the first phase of the repatriation, to be continued in 2008.

#### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Not applicable in this particular context.

### ***Zimbabwe***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

In 2007 Zimbabwe continued to be immersed in a profound crisis, further aggravated as of July by the Government's price-control policy, which was intended to curb inflation. The policy has, however, had the opposite effect, as inflation spiralled to over 100,000% by the year's end. Furthermore, in addition to the already chronic shortages of fuel, spare parts, essential drugs, electricity, water and other commodities, the enforced slashing of prices resulted in shelves being emptied overnight, and put many producers and suppliers out of business, whilst others suspended production – even of basic foodstuffs such as meat and milk. The socio-economic collapse is further compounded by problems common to the Southern African sub-region – high rates of people infected and affected by HIV/AIDS, declining soil productivity and erratic rainfall. Despite improved food production in 2006,

which was much closer to the needs of the country than in 2005, an estimated 1.9 million people were in need of food assistance in the agricultural season 2006/2007.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

The levels of humanitarian funding have remained fairly steady over the last five years, from €13,000,000 in 2003 to €15,000,000 in 2004 and 2005, to €12,000,000 in 2006 and a total of €15,200,000 in 2007. Though efforts have been made to try to gradually reduce assistance in 2006 and 2007, when an initial allocation of €8,000,000 was made, the deterioration in the humanitarian situation in Zimbabwe has meant that levels of funding have had to be increased.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The principal objective of 2007 humanitarian interventions was to mitigate the impact of socio-economic breakdown in Zimbabwe by reinforcing the coping mechanisms of the vulnerable populations. In February 2007 the Commission adopted a Global Plan for Zimbabwe of €8,000,000 with duration of 18 months. Based on the strategy developed by DG ECHO and its partners, the Global Plan focused on reinforcing immediate food security needs at household level; on increasing access to safe water sources and basic sanitation facilities and on provision of an integrated assistance, including non-food items, water and sanitation and HIV/AIDS prevention to IDPs. Vulnerable groups, including people living with HIV/AIDS, orphans and other vulnerable children (OVC) and IDPs were provided with the improved food security conditions; increased access to safe water and sanitation facilities, and improved health, hygiene and HIV/AIDS protection knowledge.

As the humanitarian situation deteriorated in the second half of the year, the Commission in December 2007 adopted an additional funding decision of €7,200,000 with an increased focus on supporting emergency health and epidemic interventions.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Though the 10<sup>th</sup> EDF provides an allocation of funding for Zimbabwe, it seems unlikely that the CSP will be signed, as development cooperation remains suspended by the Council Decision of 18 February 2002. The EC financial support is re-oriented to programmes in direct benefit of the Zimbabwean population, social sectors, democratisation, respect for human rights and the rule of law. It is therefore not possible at this stage to engage in a comprehensive LRRD process in Zimbabwe in the absence of an improvement in and stabilization of the political situation.

## ***Madagascar***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Madagascar is a country with an extremely high level of chronic vulnerability affecting a large proportion of the population. This vulnerability is compounded by the effects of the various climatic phenomena such as erratic rainfall patterns, cyclones, floods and drought. Floods and cyclones were a major problem in the first part of 2007.

## *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years*

Not applicable (emergency)

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

A €1,500,000 emergency funding decision, adopted in March 2007 provided support to vulnerable populations affected by flooding in the north-east of the country, whilst a second €1,500,000 emergency decision adopted in April aimed to alleviate the effects of cyclone Indlala. Both decisions supported health, water and sanitation, food aid and logistics interventions.

### *LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country*

Not applicable

## **1.2 CARIBBEAN AND PACIFIC**

Assistance to 50,000 people affected by hurricane Dean was provided in Belize, Dominica, Haiti, Jamaica and St. Lucia, whereas 120,000 hit by tropical storm Noel were assisted in Haiti and the Dominican Republic.

Humanitarian needs remain high in Haiti, where interventions were funded in the sectors of health, water, sanitation, food and emergency relief items.

A rapid response was provided to the tsunami in the Solomon Islands.

Funding covered the following issues / countries:

Country (Region)	Funding Decisions adopted in 2007			Agreements signed in 2007		
	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL
<b>CARRIBEAN / PACIFIC</b>	<b>10.310.000</b>	<b>2.000.000</b>	<b>12.310.000</b>	<b>8.346.474</b>	<b>650.000</b>	<b>8.996.474</b>
Solomon Islands	550.000		550.000	547.939		547.939
Caribbean	7.260.000		7.260.000	5.299.043		5.299.043
Haiti	2.500.000	2.000.000	4.500.000	2.499.492	650.000	3.149.492

### *1.2.1. Caribbean*

#### *Humanitarian needs*

The Caribbean region is prone to frequent natural disasters, especially hurricanes and floods, which had a great impact in 2007. The region's vulnerability is accentuated by high population density, fast demographic growth and great poverty. This results in communities with few coping capacities in the event of disaster. In 2007, DG ECHO continued to provide community-based Disaster Preparedness, through its DIPECHO programme, as well as Emergency Relief.

DG ECHO also supported Disaster Management capacity in the Caribbean via the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) throughout 2007 helping National Red Cross Societies to respond more effectively to disasters (Decision of €500,000 adopted 22/12/06).

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Since 2003, DG ECHO has provided all three types of humanitarian aid described above. DG ECHO has provided humanitarian assistance for more than €40,000,000.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The objective of providing a rapid response to disasters was met via 2 regional funding decisions. Hurricane Dean struck the Caribbean in August 2007, leaving a path of destruction that affected several Caribbean islands, as well as Belize. The hurricane's impact left thousands of poor families in need of emergency assistance. DG ECHO's Emergency decision supported relief actions in Belize, Dominica, Haiti, Jamaica and St Lucia, assisting 50,000 people. Projects provided livelihood support for hundreds of farmers and fishermen, reconstruction in the health sector (especially in Jamaica) and distributions of food and essential relief items. (Total funding of €3,000,000 supported these actions.)

There was also an Emergency decision post-Tropical Storm Noel for Haiti and the Dominican Republic. At the end of October and early in November 2007, the island of Hispaniola was severely affected by the passage of Tropical Storm Noel, followed by a low pressure system (a "Tropical Wave") producing more heavy rainfall. Both storms caused devastation in the Dominican Republic and Haiti, with huge persistent floods and mudslides. The emergency decision of €2,500,000 adopted on 13 December, assisted 120,000 people with emergency assistance in the sectors of food; non-food items; water; sanitation; health; livelihoods; agricultural and emergency rehabilitation.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

After Hurricane Dean, some European Development Funds were allocated to rehabilitation in Jamaica and to banana recovery in Dominica and St Lucia.

## ***Dominican Republic***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

There are frequent natural disasters affecting vulnerable people, as described above for the region.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

DG ECHO provides Technical Assistance for all humanitarian aid operations in the Caribbean region, from its office in Santo Domingo. DG ECHO was first present in the region in Haiti in 1994, and since 1998 has been based in the Dominican Republic. Essential services of need assessment, monitoring and disaster response are provided.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The first response to Tropical Storm Noel was a Primary Emergency decision adopted in November 2007 for the Dominican Republic alone (€1,500,000). This decision helped to meet urgent needs, including support for the Pan American Health Organization to undertake fumigation and destruction of rats, in response to dengue fever and leptospirosis, in close co-operation with the national authorities.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

In the above operations there were components linking relief to development, such as rehabilitation of sewage systems and donation of water equipment. DG ECHO works closely with other Commission services, which are undertaking Disaster prevention and Risk reduction programmes in the region.

## ***Haiti***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Haiti is considered to be a fragile state, which is struggling to increase its stability and to improve its economic performance. It suffers both from structural problems that cause severe poverty and from regular livelihood crises. Access to most basic public services, like health services or safe drinking water, is comparable to the severest cases in Sub-Saharan Africa. The food security of most households is directly linked to recurrent natural disasters (i.e. hurricane, flood and environment depredation) that strike the country every year. The country is not only affected by flash floods, but is also in the path of Atlantic Storms from June to November. The 2007 Atlantic season was particularly bad with mid-size events registered in the whole country. Floods in the South, Centre, West and North-Eastern part of the country have taken a huge toll on the livelihoods of the population (i.e. harvests lost, cattle killed and back gardens destroyed). An Evaluation funded by DG ECHO in 2007 showed Under-5 Mortality of 86/1,000 and national acute malnutrition of over 9%, with entire Departments at 12-18%.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Between 1995 and 2007 over €49,000,000 was allocated to Haiti by DG ECHO. Concerning recent years, in 2004 and 2005 €8,500,000 in humanitarian aid was provided by DG ECHO in response to the socio-economic crisis, including Emergency Health and Protection. In 2006 there was an emergency flood response.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

There were 2 funding decisions for flood relief in Haiti in 2007: €1,500,000 in January and €1,000,000 in November. Assistance was provided in the sectors of health, water, sanitation, food and emergency relief items. Haiti also had funding (€2,000,000) under DG ECHO's 2nd Food Aid decision 2007. Food security, Community Therapeutic Care and Malnutrition programmes were also provided.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

DG ECHO works closely with other Commission services, which are undertaking Disaster prevention and Risk reduction programmes in the region.

#### ***1.2.2. Pacific region***

The Pacific region experienced many natural disasters, especially cyclones, earthquakes and floods. In 2007 DG ECHO provided emergency relief to the Solomon Islands.

### ***Solomon Islands***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

In April 2007 an underwater earthquake of magnitude 8.1 caused a tsunami of several meters hitting the Solomon Islands. The tsunami reached the shore within 3 minutes. The waves crashed into some of the western islands and disaster warnings were issued across the Pacific region. There were 18 aftershocks with magnitude higher than 5.0. Whilst only the initial shock was strong enough to generate a significant tsunami, the other earthquakes caused further damage, particularly to structures that were already damaged from the initial shock. The death toll was at least 52, and there were many displaced and homeless people, requiring urgent assistance. Approximately 50,000 people were affected out of a total population of 552,438.

#### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

DG ECHO provided a rapid response to the Solomon Islands Tsunami, leading to an Emergency decision (€550,000) to assist 5,000 people in the sectors of shelter, health, water, sanitation, education and relief items.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

In the above operations, there were components linking relief to development were provided such as the donation of water and sanitation equipment, training of maintenance teams, rain harvesting systems and community preparedness for child trauma response to disasters.

## 2. EASTERN EUROPE, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, SOUTHERN CAUCASUS, CENTRAL ASIA, INCLUDING MONGOLIA

The situation in this geographical region is characterised by an overall positive evolution of the protracted crises that have required a Commission humanitarian intervention in the past years, allowing an exit strategy expressed in: a reduction of the size of the humanitarian aid programme (phasing down –for example in the Caucasus), an end of humanitarian aid (phasing out –like in Tajikistan) as well as a process of hand-over to development-oriented instruments (LRRD- in Georgia and Tajikistan).

At the same time, the region remains vulnerable to hazards to which national structures do not always provide a sufficient response capacity and which the more vulnerable segments of the population do not have the coping mechanisms to overcome. In those cases, DG ECHO stands ready to intervene on the basis of humanitarian needs assessments (e.g. in Moldova in 2007).

Funding in this geographical region was to provide humanitarian assistance in the following countries / areas:

Country (Region)	Funding Decisions adopted in 2007			Agreements signed in 2007		
	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL
<b>NIS</b>	<b>22.500.000</b>	<b>3.307.118</b>	<b>25.807.118</b>	<b>23.421.931</b>	<b>3.185.531</b>	<b>26.607.462</b>
Caucasus, Northern (Chechnya)	17.500.000	3.307.118	20.807.118	17.580.087	3.185.531	20.765.618
Caucasus, South (Georgia)	2.000.000		2.000.000	2.791.844		2.791.844
Moldova	3.000.000		3.000.000	3.000.000		3.000.000
Tajikistan				50.000		50.000

### *Northern Caucasus*

#### *Humanitarian needs*

According to DG ECHO's Global Needs Assessment, Chechnya is still ranked among the areas with great vulnerability and is likely to remain a forgotten crisis, even if the severity of the crisis has decreased.

Entirely destroyed by two devastating conflicts, Chechnya is now recovering and engaged in a significant reconstruction process focusing largely on the physical rehabilitation of buildings and infrastructure and does not target the most vulnerable populations, whose humanitarian needs remain often unattended.

Although there is still a heavy military presence and attacks targeting security forces, the conflict is virtually over and most of the people displaced in the region have come back to rebuild their lives. Human rights organisations continue to report severe violations of human rights, notably abductions, torture and fabricated judiciary cases, but in decrease with regard to the previous years.



The reconstruction effort started in 2006 focused largely on the physical rehabilitation of buildings and infrastructure and does not target the most vulnerable populations, whose humanitarian needs remain often unattended.

According to DG ECHO's Global Needs Assessment, Chechnya is still ranked among the areas with great vulnerability and is likely to remain a forgotten crisis, even if the severity of the crisis has decreased.

While security in Chechnya has very significantly improved for the civilian population, the situation in the rest of the region has steadily deteriorated in the last few years, notably in Ingushetia, but with no noticeable humanitarian impact.

The situation for the Chechen refugees hosted in Azerbaijan did not change in 2007 and they remain a forgotten and under-assisted caseload with significant protection problems and no durable solutions in sight, which justified a continued support from DG ECHO.

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years*

The Commission has been supporting victims in the Northern Caucasus since the beginning of the Chechen conflict. However, recent socio-economic improvements and the successful implementation of reconstruction projects mean that the Commission is now able to begin phasing out its activities. Five years ago, the humanitarian assistance provided by DG ECHO was covering most humanitarian sectors including food aid, non food items, water and sanitation and medical activities. Nowadays, assistance is focusing on those sectors (with incomplete LRRD process) and those areas (in particular those which have been more recently accessible) where needs remain.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

This forgotten humanitarian crisis was one of DG ECHO's operational priorities in 2007, with funding totalling €20,807,118. The European Commission continued to be the main donor in the region.

DG ECHO concentrated its efforts on the most urgent needs of the population, i.e. protection (including for Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Ingushetia and Dagestan and for the refugees from Chechnya hosted in Azerbaijan and in Georgia, who represent forgotten caseloads), shelter for those still displaced within Chechnya and food security as well as support to livelihoods, notably for those who are excluded from food aid lists and for those returning to their homes. Considering the very poor health status of the population, specific programmes continued to be supported in areas where the Government was not covering the needs, notably with regard to mother and child healthcare and support to handicapped people. DG ECHO continued also to pay specific attention to children, who suffered tremendously in this conflict, in particular through psycho-social assistance.

Difficulties to enter Chechnya remained a concern for several DG ECHO partners, less for security reason than because of the Russian Authorities' administrative procedures (e.g. stricter rules on visa).

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

DG ECHO has engaged in LRRD discussions with local authorities in Chechnya and Ingushetia, directly and through its partners, which resulted in the authorities agreeing to take over activities in water and sanitation, basic education and partly psycho-social support to children.

The special TACIS programme of €20,000,000 for the North Caucasus, which was supposed to start in 2006, was signed one year later by the Russian side and projects started in 2007.

However, no real LRRD process will take place as the activities funded by TACIS only partly correspond to the priorities suggested by DG ECHO due to political considerations, and no further specific assistance programme for the North Caucasus will be implemented beyond this TACIS allocation.

### ***Southern Caucasus (Georgia)***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

In Georgia, DG ECHO gradually started the handing over of its activities to other Commission services, which are focusing on rehabilitation and development programmes. DG ECHO phased out from Western Georgia. However, humanitarian needs remained in Abkhazia due to the unresolved conflict with Georgia and the international isolation of this de-facto independent republic.

#### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years***

Due to the unresolved and forgotten character of the conflict, the humanitarian assistance provided by DG ECHO, amounting €2,000,000 over the last three years, has not evolved.

Five years ago, the humanitarian assistance provided by DG ECHO was mainly composed of food aid, non food items, water and sanitation and medical activities. Nowadays, assistance is focusing only on the areas of remaining greatest needs such as livelihood support activities, shelter and protection.

#### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

With €2,000,000 funding, DG ECHO provided assistance in two main types of activities aimed at improving living conditions for the most vulnerable segments of the population in Abkhazia and helped them regain a minimum of self-sufficiency: food security/income generation projects and the improvement of shelter conditions, especially for returnees.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

An EC rehabilitation programme for Abkhazia funded under the new European Neighbourhood Policy has been agreed. Once implementation is underway, this should allow DG ECHO to phase out from Abkhazia, provided the situation does not deteriorate.

## ***Moldova***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

In 2007, Moldova was hit by a severe drought, which affected 80% of the country. The drought inflicted serious damage to the agricultural sector and in particular was a harsh blow for the most vulnerable small farmers who depend on livestock and home gardens.

In a country which is the poorest in Europe, where 61 % of the population live in rural areas and the majority of urban dwellers have relatives in villages, the availability of grain stocks in peasant farms is not only an insurance reserve (seeds, flour and bread) for themselves, but in lean years it also provides a buffer for urban relatives against bread price increases in cities.

The reduced availability of water has also sharply decreased household production from home gardens, a key source of food staples for almost all rural families. In addition, the lack of pasture and fodder and the need to purchase expensive food to replace that no longer being produced in the gardens, has forced a large number of households to sell part of their livestock for cash for food purchasing in the short term.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years***

Not relevant: one-off intervention.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The objective of DG ECHO funding in Moldova in 2007 (€3,000,000) has been to ensure the availability of food for small-scale farmers and agricultural workers in the southern districts of Moldova, through assistance aiming at maintaining the remaining livestock assets. The priority before and over the coming winter was to preserve what is left of livestock assets by distributing fodder and feedstuffs to small-scale farmers and agricultural workers. A re-assessment of the humanitarian situation has been foreseen in 2008.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

The provision of humanitarian aid was needed due to the particular acuteness of the 2007 drought. A more structural food security approach is needed to tackle the challenges of the agricultural sector and DG ECHO is advocating that such approach be adopted by instruments under the European Neighbouring Policy.

## ***Tajikistan***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Tajikistan continues to recover from the disastrous effects of civil war from 1992 to 1997, and drought between 1999 and 2001. Progress has, however, been made over the last few years in terms of both political stability and strong economic growth which allow the phasing out of DG ECHO intervention from this country.

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years*

The Commission has been providing humanitarian aid to Tajikistan for total funding of €39,000,000 since 2002.

In 2003 a three-year phasing out strategy was decided and effectively put in place resulting in completing DG ECHO humanitarian aid while support in disaster preparedness continued through the DIPECHO Action Plans.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

In May 2006, the European Commission adopted its final package of humanitarian assistance in favour of vulnerable populations in Tajikistan. This last decision (€5,000,000) financed operations in health, water and sanitation, and food assistance sectors, which were implemented during the last semester 2006 and the first semester 2007. DG ECHO continues to remain active in Tajikistan through its DIPECHO Action Plan for Central Asia, and continues to closely monitor the humanitarian situation in Tajikistan.

### *LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country*

With the end of DG ECHO funding, some of these interventions succeeded to be financed by other European Commission cooperation instruments.

### 3. MEDITERRANEAN AND MIDDLE EAST

In 2007, DG ECHO continued its large-scale intervention in response to the humanitarian needs of the Palestinian populations affected by the further aggravated crisis, both in the occupied Palestinian territories as well as in Lebanon.

In addition, increased humanitarian needs linked to the crisis in Iraq prompted a humanitarian response inside Iraq as well as in neighbouring countries, host to a large refugee caseload.

The response to man-made disasters continued in the region with the provision of assistance to the Sahrawi refugees in Algeria, and with a small-scale response to the situation in Yemen.

Funding in these regions was to provide humanitarian assistance in respect of the following crises:

Country (Region)	Funding Decisions adopted in 2007			Agreements signed in 2007		
	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL
<b>MIDDLE EAST &amp; MEDITERRANEAN</b>	<b>70.790.000</b>	<b>28.300.000</b>	<b>99.090.000</b>	<b>80.143.742</b>	<b>24.550.000</b>	<b>104.693.742</b>
West Bank & Gaza (Palestinian population)	36.700.000	23.300.000	60.000.000	35.185.000	22.800.000	57.985.000
Lebanon, Syria and Jordan (Palestinian Refugees)	10.300.000		10.300.000	23.535.084		23.535.084
Iraq Crisis	17.800.000		17.800.000	11.676.259		11.676.259
Western Sahara	5.000.000	5.000.000	10.000.000	8.757.399	1.750.000	10.507.399
Yemen	990.000		990.000	990.000		990.000

#### *Occupied Palestinian Territories (West Bank and Gaza Strip), Lebanon, Jordan and Syria (Palestinian crisis)*

##### *Humanitarian needs*

Over seven years of conflict following the start of the second intifada, the further deterioration of the economic and social conditions in the occupied Palestinian territories, and exacerbated inter-factional clashes have had a serious impact on the coping mechanisms of the Palestinian population, making ever larger segments of the population dependent on humanitarian aid. Throughout 2007, the growing closure and restrictions on movement in the West Bank as well as the ongoing construction of the separation barrier in the West Bank and around East Jerusalem have continued aggravating the daily living conditions of Palestinians in the West Bank. The blockade of the Gaza Strip following Hamas takeover of the coastal territory in June 2007, including strict limitations on power supplies to Gaza imposed by Israeli authorities, plunged the strip into a deep socio-economic crisis.

In Lebanon and, to a much lesser extent in Jordan and Syria, Palestinian refugees continue to live in refugee camps in precarious hygiene and sanitation conditions and in dilapidated, often life-threatening shelters, with little attention from the international donor community.

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years*

The Commission has been providing humanitarian aid to the Palestinians since the outbreak of the second Intifada, with a total funding of €257,950,000 from 2003. The aid provided has kept up with developments on the ground, such as the steady aggravation of the crisis, the contributions of other donors to cover different types of needs, upsurges of humanitarian needs (e.g. increased humanitarian needs due to the suspension of other forms of assistance following the Hamas' victory in the Palestinian Legislative Council elections in January 2006) and DG ECHO's own assessment of the needs and that of other organisations as well as implementing conditions on the ground.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

The European Commission made available in 2007 €70,300,000 for humanitarian operations benefiting Palestinians in the Palestinian Territories, and Palestinian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan, especially the victims of the conflict in and around the Nahr el Bared refugee camp in Lebanon.

The bulk of the funds, over €60,000,000, went to operations in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in the following sectors: food; health; water and sanitation; temporary job creation; protection; shelter rehabilitation; psycho-social support, and co-ordination. A substantial part of the funds went to operations targeting beneficiaries affected by the construction of the barrier on Palestinian land.

For Palestinian refugees in Lebanon, hospitals managed by the Palestinian Red Crescent Society were provided with adequate safety standards, as well as a quantity of quality water. Services to disabled persons, the elderly and children were funded, as well as protection activities. In Lebanon, Jordan and Syria, funds were earmarked for the rehabilitation of dilapidated, unsafe and unhealthy shelters.

The Commission's response to the humanitarian crisis in and around the Nahr el Bared refugee camp in Lebanon has been prompt and substantial. Operations addressed humanitarian needs of the affected population in the following sectors: rubble clearance, shelter, water and sanitation, emergency health needs (including psycho-social support), and the provision of food and non-food items.

### *LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country*

In view of the overall political context, LRRD was still not an option for the Palestinian Territories in 2007. However, full co-ordination was ensured with more development-oriented Community instruments and funding, particularly in the food and health sectors. Consistency and complementarity with operations in favour of Palestinian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria funded under other budget lines were also ensured.

## ***Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Turkey and Lebanon (Iraqi crisis)***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Since the 2003 war and the fall of the Hussein regime, the Republic of Iraq has been faced with a dire security situation characterized by growing sectarian violence and an ongoing asymmetric warfare. In particular, Central and South Iraq suffer from significant instability, where clashes between Sunni and Shi'a communities as well as among the Shi'ites continue unabated. Violent deaths are a daily occurrence and, although attacks on the Multi-National Force Iraq (MNF-I) and bomb explosions have been reduced in the second half of 2007, there are several dozen violent deaths per day. This unremitting violence inside Iraq has led to continued mass internal and external displacement affecting much of the surrounding region. A significant proportion of the internally displaced and of the refugees has run out of resources, leaving them and their host communities increasingly vulnerable, and the arrival of refugees in neighbouring countries has put a significant strain on the infrastructure of host countries and on the provision of basic services such as water, sanitation, health, and education.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years***

In response to a growing protection crisis and increasing humanitarian needs inside Iraq, and a major refugee crisis in neighbouring countries, DG ECHO allocated in 2007 €17,800,000 for the Iraqi crisis.

This is the first re-engagement of the Commissions' humanitarian aid department with Iraq since the phase out of its operations in Iraq following the 2003 Iraq war (for which €100,000,000 were allocated).

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

To address the most urgent humanitarian needs of Iraqi refugees in the Iraq neighbouring countries, notably Jordan and Syria, DG ECHO has provided a total of €10,000,000 in 2007, aiming at achieving protection and provided assistance to the most vulnerable refugees. This sum was supplemented by €35 million from the DCI budget line allocated to assist Jordan and Syria in coping with the influx of Iraqi refugees at the end of 2007. These funds contributed to finance the provision of basic health, water and sanitation as well as social and education services, including the distribution of food and basic household items.

The population of Iraq, and notably IDPs in Iraq, have been assisted through a humanitarian aid decision of €7,800,000, mostly implemented by the International Committee of the Red Crescent (ICRC) to cover protection and basic humanitarian assistance needs. It has to be noted that, while there are significant humanitarian needs, there are also significant impediments to the delivery of humanitarian aid inside Iraq, i.e. severe security concerns and problems of access, that prevent the Commission from allocating funds commensurate to the level of needs.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Given the overall volatile situation in Iraq, and the lack of perspective on the refugee situation in neighbouring countries, LRRD was not an option for the Iraqi crisis in 2007. However, full

co-ordination and consistency was ensured with more development-oriented Community instruments and funding.



## *Algeria – Sahrawi refugees*

### *Humanitarian needs*

Sahrawi refugees who have lived for the past 30 years in camps in the desert in the South-Western Algerian region of Tindouf continued to substantially depend on international humanitarian assistance to cover basic needs in all sectors (food, health, water and sanitation, shelter, hygiene, education). According to DG ECHO's classification, the humanitarian situation of the Sahrawi refugees in the Tindouf camps amounts to a forgotten crisis, with only a handful of institutional donors providing humanitarian aid. In contrast to this limited institutional donor interest, there is a large support from European civil society organisations and regional authorities (mostly, but not exclusively, from Spain and Italy).

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years*

The Commission has been providing humanitarian aid to the Sahrawi refugees since the early 1990s. Between 2003 and 2007, a total of €43,000,000 was funded.

Whilst remaining at a steady level, which reflects the relative stability of the crisis, the aid provided has kept up with developments on the ground, such as the contributions of other donors to cover different types of needs, upsurges of humanitarian needs (such as the February 2006 flash floods) and DG ECHO's own assessment of the needs and that of other organisations as well as implementing conditions on the ground.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

In 2007, humanitarian assistance allocations remained at the same level of 2006 (if we exclude the exceptional primary emergency response of €900,000 to the February 2006 floods) and was provided from two sources: €5,000,000 were allocated under the second food aid decision of 2007 to provide for basic food assistance (through the World Food programme) and for fresh food to complement and diversify the food intake of refugees especially on micro-nutrients and vitamins. Another €5,000,000 of humanitarian aid was approved in July 2007 to cover basic needs of refugees such as non-food items (hygiene and shelter-tents), water, sanitation and health. Based on the experience gained in 2006, the funding decision pursues the objective of improving sector-wide approaches, including coordination, to respond to the humanitarian needs of the refugees, notably in health, water and nutrition/food.

### *LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country*

Although LRRD is not applicable in the circumstances prevailing in the refugee camps, there is an ongoing project, funded by EuropeAid Co-operation Office under the “NGO co-financing” programme which provides for veterinary services in the camps. As the main local coping mechanism for the refugees is herding, these services are an important complement to the humanitarian assistance provided

## ***Yemen***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Yemen is a country with a great degree of vulnerability due to the widespread poverty, low human development indicators, and a history of humanitarian crises –both man-made and resulting from natural disasters. In addition, Yemen is host to a sizeable refugee population from the Horn of Africa, notably from Somalia.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years***

The DG ECHO's assistance to Yemen in the last five years was of €8,500,000. Recent interventions in this country have aimed at tackling extreme vulnerabilities notably in rural areas, through interventions in health and water and sanitation, as well as support to most vulnerable segments of the population such as refugees from the Horn of Africa and street children. An independent evaluation conducted in 2005 recommended that a gradual phase-out from Yemen take place, as the humanitarian aid interventions were reaching the limit of addressing more long-term development needs as follows:

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

Although no funding was provided in 2006 for Yemen, a funding decision adopted at the end of December 2005 financed health and water and sanitation interventions in poor rural communities. Based on a comprehensive assessment of the situation (undertaken by officials from headquarters as well as experts from the Regional support office at the end of 2006 and beginning of 2007), and in line with the recommendations of the 2005 evaluation, a funding decision was adopted in 2007 to respond to two sets of needs. First of all, the provision of basic assistance to the most vulnerable amongst the Horn of Africa refugees, living in the Kharaz camp absorbed most of the funds allocated under the decision. Second, two small-scale interventions were funded in the water and sanitation sector to ensure some sustainability to the previously funded projects.

In addition to this funding, the situation in the Northern governorates of Yemen was closely monitored as the low intensity conflict raging in the area flared up. After thorough consideration, the mobilisation of humanitarian funds was not considered necessary.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

The assistance provided in the past years was very much an LRRD intervention and linkages were sought with the authorities as well as other donors including the EC. The phasing-out from Yemen can be considered as having been completed, although a re-intervention in response to punctual needs (such as those of refugees, a natural disaster, or a conflict) cannot be excluded.

## 4. ASIA

In 2007, humanitarian and food aid interventions were funded in 33 countries in Asia, through the adoption of 19 funding decisions for a total amount of €109,800,695<sup>6</sup> which represented 14% of the total budget committed by DG ECHO.

EC humanitarian assistance was provided and/or implemented in the following countries:

Country (Region)	Funding Decisions adopted in 2007			Agreements signed in 2007		
	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL
<b>SOUTH EAST &amp; EAST ASIA</b>	<b>27.245.695</b>	<b>2.500.000</b>	<b>29.745.695</b>	<b>30.751.822</b>	<b>2.500.000</b>	<b>33.251.822</b>
Burma/Myanmar/Thailand	18.000.000	1.000.000	19.000.000	16.210.000	1.000.000	17.210.000
Indonesia	1.600.000		1.600.000	1.589.889		1.589.889
East Timor	1.500.000	1.500.000	3.000.000	1.350.000	1.500.000	2.850.000
North Korea	2.000.000		2.000.000	6.892.826		6.892.826
Philippines	2.145.695		2.145.695	2.710.000		2.710.000
Vietnam	2.000.000		2.000.000	1.999.107		1.999.107
<b>SOUTH &amp; SOUTH WEST ASIA</b>	<b>69.555.000</b>	<b>10.500.000</b>	<b>80.055.000</b>	<b>57.379.318</b>	<b>10.499.992</b>	<b>67.879.310</b>
Afghanistan/Pakistan /Iran	21.000.000	6.000.000	27.000.000	20.499.070	5.999.992	26.499.062
Bangladesh	9.925.000		9.925.000	8.924.139		8.924.139
India	2.630.000		2.630.000	2.230.000		2.230.000
Nepal	4.500.000	1.500.000	6.000.000	4.500.000	1.500.000	6.000.000
Sri Lanka	12.000.000	3.000.000	15.000.000	11.228.747	3.000.000	14.228.747
Regional South Asia	19.500.000		19.500.000	9.997.362		9.997.362
<b>TOTAL ASIA</b>	<b>96.800.695</b>	<b>13.000.000</b>	<b>109.800.695</b>	<b>88.131.140</b>	<b>12.999.992</b>	<b>101.131.132</b>

### 4.1. SOUTH EAST AND EAST ASIA

The peaceful demonstrations of monks in the streets of the main cities of Burma/Myanmar in August followed by the violent crackdown ordered by the junta were the main the political events of the year in South East and Far East Asia. Also worth mentioning is the Joint Agreement of February in the six-Party Talks paving the way for the denuclearisation of Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and the tension created by the parliamentary elections in Timor Leste in April and June.

Overall DG ECHO supported victims of protracted crises and natural disasters in the region for an amount of around € 30,000,000. The bulk of DG ECHO's support went to the vulnerable population of Burma/Myanmar and the Burmese refugees living in camps in Thailand with an amount of €19,000,000. The IDPs victims of the 2006 riots in Timor Leste received support worth €3,000,000. As usual for the region, responses to natural disasters were a regular occurrence.

<sup>6</sup> Of which €96.8 M humanitarian aid budget line; €13 M food aid budget line. A Dipecho decision for South Asia is to be added (€7,500,000) – see part on Dipecho activities.

The major interventions took place in Vietnam after typhoon Lekima and subsequent floods in October and November and in DPRK in response to the torrential floods of August for € 2,000,000 in each country. DG ECHO also intervened twice in Indonesia for a total amount of € 1,600,000 and additional support was provided to IDP victims of the 2006 typhoon in the Philippines.

Next year, the situation of the vulnerable population of Burma/Myanmar and of the Burmese refugees in Thailand will remain DG ECHO's priority in the region, while DG ECHO's phase out from DPRK is foreseen for May 2008 but continuous support is foreseen for IDPs in Timor Leste. As in previous years, ECHO will continue to respond to medium and large-scale natural disasters.

## ***Burma/Myanmar***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

In Burma/Myanmar, ruled by a military regime since 1962, forced village relocations and ongoing armed resistance by ethnic minorities have led to an exodus of refugees to neighbouring countries (over 150,000 in Thailand and 28,000 remaining in Bangladesh). In Northern Rakhine State 236,000 returnees of the Muslim minority have now gone back to Burma/Myanmar, but they do not enjoy any citizenship rights. In other border States and Divisions adjoining Thailand, there is an estimated number of over 500,000 internally displaced persons. The situation in the health sector is extremely precarious with one of the lowest per capita government expenditures in the world. The under-five mortality rate is 108 per 1,000 live births and over 35% of children under five are underweight. The water and sanitation problems are also very acute. The main causes of premature death are malaria, HIV/AIDS, acute respiratory infections and diarrhoeal diseases (only 66% of rural populations have access to safe water and 57% to safe sanitation). The crackdown on the street protests led by Buddhist monks last August and September and the regime's retaliation afterwards did not worsen the humanitarian situation in the country and the influx of Burmese refugees into neighbouring Bangladesh and Thailand did not take place either. Because of the political situation, under the EU Common Position only humanitarian assistance can be implemented. The Regulation renewing Sanctions against Burma/Myanmar were renewed and should be strengthened in 2008. Most other donors are also reluctant to provide support in that context and official development assistance per capita is very low (around €2/person).

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Since 2003, DG ECHO allocated over €36 million to the most vulnerable people within Burma. In response to the growing humanitarian challenges, the annual allocation was increased gradually from €5,300,000 to €9,500,000 in 2007.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In 2007 DG ECHO's activities in Burma/Myanmar continued to be based on three main sectors: protection, health, water and sanitation, nutrition and food aid. In the health sector activities continued to focus on access to primary health care and on malaria control programmes, since malaria is the largest single cause of death among children under five (over 150,000 people were treated for malaria through projects funded by DG ECHO).

In the water and sanitation sector, the aim was to improve access to drinking water and reduce the level of water-borne diseases, such as diarrhoea and chronic malnutrition. This was complemented by targeted nutrition programmes which treated over 17,000 acute malnourished children and women and food aid activities benefiting 33,000 people. DG ECHO also funded activities to protect civilians and prisoners through the work of UNHCR and the ICRC.

DG ECHO gave priority to the highly vulnerable border groups, notably to those living in remote rural areas on the borders with Bangladesh, India, China and Thailand, those lacking access to basic social services or those suffering discrimination on ethnic (Mon and Karen minorities) or religious grounds (the Muslim Rakhine in Northern Rakhine State). In 2007 €18,000,000 were allocated for vulnerable people in Burma/Myanmar and for Burmese refugees in Thailand.

This funding enables the rehabilitation or installation of basic water and sanitation systems and hygiene trainings, continued support for the fight against malaria, mobile supplementary feeding centres to help about 10,000 children and more than 2,000 pregnant or lactating women. Protection activities for detainees take also place. Furthermore under food aid, €1,000,000 was allocated to address the food security needs of 149,000 ex-poppy growing households in Shan State.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Given the current EU Common Position, LRRD cannot be fully applied in Burma/Myanmar, but good coordination exists with the Uprooted People instrument managed by DG for External Relations/EuropeAid Co-Operation Office to complement these activities and avoid duplication. For example a nutrition programme in Northern Rakhine State is completed by a food security programme funded through this budget line. In 2007, DG for External Relations/EuropeAid Co-operation Office launched a Food Security Thematic Programme of €8,000,000 for four years – providing further opportunities for LRRD. Funds are also allocated to the Three Disease Fund for tuberculosis, malaria and HIV-AIDS through the first ever approved Multi-Indicative Programme (MIP) for Burma/Myanmar (€18,000,000 over four years).

## ***Thailand***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

The number of Burmese refugees along the Thailand-Burma border has increased from 10,000 in 1984 to 142,000 in December 2007. A continuing low-intensity conflict between ethnic groups (notably of Karenni and Karen origin) and the military regime in Yangon has led to a steady flow of refugees (600 to 800 per month over the past few years).

Since 2006 resettlement opportunities in third countries have been offered to refugees while new arrivals enter regularly the 9 camps along the Thai Burma border, where the refugees' dependence on external aid is almost total. Resettlement options are, however, not popular among the refugees who would prefer returning to Burma/Myanmar one day or integrating into Thai society. The majority of these refugees have now been living in the camps for over 20 years, where they are subject to a number of significant restrictions and abuses and their quality of life is very precarious.

On top of the basic humanitarian needs (shelter, food, health care, water and sanitation), social and psychological problems are increasing, as well as violence within the camps and trafficking outside.

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years*

Given the political stalemate in Burma/Myanmar, refugees living in Thailand received extensive support from DG ECHO in the fields of food, health and water and sanitation. This support grew from €6,200,000 in 2003 to €9,500,000 in 2007.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

In 2007, DG ECHO decided to allocate more funding for activities inside Burma/Myanmar and gradually over a period of time to decrease its assistance for Burmese refugees in camps in Thailand, where DG ECHO continued the provision of food aid, cooking fuel and basic health care.

### *LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country*

Given the circumstances, LRRD cannot be fully applied to the refugee camps in Thailand but good coordination exists with the EC instrument for Uprooted People to complement these activities and avoid duplication. The 2007 Aid to Uprooted People instrument provided €3,300,000 for health interventions, environmental health activities and education programmes. Funding from other thematic budget lines such as the European Initiative for Democratic and Human Rights and Reproductive health, NGO co-financing were also available. Both in Brussels and in Bangkok, DG ECHO has been advocating to other donors to urge the Royal Thai Government to find durable solutions for one of the world's oldest refugee caseload.

## *Indonesia*

### *Humanitarian needs*

The last DG ECHO programmes addressing the humanitarian needs of the tsunami-affected population in Aceh and Nias financed under a December 2005 €20,000,000 finished in June 2007.

Large humanitarian needs are regularly caused by recurrent natural disasters, Indonesia being located in one of the most disaster-prone regions in the world - the so-called 'ring of fire' - where there is a particularly high vulnerability to earthquakes, floods and landslides.

In late 2006, heavy rains flooded vast areas of Northern Sumatra – Indonesia's largest island. By early December the area had been hit by three earthquakes with magnitudes of between 4.9 and 6.1 which had resulted in landslides that had filled the rivers with debris and vegetation. The rains that struck later therefore caused banks to burst affecting 400,000 and bringing widespread destruction to basic infrastructure.

In February 2007, heavy rains over Jakarta triggered overflowing of rivers and flooding in the city and its surroundings. 78 people died due to floods while at least 420,000 other people were displaced temporarily and more than 102,000 houses were inundated.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

This period was marked by the earthquake and tsunami which devastated Aceh and Northern Sumatran coasts on 26 December 2004. For this crisis only, ECHO disbursed an amount of close to €60,000,000 with projects running from 26 December 2004 to 30 June 2007. Other smaller crises were addressed by ECHO during the years 2003-2007: displacement due to ethnic violence, drought and malnutrition, epidemics, earthquakes, smaller tsunamis, and in May 2006, the destructive earthquake that hit the city of Yogyakarta and the surrounding areas. The total contribution of ECHO to Indonesia excluding the tsunami response was €19,958,129.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In January, an emergency decision of €1,000,000 was adopted to respond to the important floods of December 2006 in the northern part of Sumatra Island. The operations focused mainly on isolated highland areas in the sectors of water and sanitation, restoration of livelihoods, emergency rehabilitation of roads and bridges to restore access, distribution of essential non food items and road and villages cleaning activities.

In February, disastrous floods in Jakarta and the surrounding area were addressed through a €600,000 primary emergency decision, with short operations focusing on the immediate relief for thousands of vulnerable displaced populations, through provision of water, essential food and non-food items such as cooking utensils and tarpaulins, medical care and nutritional assistance in particular to children and pregnant and lactating mothers.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

In Aceh and Nias, tsunami rehabilitation and recovery programmes funded under a Multi Donor Trust co-chaired by the EC are ongoing.

### ***Timor-Leste***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

Further to the April and May 2006 civil unrest which caused the displacement of up to 15% of the population, the situation remained tense in 2007, especially around the time of the presidential and parliamentary elections in April and June. Around 100,000 people were still displaced in camps in and around Dili and with host families in the rest of the country.

In 2007 the situation of IDPs in Timor Leste remained volatile and people reacted very quickly to any event that they felt could threaten their security. Many people seemed to go to work or back home normally during the day and only spent the night in the camps, where they felt more secure and where free food distribution was available. Insecurity and unresolved land and property issues prevented return; in the absence of any mechanism for compensation and property restitution, the displacement crisis was likely to persist. However, the newly elected government began to show a strong will to find solutions for the resettlement of IDPs, and by the end of the year the 2008 budget contained concrete measures to enable a sustainable return of IDPs to their places of origin.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Since the country became independent in 2002, DG ECHO has intervened in Timor Leste in response to displacement, acute malnutrition, civil unrest and natural disasters for an amount of €13,193,871, amount which includes €1,500,000 from the first food aid decision in 2007.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In 2007, humanitarian and food aid needs in the camps and in some rural areas were addressed through two financial decisions, one being a humanitarian aid decision specific to Timor Leste for an amount of €1,500,000 and the other being the global food aid decision, out of which two grant agreements, also for a total amount of €1,500,000, were signed.

These two 2007 decisions aimed at assisting IDPs with camp management, access to drinking water and sanitation in camps and transitional shelters, child protection activities and food aid, as well as vulnerable rural households with food security and livelihood assistance. In 2008, DG ECHO will respond to remaining needs in camps through operations covering camp management, access to water and sanitation and child protection activities, but will also assist the likely return of thousands of displaced persons to their region of origin mainly through transport, provision of a food aid return pack and protection activities. This should be the last humanitarian intervention in this crisis.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

DG ECHO's interventions are coordinated with the EC Representative in Dili and with other stakeholders present in the country, such as Member States and other donors.

### ***North Korea (Democratic People's Republic of Korea - DPRK)***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

The protracted humanitarian crisis in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) is caused by a combination of the continuing decline of the economy and the inability of the Government to effectively redress the situation with appropriate development measures. After the 13 February 2007 Joint Agreement in the 6-Party Talks, there was for about 6 months a positive political momentum when the denuclearisation process started. This became stalled by the end of the year due to complications in the "denuclearisation for aid" process. This also means that there are still considerable humanitarian needs in the various parts of the country which are of a structural nature and therefore can be addressed best by longer term instruments in a sustainable way. On average the malnutrition of Koreans is "high" according to WHO classifications. The most recent UNICEF-led nutritional assessment confirmed this: 37% of children were stunted; 7% were "wasted", with a low weight/height ratio which could be life-threatening. Although the economic reforms of 2002 have brought about some changes, over the past year the average North Korean has found it more difficult to feed his family and to stay healthy. Basic drugs are supplied only through international aid and the needs of particularly vulnerable groups such as the handicapped and the elderly are greatly neglected. The water supply networks in the towns lack the energy necessary to operate them, materials to disinfect the water and spare parts to maintain broken pipelines. There are huge needs in sanitation. If international aid were not given, there would be a high risk that the achievements of recent years would rapidly be lost. In August 2007 DPRK was once again affected by flooding which destroyed rice fields just before harvest and causing serious losses



in the fertile Southern "cereal bowls" of the country, also damaging water supply systems, schools and health facilities.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Between 1995 and 2007, € 124,000,000 has been provided for humanitarian assistance. Humanitarian assistance has been allocated to cover the immediate needs of flood-affected populations, to address food/nutritional problems, improve access to water as well as health care.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In 2007 DG ECHO continued the execution of its exit strategy from DPRK. Projects were implemented under the 2006 Ad Hoc decision for €8,000,000 focusing on health and water and sanitation and addressing the needs of the most vulnerable North Korean populations. This financing Decision also enabled partners to accomplish their ongoing actions. The very specific structure of EU resident NGOs, the European Union Programme Support (EUPS) functioned well. All parties (DG ECHO, NGOs and the North Korean authorities) concerned adhered to the modus operandi of this arrangement. With €2,000,000 flood relief, DG ECHO provided assistance to about 500,000 affected people by the provision of emergency food. At the end of November a capitalisation workshop on water and sanitation activities was organised with the NGOs and North Korean local counterparts.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Due to the nuclear standoff triggered in the autumn of 2002 and aggravated by the DPRK's nuclear test in October 2006, the international community has been reluctant to finance development programmes. In line with UN Security Council - Resolution 1718<sup>7</sup>, the EU also introduced restrictive measures against DPRK. Throughout 2007, DG ECHO advocated pro-actively for a better LRRD within the Commission after its exit and the timely phasing in of the new long-term instrument.

EuropeAid Co-operation Office can only support food security activities under its LRRD Thematic Programme. At the same time complementarities with other EU Member States' funded actions became more realistic, in particular in the water and sanitation sector with Sweden and Ireland. In the positive political atmosphere numerous other fact-finding missions arrived in DPRK not only from the EU, but also Australia, Canada, New Zealand and USA. The EU remains the second largest humanitarian donor behind Republic of Korea.

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/sc8853.doc.htm>

## ***Philippines***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

The Philippines is prone to frequent typhoons, but the 2007 typhoon season was not as serious as the previous year and no intervention from DG ECHO was requested.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

DG ECHO's interventions in Philippines over the last 5 years focused on the response to displacement due to the religious violence affecting Mindanao and to typhoons, for a total amount of €5,860,000. Philippines also benefited from DIPECHO operations.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

DG ECHO's objectives in response to the typhoons that struck the Albay province at the end of 2006 were to provide integrated relief to the most vulnerable typhoon-affected communities, in particular those that had to move to evacuation centres because their homes and land had been lost to the lava flows, and those whose houses had been totally destroyed by the typhoon. These objectives were met through a €2,000,000 Emergency Decision approved in December 2006 (of which € 1,400,000 on 2007's budget) and mostly implemented in the first part of 2007.

An additional envelope of €710,000 was released in April 2007 to address the remaining needs, mainly in shelter, of more than 10,000 people still living in very poor conditions months after the disaster.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Intensive contacts took place throughout 2007 with the EC Delegation and the authorities in order to secure a permanent solution for the remaining displaced people.

## ***Vietnam***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Vietnam has over the years developed good coping mechanisms to counter the impact of natural disasters. However, local capacity can be exhausted where disasters such as heavy rains and typhoons exceed their normal intensity. In October 2007, typhoon Lekima hit the northern and central parts of the country and was followed throughout October and November by repeated episodes of extensive flooding, affecting one third of the country provinces. Local government capacities, although well organized, were soon exhausted, as much as the coping capacities of the mostly rural populations affected by the disaster, who had lost both their standing crops and their food stocks. The most urgent needs were food and non food items, access to clean water, seeds and tools to quickly restore livelihoods and assistance to damaged schools through distribution of furniture, books and uniforms so that children could go back to school.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Since 2002, DG ECHO's response to natural disasters has been quite limited, with a total amount of €1,410,000 for flooding and typhoons in 2002 and 2006.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

DG ECHO adopted a €2,000,000 Emergency Decision in October 2007 to address the consequences of the typhoon and subsequent floods. The objectives were to provide immediate assistance to the victims to quickly restore livelihoods and coping capacities and assist families, and in particular children to go back to normal life and cope with the trauma. Nevertheless, the seriousness of the disaster and the uneven delivered assistance between different provinces will be addressed in 2008 by a follow up decision.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Recovery is supported by the central and local government of Vietnam. The continued presence of the DIPECHO programme in the affected regions will contribute to the dissemination of typhoon/floods preparedness best practices and to their adoption by the national and local legislation.

## **4.2. SOUTH AND SOUTH WESTERN ASIA**

### ***Afghanistan (including Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran)***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

The main groups with substantial humanitarian needs in 2007 were the over 330.000 refugees who returned from Pakistan and Iran, the Afghans deported from Iran, the battle-affected IDPs within Afghanistan and the host communities receiving these returnees. The needs of the returning refugees and IDPs included transport and resettlement support, as well as food, shelter and water and sanitation for the most vulnerable such as female headed households. With over 5,000,000 refugees and displaced people having returned since the fall of the Taliban at the end of 2001, many of these and their host communities have required continuing support to avoid a major humanitarian crisis, particularly in the sector of water and sanitation where Afghanistan has some of the worst global indicators. A further significant area for humanitarian support was protection, especially in the south of Afghanistan. The continued vulnerability of much of the population also meant that humanitarian aid was required in response to the drought that developed in large parts of Afghanistan in 2006 and whose consequences continued to be felt in 2007.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

DG ECHO has funded projects addressing the needs of returnees, IDPs and the most vulnerable people affected by the consequences of the Afghan conflict and natural hazards since 1992. Between 2003 and 2007 DG ECHO has spent €217,000,000, including €6,000,000 from the food aid budget line.

Water and sanitation, food, shelter, protection, basic livelihood, security advice and humanitarian flights were the main sectors of activity. Activities in the health sector were taken over by the EC Delegation in a successful LRRD exercise in 2004.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

DG ECHO's strategy for 2007 was focused on assisting the return of refugees and IDPs and ensuring basic livelihood support for the most vulnerable and for their host communities. In parallel, DG ECHO worked with DG for External Relations and UNHCR to attain durable solutions for the Afghan populations remaining in Pakistan and Iran, preparing for the time when they would cease to be considered as refugees.

DG ECHO under its Global Plan funded €21,000,000 of humanitarian aid for victims of the Afghan crisis, covering the registration and transportation of refugees from Pakistan and Iran to Afghanistan, as well as continuing support for the most vulnerable of the remaining refugees. Shelter, and water and sanitation were the main sectors of intervention within Afghanistan. Responses to localised disasters were made, with an increasing emphasis on building up local capacity. All projects were implemented with full respect of the key issue of gender.

Protection assistance was provided, notably through continued support to both UNHCR and ICRC in their respective protection mandate roles. Given the constraints of security and geography, support to security advisory services for aid agencies in Afghanistan, and to a subsidised humanitarian flight service was maintained.

€6,000,000 from the global food aid decision was allocated to Afghanistan in order to respond to the consequences of the 2006 drought. Access to food and clean water supplies as well as food security were improved for the most vulnerable populations, with a particular focus on disabled persons and female headed households. Food assistance to battle affected IDPs in the South of the country was also provided.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Close coordination is taking place on LRRD matters between DG ECHO, DG for External Relations and EuropeAid Co-operation Office, with a view to ensuring the mutual compatibility of their programmes and a handover wherever possible. Regarding assistance to refugees in Pakistan and Iran, DG ECHO closely coordinated with EC Delegation (through the Uprooted Peoples budget line) so that a clear distinction of funding between strict humanitarian and more developmental actions was respected.

In the food sector, a comprehensive LRRD strategy between DG ECHO's food aid and EuropeAid Co-operation Office's Food Security Thematic Programming was designed and this strategy will be implemented in 2008.

## ***Pakistan***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Humanitarian needs resulted from natural disasters, with continuing needs following the 2005 earthquake, as well as new needs arising from floods in Balouchistan and Sindh provinces in June and July 2007.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

While initially involved mainly in relation to the Afghan refugee crisis (assistance to Afghan refugees in Pakistani soil), humanitarian aid has become increasingly engaged in responding to natural disasters.

### ***Humanitarian Objectives and Achievements***

The main achievement was the completion of the final phase (€ 11,000,000) of ECHO's earthquake response. In this final phase of assistance, the main sectors were health, and water and sanitation, with the main result that despite many cases of potentially epidemic disease appearing, these were all contained and no widespread incidence of disease occurred. There were over 800,000 direct beneficiaries of assistance, and 3,500,000 indirect beneficiaries. Health assistance included overall surveillance for the 3.5 million earthquake affected population together with direct assistance to over 500,000 beneficiaries mainly for primary and reproductive health. Water and sanitation consisted largely of the re-establishment of water supplies, together with health education and latrines, for over 175,000 beneficiaries.

Other assistance provided was food security for first phase livelihood support for 65,000 beneficiaries, legal aid for 24,000 beneficiaries, assistance to 35,000 IDPs remaining in camps, and disaster preparedness for 80,000 beneficiaries.

Furthermore, DG ECHO and its partners continued to show in 2007 their capacity to respond rapidly to new humanitarian needs as they arise with needs based and non-partisan assistance, in close coordination with key member States. This was demonstrated in the response to the Balouchistan floods in June/July, even if ultimately government access restrictions blocked planned funding from being disbursed.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

During 2006, EuropeAid Co-operation Office allocated €50,000,000 to UNICEF, UNDP and Asia Development Bank for recovery phase assistance which applied in contiguum with humanitarian aid in 2007, and then to follow on as the humanitarian assistance was phased out.

## ***Bangladesh***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Bangladesh, the world's most densely populated country, is highly vulnerable to natural disasters, in particular earthquakes, floods and cyclones. This vulnerability is being exacerbated by climate change factors.

2007 was a particularly harsh year. First, two spells of monsoon floods in August and September 2007 affected 46 districts, claimed more than 900 lives, displaced millions of people, destroyed crops and killed livestock. Then, the super-cyclone SIDR hit the country on 15 November 2007, affecting close to 9 million people in 30 southern districts, killing an estimated 4,407 people and injuring over 55,000. The cyclone caused extensive damage, destroying more than 500,000 houses, harvests, food stocks and livelihoods, killing livestock and destroying fishing material and other income generating assets. Water and sanitation and health infrastructures have also been destroyed or damaged.

In addition, an estimated 10,000 Rohingya undocumented refugees are still living in overcrowded and appalling conditions in a makeshift camp in Teknaf, in very basic shacks, without access to drinkable water or adequate sanitation.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

DG ECHO intervened in Bangladesh when the country was hit by severe floods in 2004 and 2006, providing mainly food rations, safe drinking water and emergency items. In 2004, it also provided humanitarian assistance to the people of Chittagong Hill Tracts, who were victims of communal violence.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

By a regional decision covering Bangladesh and India, DG ECHO funded emergency and early recovery assistance for the flood victims, consisting mainly of food, shelter, provision of basic items and drinking water, and supporting the restarting of a new life for the populations directly affected by the floods.

In relation to the cyclone, emergency programmes totalling €8,425,000 were funded by DG ECHO immediately after the cyclone in November and December 2007. These programmes focused on providing food, safe water, basic household items, emergency health care, temporary shelter and emergency livelihood.

In December 2007 a package of €1,500,000 was granted for the relocation of the 10,000 Rohingya refugees to a new site, to set up the necessary shelters and water and sanitation infrastructures, and provide basic medical services.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

In Bangladesh LRRD in the sectors of food security and disaster preparedness/ disaster risk reduction are particularly important, as structural issues in these sectors contribute directly to the humanitarian crises caused by sudden onset disasters.

With regard to the cyclone and the floods, close coordination is ensured with the DG for External Relations Stability Instrument and the EC Delegation, so as to link the emergency

interventions of DG ECHO with the longer term interventions of the European Commission, particularly in the sectors of livelihoods and food security.

Active collaboration with the EC Delegation has facilitated the granting of a site for the relocation of the Rohingya refugees, and close coordination is maintained between DG ECHO and the EC Delegation, which is supporting two official camps for documented Rohingya refugees.

## ***India***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

2007 saw a welcome decrease in the level of violence in Jammu and Kashmir, although many suggest that this is only a temporary respite and not the consequence of any substantial improvement in the political situation. On the other hand, a series of very large explosions occurred in August, killing or maiming several people in the nearby villages and adding to the psychological trauma among the rest of the population. The profound effects of this trauma cannot be easily mitigated and women and children are the most vulnerable. Media coverage of the consequences of the conflict on local populations remained limited.

Conversely, Naxalite-related violence increased, in particular in the Southern part of Chhattisgarh State, where the population (mainly tribal people and scheduled castes) are caught between the Maoist guerrillas and vigilante militias. Some areas are totally inaccessible due to the conflict and in general the region is acutely lacking in basic social services, as it is practically impossible to hire doctors, for instance, to work in such a risky environment. The Prime Minister of India stated, in a public speech delivered in 2007 that he considered the Naxalite problem to be the most acute one which India is currently facing.

The 2007 monsoon season caused severe flooding in several States, destroying crops, houses, livestock and social infrastructure such as water and sanitation. Over 5 million households were affected.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

DG ECHO has funded projects addressing the needs of conflict-affected populations in Jammu and Kashmir since 2002, amounting to €9M so far. 2007 was the first year of DG ECHO intervention in Chhattisgarh and assistance totalled €630,000.

India is prone to natural disasters and DG ECHO provided humanitarian assistance to the victims of a series of these in the past 5 years, including the 2004 South Asia Tsunami, the 2005 Kashmir earthquake and monsoon flooding in 2004, 2006 and 2007.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In the context of the conflict in Kashmir, approximately 40,000 people received psychosocial support and protection, including children in orphanages. In Chhattisgarh, 20,000 people benefited from curative and preventive basic healthcare services and 7,500 internally displaced families benefited from improved water and sanitation.

DG ECHO approved a total of €11,000,000 in humanitarian aid for the flood victims (covering India and Bangladesh), including provisions for emergency shelter, food rations,

drinking water and improved storage and sanitation facilities, health, hygiene and medical support and livelihood support.

Finally, DG ECHO continued to finance projects in nutrition and the provision of water and sanitation to the Sri Lankan refugee children living in camps in Tamil Nadu.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

In Jammu and Kashmir, past DG ECHO support for non-formal education is being continued by EuropeAid Co-operation Office and the EC Delegation.

In Chhattisgarh a State Partnership Programme was signed between the EC Delegation and the State authorities, aiming at the equitable delivery of and access to quality health and education services, as well as improved forest-based tribal livelihoods, through governance, institutional reform and capacity development at state and at decentralized levels. It is expected that this programme will be a valuable vehicle for linking relief and rehabilitation, and will ultimately allow DG ECHO to exit from this crisis.

## ***Nepal/Bhutan***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

Nepal is one of the world's poorest countries and remains the scene of two forgotten humanitarian crises.

The violent conflict initiated by Maoist rebels in 1996 cost over 13,000 lives and although it was formally brought to an end with the signature of the Peace Agreement in November 2006, the country is still suffering from its consequences, marked by high volatility and frequent spates of violence. Constituent Assembly elections have been postponed twice but are now scheduled for 10 April 2008.

Against this poor socio-economic background and political instability, the toll of the 10-year conflict is still heavy. The conflict isolated populations in the worst affected areas and disrupted trade and agricultural activities; it destroyed water supply systems and communications infrastructure. Most of the community drinking water systems constructed during the 1980s and 1990s are not working effectively. Health posts are not functioning properly and still suffer from a lack of trained personnel, hygiene, medicines and waste treatment equipment and systems. The Nepalese authorities have not been able to give support to communities due to budget cuts and security concerns.

A second forgotten crisis has trapped over 108,000 refugees, including 23,000 children, who were expelled from Bhutan between 1990 and 1992. Since then they have been stuck in seven camps in the south-east of Nepal, accepted by neither Nepal nor Bhutan, and are totally dependent on external aid. In the absence of a political solution, the United States and other countries have offered a resettlement options and the first refugees are expected to leave in 2008.

The 2007 monsoon season caused severe flooding in the Terai plains, destroying crops, houses, livestock and infrastructure. Over 330,000 people were affected.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***



Since 2001, DG ECHO has provided close to €14M of food aid for the refugees through a series of contracts with the World Food Programme (WFP) and nearly €20,000,000 for victims of the armed conflict.

Nepal is prone to natural disasters and DG ECHO provided humanitarian assistance to the victims of droughts in 2006 and monsoon flooding in 2007.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In 2007 the populations living in the areas most affected by the conflict continued to benefit from protection activities, with particular emphasis on support to internally displaced people. Additionally, a particular focus was put on the protection of children formerly associated with the armed forces and armed groups. Primary and reproductive healthcare was provided to over 300,000 people in the mid and Far Western regions. Also, 10,000 people benefited from the construction of drinking water systems and latrines.

Food aid (€ 1,500,000) was distributed to 108,200 Bhutanese refugees, this representing a fifth of their annual requirements. DG ECHO also supported a supplementary food ration programme for 2,600 vulnerable refugees (malnourished children under five, pregnant women and nursing mothers, tuberculosis patients and elderly sick people).

DG ECHO approved €4,500,000 in humanitarian aid for the flood victims, including provisions for emergency shelter, food rations, drinking water and improved hygiene.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

The contribution to the Bhutanese refugees' food needs is complemented by support from EuropeAid Co-operation Office for UNHCR's management activities in the camps. 2007 brought fresh hopes in terms of a possible solution to this crisis through resettlement in third countries, from which the refugees can continue to lobby to return to Bhutan. It is foreseen that a majority will opt for the resettlement option, thus significantly reducing the number of those requiring continuing assistance. However, given the size of the caseload, it will take at least 5 years to complete the process. During that time political efforts will be maintained to lobby for a solution for those not able or willing to relocate, including for a return to Bhutan and the possibility for others to settle legally in Nepal.

DG ECHO is also carefully monitoring the evolution of the socio-political situation. It is hoped that socio-economic development will be made possible through progressive political stability, enabling the development partners to occupy their natural space and, consequently, allowing DG ECHO to close down its operations linked to the conflict.

## ***Sri Lanka***

### ***Humanitarian needs***

The conflict between Tamil separatists and the Government of Sri Lanka continued to intensify during 2007 with devastating consequences for the civilian population in the north and east of the country. The conflict is brutal and there are major violations of international humanitarian law by all parties to the conflict on a daily basis. Over 500,000 people are currently displaced by the conflict and a further 70,000 people are still displaced by the 2004 tsunami, bringing the total IDP caseload in the country to around 570,000. In addition to IDPs, the everyday life of all communities in the conflict areas has been severely affected, especially the 800,000 civilians virtually trapped in Jaffna and the Vanni because of access and other restrictions. Due to the protracted nature of the crisis the coping mechanisms of these people are now virtually non-existent.

Sri Lanka is a complex emergency and the humanitarian situation is highly politicised. While the humanitarian workload in the north and east is increasing the humanitarian space continues to diminish due to security concerns, access problems and other restrictions. This undermines the ability of DG ECHO's partners to reach vulnerable populations caught up in the conflict. Already more than 2,000 aid workers and many humanitarian agencies have left the north east, for security reasons.

### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last 5 years***

Since 2002 the Commission has provided over €97,000,000 of humanitarian assistance including over €43,000,000 in response to the tsunami. The remaining tsunami projects ended in mid 2007 and the focus has now returned to conflict affected communities.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

In 2007 DG ECHO provided €12,000,000 to integrated emergency relief to over 700,000 IDPs and conflict affected populations in Sri Lanka and 30,000 Sri Lankan refugees living in camps in Tamil Nadu, India. The main sectors of intervention were protection, food aid and food security, shelter and non food relief items, water and sanitation, coordination and security. In Tamil Nadu the focus was on water and sanitation. In addition €3,000,000 was provided in 2007 from the food aid budget line to support conflict affected populations in Sri Lanka.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

In terms of LRRD, DG ECHO works closely with other Commission services to link with programmes which complement and go beyond DG ECHO emergency interventions by concentrating on the medium term needs of returnee IDPs and host communities in Sri Lanka.

## 5. LATIN AMERICA

Many of the countries of Latin America region are recurrently affected by natural hazards such as floods, flash floods, cyclones, landslides, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, droughts and forest fires and other complex emergencies. DG ECHO was called on to respond to an array of disaster events in 2007 – hurricane Felix in Nicaragua, earthquake in Southern Peru, cold wave in the same country, floods in Bolivia, drought and wildfires in Paraguay. Apart from response to natural disasters, DG ECHO's humanitarian assistance to victims of Colombia's entrenched armed conflict continued in 2007, including support for IDPs, refugees and other vulnerable groups as well as refugees from the conflict who crossed the border into Venezuela, Ecuador, and Panama. In disaster prone countries in the region, DG ECHO's disaster preparedness programme (DIPECHO) continued, aiming to improve the capacities of communities at risk, so that they can better prepare for and protect themselves against natural disasters. DIPECHO provided a stable programme, enabling organisations to become involved in disaster preparedness and filling a gap, creating a platform for community focused disaster preparedness and a means to reach isolated and vulnerable communities. In Latin America, ECHO works closely with other programmes and donors to ensure the transition to longer term development.

The EC Humanitarian Assistance in this part of the world was, in 2007, mainly to respond to natural disasters and also in respect of the internal conflict in Colombia.

Country (Region)	Funding Decisions adopted in 2007			Agreements signed in 2007		
	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL	HUM.AID	FOOD AID	TOTAL
<b>LATIN AMERICA</b>	<b>31.000.000</b>	<b>1.064.983</b>	<b>32.064.983</b>	<b>30.595.877</b>	<b>1.064.983</b>	<b>31.660.860</b>
Bolivia	1.000.000		1.000.000	1.000.000		1.000.000
Honduras		500.000	500.000		500.000	500.000
Nicaragua	6.000.000		6.000.000	5.720.981		5.720.981
Paraguay	1.500.000		1.500.000	1.500.000		1.500.000
Peru	9.500.000	564.983	10.064.983	9.500.000	564.983	10.064.983
Colombia / Ecuador	13.000.000		13.000.000	12.874.896		12.874.896

### 5.1. CENTRAL AMERICA (GUATEMALA, EL SALVADOR, HONDURAS, NICARAGUA)

#### *Humanitarian needs*

Central America is one of the most disaster-prone regions of the world. More than 80% of the area is at high risk of earthquakes, volcanoes, flooding, landslides and hurricanes. Every year Central America is badly affected by tropical storms, heavy rains and floods, particularly during the hurricane season (July to November).

In 2007 tropical storms affected a number of countries in Central America, producing floods and landslides of varying magnitudes, from a very local impact (as in Guatemala and Honduras) to very high impact (e.g. the Mexican states of Tabasco and Chiapas experiencing their worst floods in 50 years). On 4 September 2007 hurricane Felix made landfall at the Nicaraguan Atlantic Coast as a category V hurricane, with heavy rains and winds of more than 250 km/hr. As a result more than 200 people were killed and 198,000 people affected.

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years*

From 2003 to 2006, more than €11,000,000 was allocated to Central America. This amount included notably the response to hurricane Stan in Guatemala and El Salvador. In 2007 the total allocation to Central America was €6,500,000.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

In 2007, DG ECHO operations in Central America basically focussed on responding to the emergency caused by hurricane Felix in Nicaragua.

A primary emergency decision of €1,000,000 was adopted to assist the most vulnerable population during the initial phase. This was followed by an emergency decision of €5,000,000 one month later, covering further identified needs.

A total of 130,000 people benefited from DG ECHO-funded operations, which paid specific attention to the needs of affected indigenous populations. The projects financed covered emergency rehabilitation of houses, water and sanitation, basic health services, food aid, agricultural support, emergency telecommunications and disaster preparedness activities.

DG ECHO also continued its monitoring of operations in Guatemala and El Salvador, funded under the ad hoc financial decision taken to response to Hurricane Stan in late 2006.

In addition, €500,000 was allocated to Honduras from the Food Aid Decision to prevent the deterioration of the nutrition and health status of children and pregnant women and to enhance small-scale farmer households' resilience in the drought-affected southern part of the country.

### *LRRD – possibly exit strategy of the sector and/or country*

The strong links with the EC Delegation and other Commission services were reinforced after hurricane Felix. With the aim of bridging the gap between emergency relief and reconstruction, DG ECHO actively contributed to the preparation of a proposal under the Instrument for Stability (€7,490,000). Activities will build upon DG ECHO operations and focus on water and sanitation and early recovery. LRRD has also been incorporated into the planning for the financial instruments in the new Country Strategy Paper 2007-2013.

## **5.2. SOUTH AMERICA (EXCEPT COLOMBIA)**

### *Humanitarian needs*

South America is exposed to a whole range of natural hazards due to its geography, geology and climate: The phenomena of "El Niño" and "La Niña", attributed to warming/cooling in the eastern and central Pacific, are causing regular floods and droughts. The Andean region is particularly vulnerable to earthquakes and many volcanoes are still active. In 2007 an increasing number of hazards occurred throughout the year, often affecting highly vulnerable populations. The most disastrous single event was the earthquake which struck Southern Peru on 15 August 2007.

### *Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years*

From 2003 to 2006, a total of €6,291,000 was allocated to South America, mainly in response to floods. In 2007 the allocation to the region totalled €12,564,983, with two thirds of this amount earmarked for the earthquake response in Peru.

### *Humanitarian objectives and achievements*

DG ECHO responded to the humanitarian needs arising from the floods in Bolivia in January 2007, which caused damage to crops, houses and infrastructure. DG ECHO adopted an emergency decision of €1,000,000 to meet the most urgent needs of the victims, in terms of water and sanitation, health, emergency repairs to health centres and schools, and disaster preparedness. Food aid and short-term emergency agricultural activities were also implemented. Approximately 108,500 people were assisted through the Commission's humanitarian aid.

Later on in the year, the Commission provided €8,000,000 (through a primary emergency and an emergency decision) to the victims of the earthquake measuring 7.9 on the Richter scale, which had its epicentre 160 km south of Lima (Peru) and which affected some 500,000 people, destroying or damaging 94,000 houses. Through the primary emergency decision (€2,000,000) immediate integrated relief assistance was provided, including food, provision of water, non-food items, medical assistance, emergency telecommunications and psycho-social support to victims.

Through the emergency decision (€6,000,000) 15 partners delivered mainly food aid, emergency shelter, water and sanitation and non-food items, mainstreaming disaster preparedness.

Also in Peru, where national response capacity was clearly overwhelmed by the earthquake, the Commission provided humanitarian assistance to the victims of the cold wave: 41,500 inhabitants of the Andean region, whose livelihoods had been endangered by unusually low temperatures. An additional allocation of €564,983 was made available for the most vulnerable affected Andean populations from the Food Aid Decision to help them overcome the loss of their agricultural inputs and prepare for the next sowing season. In this context, food aid and food for work activities (construction of communal shelters for alpacas, sewing of cereals and pulses, construction of stone fences for pasture protection) were provided. The total number of beneficiaries for DG ECHO's interventions in Peru in 2007 is 250,000.

Finally, Peru has experienced a severe cold wave, the coldest weather in 30 years, with temperatures significantly below the average, falling as far as minus 27°C and affecting in particular the Andean communities living above 3,500-3,800 metres. A decision of €1,500,000 was taken to assist the victims with food aid, early recovery support and other emergency relief, targeting a population of up to 41,500 people.

Last but not least, in Paraguay, €1,500,000 was provided for 46,600 victims of drought and wildfires in terms of supplementary food rations and agricultural inputs so as to help them restore their livelihoods. Disaster preparedness was mainstreamed into the three emergency operations funded.

### ***LRRD – possibly exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

DG ECHO continued to actively explore avenues for LRRD with the EC Delegations in the region and DG for External Relations, seeking ways to undertake activities in the framework of the corresponding country strategy papers or thematic budget lines. For the Peru earthquake, LRRD with the Stability Instrument was discussed in detail and an intervention (€3,000,000) is in the pipeline.

### ***Colombia (including Colombian refugees in Ecuador, Venezuela and Panama)***

#### ***Humanitarian needs***

For more than 40 years Colombia has suffered from an internal conflict between government, paramilitary and guerrilla groups. As a result, over 3,600,000 people have been displaced from their home areas since 1985, with some 200,000 new IDPs in 2007. More than 200 communities were in a situation of confinement or blocked by armed actors. In addition, UNHCR estimates that more than 400,000 Colombians have fled the conflict to neighbouring countries (Ecuador, Venezuela and Panama). Of these, less than 50,000 have obtained refugee status. Most IDPs settle in shanty towns, often with no legal title to the land, building precarious shelters out of plastic, wood and cardboard. IDPs displaced to an unfamiliar urban environment often very quickly see their food security situation deteriorate and their household economy collapse. Blocked or confined communities' access to food and to basic services is severely hampered they are prevented from cultivating their fields or going to markets. Furthermore, their access to public health services is very limited.

Most Colombians newly arriving in the neighbouring countries need emergency assistance such as food, water and sanitation immediately after arrival. Subsequently, they require assistance to know their rights and the steps to take in the refugee registration process, and to foster their integration.

Colombia is also vulnerable to natural disasters, particularly earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and floods.

#### ***Evolution of humanitarian aid in the last five years***

From 2003 to 2006, DG ECHO allocated €40,000,000 to improve the humanitarian situation of the victims of the Colombian conflict, both in Colombia and in neighbouring countries (Ecuador, Venezuela and Panama). A further €500,000 was allocated for flood response. In 2007 €13,000,000 was allocated to Colombia: €12,000,000 for the victims of the conflict (both inside Colombia and in neighbouring countries) and €1,000,000 for an emergency response to the worst floods in 40 years.

#### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

€12,000,000 was allocated to support the Colombian population affected by the armed conflict. In 2007 some 70,000 people received assistance (food and non-food items) via ICRC during their first three months of displacement. In addition, more than 40,000 new IDPs, confined or blocked populations and, to some extent, host communities received humanitarian post-emergency assistance including improved shelter, distribution of non-food items, access to basic services (primary health care, water and sanitation) and psychosocial assistance.

DG ECHO continued to concentrate on the more remote rural areas, where state institutions are generally not present. Protection of children continued to be a priority. More than 1,500 new IDP children were integrated in accelerated learning cycles with a view to paving the way for their re-integration into the formal education system and, at the same time, to prevent their recruitment by illegal armed actors. DG ECHO assistance was targeted to be complementary to the aid provided by state institutions, and implementing partners were required to adopt a pro-active stance to involve government institutions with a view to handing over operations to them in the not too distant future.

DG ECHO also financed projects in Ecuador, Venezuela and Panama to assist the victims of the Colombian conflict who have fled to those neighbouring countries. With DG ECHO funding, UNHCR continued to improve the protection framework for asylum seekers by strengthening the national institutions involved in the reception, registration, documentation, assistance and integration of refugees. Protection and support services were provided for more than 45,000 Colombians to cover basic food, nutrition, shelter, health, water and sanitation and educational needs. It also helped the refugees in the reception, registration, documentation, assistance and integration process.

In addition, given the dramatic impact of the rainy season, an intervention was required in response to the floods which affected almost 25 per cent of all Colombian municipalities. DG ECHO's intervention focused on the Northwest of the country – Cordoba and the "La Mojana" region – and provided emergency assistance (food, water and sanitation, agricultural inputs) to 45,000 people, mainstreaming disaster preparedness wherever possible.

#### ***LRRD – possibly exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

Close regular contact is maintained with the EC Delegation to seek LRRD. Linking was sought via the budget line Uprooted Peoples, which started implementation of its final projects, and other thematic budget lines, via the institutional support the Commission provided to State assistance mechanisms in order to improve the quality of the government's assistance and via the Instrument for Stability. Furthermore, DG ECHO partners were asked to involve state institutions to the largest extent possible with a view to handing over operations to them in the future.

## **6. DISASTER PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES (INCLUDING DIPECHO)**

### ***Humanitarian needs***

There has been a considerable rise in the number and intensity of disasters over the last few decades in part due to climate change. In many developing countries, population growth, poor governance, increasing impoverishment, poor management of natural resources and consequently depletion and degradation of soil are factors that have contributed to increased risks and vulnerabilities. Disasters such as earthquakes, floods, landslides, drought, wildfires, tropical cyclones and associated storm surges, tsunami and volcanic eruptions claim a heavy toll in terms of the loss of human lives, destruction of economic and social infrastructure, not to mention a negative impact on already fragile ecosystems.

Furthermore, in some parts of the world, natural disasters are a recurrent phenomenon that can have severe impacts on fragile livelihoods. In some regions disasters seem to be more frequent and vulnerable people tend to face more risks and have less time to recuperate their livelihoods in between disasters. This draws attention to the value of preparedness in any disaster management policy and strategy. DG ECHO's existing programme to support community-based disaster preparedness projects, DIPECHO, covers six regions worldwide - Central America, South America, the Caribbean, Central Asia, South Asia, and South-East Asia. All six regions are highly prone to hazards that have devastating consequences for the lives and livelihoods of thousands of people. In Central and South America the main disasters are recurrent floods, landslides, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, storms, hurricanes and droughts; in the Caribbean the recurrence of tropical storms, floods and volcano eruptions cause regular humanitarian crises; and in Central, South and South East Asia floods, typhoons/cyclones, landslides, droughts, earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions and forest fires undermine already fragile livelihoods. DIPECHO targets the most vulnerable groups in these regions and in localities where the coping mechanisms are particularly weak both in terms of local resources and the capabilities of national disaster response mechanisms. In all of these regions initiatives on disaster preparedness and prevention are emerging at national and at regional level, but they tend to suffer from a lack of resources and outreach capacity. Coordination between national governments is often not very advanced or is limited to exchanges of views and knowledge or establishment of early-warning systems that are not always adapted to disaster prone areas with limited infrastructure.

### ***Humanitarian objectives and achievements***

The global objective of DG ECHO's disaster preparedness activities is to reduce the impact of future disasters and hence the need for humanitarian aid in the aftermath of a disaster. Disaster preparedness projects and preparedness components integrated in relief are mostly implemented in countries with prevalent humanitarian needs but in some countries, DG ECHO's sole presence is DIPECHO interventions. However, when a disaster strikes, DIPECHO has proven to be the first response instrument as it has allowed communities to be prepared and respond primarily by themselves. Due to DIPECHO funding, the vulnerable communities can directly benefit from early warning systems, tested evacuation plans, on-the-spot training in first aid and search and rescue etc. that increase the local coping capacities.



DIPECHO Action Plans are implemented at three levels:

- i.) at community level, where they enhance the capacities of local communities at risk and of local authorities, through training, awareness-raising, setting up early warning systems and risk mapping;
- ii.) at national level, where activities strengthen the capacity of national disaster management services and help to produce and disseminate maps/contingency plans; and
- iii.) at regional level, where cooperation and coordination of disaster preparedness activities is encouraged, in particular through the exchange and dissemination of data, knowledge and good practices.

### ***LRRD – possible exit strategy of the sector and/or country***

It is internationally recognised that efficient Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) requires longer term engagement by development stakeholders and national authorities. DG ECHO's contribution to global DRR efforts - consisting mainly of fostering a preparedness culture and investing in community-based preparedness measures - is one contribution among several required. Hence, DG ECHO's programmatic efforts are combined with continuous advocacy efforts at headquarters level and in the six regions targeted by DIPECHO to encourage development stakeholders to invest in DRR. DG ECHO continues to encourage other Commission services, such as DG for External Relations, DG Development and EuropeAid Co-operation Office, EU Member States, other donors, local authorities and NGOs to build on DIPECHO lessons and best practices.

In several countries there is close coordination between Commission services, such as in Central America where an active relationship in the field and at headquarters level has been established. Good coordination is also experienced in South America and in the Caribbean Region. In Central, South and South East Asia the same levels of coordination have not yet been achieved even though DG ECHO has been engaged for a long time, therefore DG ECHO will continue to engage in advocacy on several levels to ensure the sustainability of its DIPECHO investments in these regions.

But even if good coordination has been established between Commissions services, it does not necessarily mean that Disaster Risk Reduction is systematically taken into consideration in high-risk countries. The EC Country Strategy Papers 2007-2013 leave room for improvement and DG ECHO will therefore continue its advocacy to encourage mainstreaming of DRR and notably relevant preparedness aspects in longer term sector programmes such as education, health, environment, and food security.

As a general observation, high levels of complementarity between DIPECHO projects and development projects can be seen as a challenge in terms of the difference in approaches by the different actors: DG ECHO's short-term community-based approach versus the macro-level approach applied by most donors. Even in countries where DRR is recognised as a national development priority, interventions that benefit the most vulnerable groups are often neglected by authorities and donors. This is an important challenge for the DIPECHO programme in the years to come, but a necessary condition for substantial contributions by the EC to the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015.

The funding provided by DG ECHO for DIPECHO Disaster Preparedness projects in six disaster prone regions is shown in the table below. Given the fact that the duration of these types of actions are typically 12-15 months, the table provides the cumulative funding in 2006 (since 1998), as well as the funding decisions adopted in 2007.

It has to be borne in mind when looking at this table that each "DIPECHO" region only benefits from a budgetary allocation every two years.

<b>Funding DIPECHO</b>				
<b>Disaster region</b>	<b>Funding 1998-2006</b>	<b>Funding 2007</b>	<b>Total 1998-2007</b>	<b>Agreements signed in 2007</b>
Caribbean	12 975 000	4 000 000	16 975 000	3 769 173
Central America	20 980 000	1 500 000*	22 480 000	6 255 000
Andean Community	17 240 000	6 500 000	23 740 000	6 500 000
Central Asia	15 050 000	6 500 000	23 740 000	5 699 354
South Asia	11 700 000	7 500 000	15 050 000	12 702 383
South East Asia	21 680 000	--	21 680 000	--
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>99 625 000</b>	<b>19 500 000</b>	<b>119 125 000</b>	<b>34 925 910</b>

\* The €1,500,000 for Central America in 2007 is in addition to an amount of €6,000,000 allocated in 2006.

### ***Caribbean***

Over the period 1998-2006, five DIPECHO Action Plans were implemented in the Caribbean region, which represents a DG ECHO investment of some €12,975,000 in disaster preparedness. The Sixth DIPECHO Action Plan in the Caribbean was launched in September 2007 and runs until February 2009.

The overall aim of the DIPECHO operations is to enable local communities to prepare for and mitigate natural disasters. Some operations are country-specific, targeting the Dominican Republic (24% of funding), Haiti (27% of funding), plus Belize, Dominica and Guyana (25% of funding together). Others are regional (24% of funding), including Anguilla, Bahamas, Barbados, Grenada, Montserrat, St Kitts & Nevis, St Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago. Operations include: components on capacity-building, early warning systems, small-scale mitigation works, mapping and data computerisation, research and dissemination, advocacy and education. A new initiative is an operation under the "Safe Hospital" programme, undertaken by the Pan American Health Organization in co-operation with the International Strategy for disaster Reduction. Recent experience after Hurricane Dean shows that measures undertaken by DIPECHO programmes are effective in minimising casualties and saving lives.

## ***Central America***

Central America is particularly exposed to natural disasters such as volcanoes, earthquakes, hurricanes, tropical storms, and landslides. The losses and destruction that result from these disasters are significant from a social and economic point of view and reduce the development potential of the region. Furthermore, Central America experiences frequent small-scale disasters affecting relatively few communities, where donors are unlikely to intervene due to the limited scale of the event, but which have a considerable negative impact on the livelihoods of those affected. These events, as well as large-scale disasters such as Hurricane Mitch in 1998, Stan in 2005 and Felix in 2007, highlight the increasing need for disaster preparedness activities in the region, and the significance of community-based disaster risk reduction efforts. Such efforts enable the communities at risk to lessen the impact of the disasters and prepare themselves for when natural disasters occur.

A Fifth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central America was implemented in 2007. An amount of €7,500,000 was allocated to improve the capacities of communities at risk to better prepare for and protect themselves against natural disasters in six countries in the region: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama, the latter two countries being covered only by regional projects. An external evaluation of the DIPECHO programme was carried out in 2007. According to the final evaluation report, "*Support for community-based Disaster preparedness in Central America has been and remains very relevant in the national and regional contexts. The programme's overriding objective of reducing risk by better preparing vulnerable populations in the most disaster prone areas maintains a high level of pertinence. Disaster preparedness remains a key factor to saving lives and ensuring an appropriate response [...]. The programme continues to fill a gap taken up on by very few other agencies or programmes; DIPECHO programme and objectives are generally well understood by beneficiaries. The DRR initiatives of other EC services, national and regional efforts, and of bilateral co-operation emergencies are meagre and do not provide a basis for phasing out DIPECHO in the short or even medium term.*"

At the end of 2007, the strategy for the Sixth Action Plan was defined in collaboration with the main stakeholders in each country through four national consultative meetings, one regional consultative meeting, an analysis of existing legislation, donor activities in DRR and the current/planned national DRR strategies and the recommendations from the above-mentioned evaluation.

## ***South America***

South America is one of the most highly disaster-prone regions of the world, exposed to panoply of natural disasters due to its geography, geology and climate: The El Niño event, attributed to warming in the Eastern and central Pacific, causes regular floods and droughts. The region is also particularly vulnerable to earthquakes and many volcanoes are still active. In 2007, the major natural disaster has been the devastating earthquake that struck Peru in August 2007 but many small to medium scale disasters have also occurred with affects across the whole region. Since 1999, four DIPECHO Action Plans have been implemented.

The Fifth Action Plan for South America, with a budget of €6,500,000 was launched in 2007 and led to the funding of projects in Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela and for the very first time, some cross boarder projects with Argentina and Paraguay.

On the basis of lessons learned from previous Action Plans and needs identified in the field through the consultative process, greater emphasis was placed on the most vulnerable populations in disaster-prone areas such as urban centres; on maintaining access to basic services such as health, water and sanitation during a disaster; on the identification of indicators to assess local capacity and needs, with the funding of bi-national and tri-national projects. Coordination with national and regional authorities remains a real commitment in the programme. It has to be mentioned that this coordination process involves also the relevant EC Delegations and the regional EU project PREDECAN.

### *Central Asia*

Central Asia is permanently threatened by potential large-scale disasters, in particular, earthquakes and by numerous small or medium scale disasters such as floods, mudflows, avalanches, flash floods, landslides, etc. Risk is exacerbated by poor national coping capacities and a near absence of co-ordination mechanisms, analysis and preventative measures. One after the other, these disasters erode capacities and threaten people livelihoods.

In December 2006, the European Commission adopted its Fourth DIPECHO Action Plan for Central Asia (€6,050,000), which covers the period February 2007-July 2008. This decision concerns Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan and Tajikistan, including small cross border initiatives with Northern Afghanistan and will bring the total DIPECHO investment in the region to €15,050,000. This fourth action plan has financed 20 grants agreements in the following activities: developing local disaster management plans, disaster and vulnerability mapping, establishing early warning systems, training and equipping rapid response, search and rescue and medical teams, developing curricula and training programmes on safe construction practices, and improvement of the coordination and the linking to national platforms for disaster preparedness with the support of UNDP.

In November 2007, DG ECHO organised the first regional consultative meeting on Disaster Risk Reduction, which has confirmed the relevance and the success of the DIPECHO programme in the region. This conference was also the opportunity to consult partners in the framework of the preparation of the Fifth DIPECHO action plan (€7,325,000) which will cover the period July 2008-December 2009 and the five Central Asia Countries.

### *South Asia*

South Asia is one of the most vulnerable regions to natural disasters. The social and political structures, demographic pressures, the structure of settlements, agricultural practices and economic development result in a population which is extremely vulnerable to natural disasters such as earthquakes, floods, cyclones, drought and landslides. 2007 has witnessed a large numbers of floods affecting Pakistan, India and Bangladesh linked notably to a particular strong monsoon. The year has ended with the cyclone SIDR that has affected thousands of people in southern Bangladesh reminding once more the important and pertinence of good disaster preparation. The Fourth DIPECHO Action Plan for South Asia with a budget of €7,500,000 was launched in 2007 for projects to be carried out in Afghanistan (for the first time), Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan. Clear priorities were once more given to a community-based approach for the most remote, disaster prone areas and vulnerable people while at the same time targeting earthquake-prone vulnerable populations in urban areas, such as big cities in Bangladesh and the Kathmandu valley.

Coordination mechanisms between partners and joint advocacy for Disaster Risk Reduction and thus also for a culture of preparedness, have been the most important achievements over the last two years and will remain a high priority during this Action Plan. DG ECHO has directly contributed to raising national awareness about DRR, reiterating the obligation of authorities to implement the *Hyogo Framework for Action* using community-based projects as the main advocacy platform for overall disaster management practices.

### ***South East Asia***

South East Asia is another highly disaster-prone area in the world. This area is particularly exposed to floods, flash flooding, typhoons, landslides, earthquakes, drought, forest fires, volcanoes and tsunamis. The losses and destruction that result from these disasters are considerable from a social and economic point of view, reducing the development potential of the poorer countries of the region especially where large parts of the populations are living in remoter areas with weak infrastructure. The disasters that affected this region in 2007, although mostly small to medium scale, from floods, landslides, earthquakes in Indonesia, to typhoons in Vietnam, floods in Vietnam and the Philippines, highlighted yet again the importance of disaster preparedness activities – especially at the community level. Over the years DG ECHO has launched five Regional Action Plans for South East Asia of which the latest was implemented in 2007. The Fifth DIPECHO Action Plan (€7,000,000) covered seven countries in the region: Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Lao PDR, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam, although Lao PDR and Thailand are only covered by regional projects.

At the end of 2007, the strategy for the Sixth Action Plan was defined in collaboration with the main stakeholders in each country through National Consultative meetings, the analysis of existing legislation, donor activities in DRR and the current/planned national DRR strategies plus the recommendations from the 2006 evaluation of the DIPECHO strategy in the region.

### ***Drought Preparedness in the Horn of Africa and Disaster Preparedness in the south-east Africa and the south-west Indian Ocean Region.***

In 2006, DG ECHO adopted a significant regional decision (€10,000,000) on disaster preparedness for pastoralist populations in the Greater Horn of Africa (i.e. Sudan, Djibouti, Somalia, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and Eritrea). DG ECHO financed actions supported the establishment of contingency planning measures, early warning systems and community-based mechanisms for response to the inevitable cycles of droughts. Activities financed under the 2006 decision continued to be implemented throughout 2007. (For more information on the drought preparedness programme in the Horn of Africa, see the Horn of Africa section.)

In 2007 DG ECHO undertook an ex-ante evaluation of disaster preparedness in the south-east Africa and south-west Indian Ocean region. This ex-ante evaluation is being followed up with the preparation of a DIPECHO Action Plan for the south-east Africa and south-west Indian Ocean region (€5,000,000).

## PART II. POLICY ISSUES

In order to improve the quality of humanitarian aid delivered, DG ECHO follows and develops policy issues with relevant partners, in specific areas (such as food, protection, HIV/AIDS, children, disaster preparedness civil-military coordination and the UN-instigated humanitarian reform etc). The European Commission and other donors agreed to 23 principles of "*Good Humanitarian Donorship*" (GHD) in 2003 to address good practice in humanitarian financing and donor accountability, stressing inter alia the need for aid to be targeted according to need: not political affiliation, ethnicity, religion or race. In 2007, DG ECHO continued to support the GHD-principles through a specific activity plan. Actions included coordination with other donors and organisations on methods for needs-based allocations, building *inter alia* on DG ECHO's instrument for Global Needs Assessment. Other activities included strong support for disaster preparedness and the response capacity of humanitarian organisations, as well engaging in increased donor coordination at all levels.

Due to a number of developments, the European humanitarian aid policy needed to be reviewed in order to confirm and/or adapt its underlying values, principles and working modalities. Moreover, the international context in which humanitarian aid takes place has changed considerably, not only in terms of the nature, frequency and intensity of disasters, but also in terms of the geopolitical context in which it operates. International humanitarian aid is therefore being reformed, a process that is driven by major donors and international aid organisations, above all the United Nations. New actors have appeared on the scene such as non-traditional donors, including actors from the corporate sector or states that have hitherto not been active in humanitarian aid. Similarly, military and civil protection forces have come to play a significant role in some circumstances and need to be taken account of in many humanitarian operations. While much of this policy terrain is covered by the *Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative*, this initiative has never been endorsed at EU level. Finally, the EU is striving to strengthen its external action with a view to increased coherence, efficiency and effectiveness.

To reply to these developments, an initiative was launched in order to propose ways for the EU to effectively confront the changing humanitarian aid environment. The reflexion on its position at European and world levels, ways of intervention and relations with its partners or other humanitarian actors has resulted in the adoption of a Communication<sup>8</sup> "*Towards a European consensus on Humanitarian Aid*" in June 2007. In developing its communication, the Commission reviewed lessons learnt in its response to a number of major crises and conducted an intensive process of its humanitarian partners and of Member States. The consultation showed considerable consensus on the challenges faced by humanitarian aid workers and the need for the Union to take a clear stance in this respect. The negotiations with the European Parliament and Council which followed the communication led to the adoption of the statement on the European Consensus in December 2007. Signed by the three Institutions, it confirms the principles and best practices for humanitarian action with the aim at promoting a coordinated approach that would allow the Union to maximise its contribution to the international humanitarian response.

A paper on **children in humanitarian crises** has progressed with discussions with partners and stakeholders over the summer 2007. The Commission Staff working paper will be part of

---

<sup>8</sup> COM(2007)317

a package developed jointly with DG DEVELOPMENT<sup>9</sup>. Operational fiches will be developed in 2008.

DG ECHO implemented technical working groups on medical aspects of funded projects for public health emergencies (**Anopheles**) or on Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (**Aquarius**), combining different expertises with DG ECHO. It also includes terms of reference as well as work plans.

DG ECHO provided political and financial support for the *cluster approach* that has been established through the UN-instigated humanitarian reform. The cluster approach aims at clarifying the division of labour among organisations, and better defining their roles and responsibilities in order to identify and plug response gaps in the overall humanitarian effort. DG ECHO has used its bilateral dialogues with humanitarian organisations, international meetings and its Delegations in Geneva and New York to advocate for increased accountability of UN-agencies and other organisations.

Finally, DG ECHO continued to support thematic funding, by funding UN agencies and the Red Cross aiming at reinforcing their core capacities. This funding supports the cluster approach as it strengthens the cluster capacity building of cluster-lead organisations.

---

<sup>9</sup> Communication adopted in February 2008 "A Special Place for Children in EU External Action"

### **PART III. RELATIONS WITH OTHER EU INSTITUTIONS, MEMBER STATES, MAJOR HUMANITARIAN PARTNERS AND NON-EU DONORS**

#### **1. EU Institutions and Member States**

As in previous years, DG ECHO pursued an active relationship with other Institutions, Member States and International Organisations and continued to promote the respect for international humanitarian law and humanitarian principles (humanity, impartiality, non-discrimination and neutrality), particularly in relation to developments under the Common Foreign and Security Policy. It ensured also that the necessity to respect the humanitarian space during emergencies has duly been taken into account in the European and international debate. This objective includes also the work done in respect to the Ombudsman and the Committee on Petitions.

In 2007, the work and negotiations leading to the EU Consensus on Humanitarian Aid represented the key process for DG ECHO's active interaction with the European Parliament and the Council on humanitarian issues. Commissioner Louis Michel, accompanied by DG ECHO representatives, participated in the meeting of the European Parliament Development Committee on 18 December. DG ECHO also contributed to the Hearing organised on 29 January 2008 by the European Parliament Committee on Development as a follow-up to the Consensus.

At the **Community institutional level**, DG ECHO continued to be active throughout 2007 with a view to ensuring that the humanitarian principles remained high on the agenda within the EU institutions. This was particularly the case in discussions with military and civil protection actors.

DG ECHO also maintained close contacts with other **Commission services** in particular with DG Environment – civil protection and DG External Relations as far crisis response is concerned. A revised Memorandum of Understanding on coordination on disaster response was signed by the three services who also agreed on a standard model for joint situation response.

As regards relations with the military, meetings with **Council** were arranged and have led to concrete operational follow up. Following the adoption in 2006 of the General Framework for the Use of Member States' Military or Military Chartered Transportation Assets and European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) Coordination Tools in support of EU Disaster Response, a "table top" exercise was organised with Military Staff of the European Union (EUMS) to test the Standard Operating Procedures developed for its practical implementation. In order to inform DG ECHO experts/staff of these developments, a special session devoted to these subjects was organised during the 2007 Experts Seminar with the participation of the EUMS.

With regard to **Member States**, seven monthly meetings of the Humanitarian Aid Committee (HAC) were organised as well as two informal meetings. The German and Portuguese Informal HAC meetings took as their common theme the Communication on the "European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid". Following its adoption, the German Presidency tabled Council Conclusions welcoming the Consensus initiative and the Portuguese Presidency tabled a draft consensus.



In relation to the **European Parliament**, DG ECHO presented its draft operational strategy for 2008 to the Development Committee (CODEV) on 17/12/07. DG ECHO continued to monitor in particular the work of the DEVE Committee and to further consolidate the relations with the Humanitarian Rapporteur, including active appearances at DEVE and regular meetings with the Rapporteur and European Parliament staff. It also successfully coordinated DG ECHO's replies and input to written and oral questions emanating from Members of European Parliament.

Other tasks completed during the year were (1) to make sure that DG ECHO complied with the obligations arising from the European Parliament's right of scrutiny, (2) provision of substantial input to the negotiations between Commission and European Parliament on a new Bilateral Agreement between the European Parliament and the Commission on procedures for implementing the Comitology Decision which will contain a provision allowing for a permanent derogation for humanitarian aid decisions from the one month deadline of the right of scrutiny and (3) follow-up of the alignment exercise to the new comitology decision and provided DG ECHO's contribution to the exercise.

## **2. Relations with international organisations and non-EU major donors**

On the **international front** and in order to ensure a strategic and trustworthy dialogue between DG ECHO and UN-agencies, NGOs and the Red Cross Movement (ICRC and IFRC), yearly high-level Strategic Partnership Dialogues (SPDs) are organised with each organisation. The SPDs represents an opportunity for DG ECHO to exchange views on key issues and developments with its main partners. Six of such SPDs were organised in 2007.

DG ECHO participates actively in the OCHA - and ICRC Donor Support Groups through which main donors provide strategic advice to the organisations. Activities include regular meetings in Geneva and New York, as well as participation in yearly high-level international conferences and field missions.

In the framework of its relations with **non-EU major donors**, DG ECHO maintained contacts with the US Administration (USAID<sup>10</sup> and PRM<sup>11</sup>) in particular through regular videoconferences, addressing general policy issues and humanitarian operations in specific countries with a view to ensuring a coherent and complementary response.

---

<sup>10</sup> United States Agency for International Development (USAID)

<sup>11</sup> Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration - US (PRM)

## **PART IV. OTHER ACTIVITIES**

### **1. Experts in the field**

In order to meet the target of 100 experts defined in the post-tsunami action plan of January 2005, DG ECHO pursued its consolidation in the recruitment of field experts, aiming at organising multi-sectoral rapid response teams. This allows DG ECHO to rapidly dispatch its field experts to new crisis situations to carry out humanitarian needs assessments and participate in the coordination of humanitarian activities in the field.

In 2007, experts were recruited in the context of the reinforcement of Regional Support Offices, to work in new country offices or to reinforce existing ones. At the end of the year, 96 experts were under contracts and 7 recruitment procedures were ongoing. This number fluctuates slightly with the closure or downsizing of certain offices and the reinforcement of others according to needs.

### **2. Security issues**

The security of humanitarian personnel in the field is a growing concern for all humanitarian bodies. During the past year, there were a significant number of violent acts directly committed against humanitarian aid workers. In particular, the number of incidents involving national/local NGO staff increased compared to those involving international staff. These security incidents continued to undermine the operational efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian partners. In this context, DG ECHO continued to pursue its efforts to strengthen its own security management system at headquarters and in the field through improved co-ordination and collaboration on security issues with appropriate humanitarian partners.

DG ECHO has established its own comprehensive security policy, taking into account the specificity of humanitarian aid delivery. This policy is coordinated by a specialised Security Advisor with a 24/7 permanence for DG ECHO headquarters and field staff and a direct reporting line to the Director General (regular meetings). His risk/threat assessment covers safety and security risks including advises on security sensitive missions.

In 2007, the emphasis has been put on security training courses for all experts, local staff, etc. working in hostile environment. An increased number of "pre-mission" security briefings were given to headquarters' staff travelling on mission to high risk security environments. DG ECHO's safety/security guidelines and procedures were submitted for inclusion in the Information Pack for Field staff.

DG ECHO appointed a new Regional Security Coordinator based in India, who will provide safety/security advice and support to all staff in Asia.

Finally, DG ECHO has initiated during the last quarter of 2007 the formalisation of existing close contacts with the concerned EC services, in view of further discussing and developing the appropriate balance between ensuring the coherence of security issues within the Commission and the efficient implementation of Humanitarian Aid.

### 3. Thematic funding and Grant Facility

#### a) Thematic funding

Thematic funding is covered by article 4 of the Council Regulation (EC) n° 1257/96 on humanitarian aid. While remaining crisis-oriented and answering primarily to the needs of populations that are victims of humanitarian disasters and conflicts, DG ECHO also finances, to a limited extent, the reinforcement of the core capacities of its partners.

In order to correct deficiencies in the general response to humanitarian emergencies, the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) commissioned an independent review<sup>12</sup> of the global humanitarian system in 2005. Following this review, a Humanitarian Reform Programme (HRP) was adopted by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) in September 2005, aimed at improving the humanitarian response by, among others, the introduction of a *cluster approach*<sup>13</sup>. The European Commission has confirmed full commitment to contribute to this reform process. In particular, DG ECHO funds selected lead agencies through thematic funding, aiming at reinforcing their capacities to fulfil their leadership responsibilities to ensure a coherent, timely, consistent, and effective humanitarian response.

A new approach to thematic funding has also been developed for the period 2007/2008, centring the thematic funding around a common theme which is the support to the humanitarian reform, in particular the cluster approach and coordination:

During the year, DG ECHO supported UN agencies and Red Cross movement organisations as lead agencies for a total amount of €27,500,000, of which €23,000,000 is allocated for a two-years round.

The emphasis has been put on the following gaps which are targeted to create an effective response capacity: assessing sector capacity, strengthening surge capacity, capacity building, increase of the availability of relief items at the onset of new emergencies, development of standard operating procedures, applying benchmarks to measure performance and improving coordination and support for the cluster to address the above.

---

<sup>12</sup> Humanitarian Response Review, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), Aug 2005

<sup>13</sup> The Cluster Approach aims to ensure e.g. sufficient global capacity and improved strategic field-level coordination. The approach is designed around the concept of partnerships between UN agencies, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, international organisations and NGOs. Partners work together towards agreed common humanitarian objectives both at the global level (preparedness, standards, tools, stockpiles and capacity-building) and at the field level (assessment, planning, delivery and monitoring). <http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/content/default.asp>

<b>THEMATIC FUNDING IN 2007</b>	
<b>Partner and type of funding</b>	<b>Amount allocated</b>
UN-OCHA – Humanitarian Information Systems	3.500.000
UNICEF – Protection of children and women	1.500.000
UNICEF – Preparedness and response capacity to humanitarian crises	4.500.000
WFP – Humanitarian Logistics capacities – Response Depot Network	4.300.000
WFP – Assessing Emergency needs in food security	4.500.000
UNHCR – Emergency Shelter Cluster	900.000
IFRC – Response to natural disasters	4.000.000
WHO – Support Health Emergencies	4.300.000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27.500.000</b>

#### b) Grant Facility

As regards NGOs, the equivalent of thematic funding is the Grant Facility. Based on article 4 of Council Regulation n° 1257/1996, the Grant Facility was established by DG ECHO during the Nineties in order to finance capacity building of non governmental partner organisations on the most relevant humanitarian aid issues.

In 2007, the objective of the Grant Facility funding was to improve the quality of EC-financed humanitarian aid and the performance of the overall humanitarian system by strengthening the organisational preparedness, management and response capacity, and accountability of humanitarian NGOs through the provision of targeted sectoral training and relevant networking activities.

#### **4. Finance and Audit**

DG ECHO has formal systems for regularly monitoring **financial information** and providing adequate management information. Specific financial indicators have been incorporated into an overall scoreboard.

Humanitarian activities are subject to financial audits, both at partners' headquarters for finalised projects and in the field for on-going projects. In respect of the Headquarter audits, DG ECHO uses an external firm of auditors to scrutinise DG ECHO projects over a two-year cycle involving an examination of partners' systems and the use of DG ECHO funds. In 2007, 69 headquarter audits were completed and 37 field audits were finalised on projects under way.

#### **5. Communication and information**

Regarding its communication strategy, DG ECHO undertook a range of actions in pursuit of its broad objective **to boost understanding in Europe and developing countries of the concrete contribution made by humanitarian aid** to the EU commitment of solidarity with developing countries. The EU is collectively the world's largest humanitarian donor. As the leading relief funder in the Union, the Commission has a leadership role in communicating the values that underlie European aid.

Within the EU, there is a high level of support for humanitarian action at European level. While public awareness of the Commission's work in this area has increased, many Europeans still have only a limited knowledge of the subject. The delivery of relief strikes a chord with most people and therefore presents an opportunity for the Commission to 'connect' positively with citizens.

With regard to printed publications, a thematic brochure on solidarity dedicated to the young people, photo-books, postcards and bookmarks as well as a new brochure on the phasing out activities in Tajikistan were printed.

Audiovisual items were produced such as a General presentation of EC humanitarian aid on DVD or broadcast of ECHO "spot" on Liberty TV.

Other communication products included press releases, witness accounts published on the DG ECHO website, new country-specific web sections, editorial features in four airlines in-flight magazines, an Annual Review and a range of other publications.

Joint communications with major institutional partners were carried out such as (1) WFP: *Food Force game in Portugal and Germany*; (2) UNHCR: *Financed reprint of leaflet "Working together to help refugees" featuring UNHCR-Commission relationship*; (3) UNICEF: *Chechnya billboards highlighting UNICEF-Commission cooperation with accompanying feature on ECHO website*; (4) ICRC: *Ongoing implementation of Communication Plan of Action. DG ECHO arranged two further venues in Brussels for ICRC photo exhibition. Presentation and media interview at launch of ECHO-funded photo exhibition in Warsaw*; (5) IFRC: *Press trip to Philippines organised and* (6) WHO: *Monitoring of visibility component in Middle East funding decision*, edited and designed advertorial placed by WHO in 'Time' magazine.

Other events were also organised, such as (1) integrated awareness-raising campaigns in Baltic States, Slovakia, Germany and Portugal, This included the launching of WFP Food Force Game [Germany and Portugal] and a "humanitarian road show" travelling to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia; exhibitions, etc; (2) participation in EuropeAid Cooperation Office "May 9<sup>th</sup>" schools campaign in Austria, France, Latvia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain and the UK; (3) increased participation in major humanitarian events, fairs and exhibition in European cities (International Aid and Trade-Geneva, Salon des Solidarités-Paris, DIHAD-Dubai) and (4) Participation in Rome Treaty 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations.

## **6. Training initiative**

DG ECHO continued to support the Network on Humanitarian Assistance (NOHA), which offers a one-year multi-disciplinary post-graduate diploma with seven universities participating across Europe<sup>14</sup> with the backing of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), inter-governmental organisations (IGOs) and other actors of the humanitarian relief community.

---

<sup>14</sup> Université Catholique de Louvain - Belgium, Université Paul Cézanne Aix-Marseille III (UPCAM) - France, Ruhr-Universität Bochum - Germany, University College of Dublin - Ireland, Universidad de Deusto - Spain, University of Uppsala - Sweden and University of Groningen - The Netherlands

## **1. 1. Evaluations**

In terms of **evaluations**, DG ECHO has an evaluation programme that covers the evaluation of operations, partnership and thematic issues. The function focuses on ex-post, ex-ante and real time evaluations of operations (usually where more than €50,000,000 of funds had been committed or which had not been evaluated for three years or more as far as the ex-post evaluations are concerned, and depending on operational priorities for the others) and on reviews/studies on sectoral issues. The staffing involved in the management of these evaluation activities is of 4 staff members. The budget allocated to evaluations was of €1,800,000.

In 2007, the following evaluations were finalised and/or launched:

- Thematic issues: DIPECHO interventions in South East Asia and Central America; DG ECHO's financed actions in the health sector; Information, communication and visibility activities; Use of cash and vouchers in humanitarian crises;
- Country operations: Greater Horn of Africa, Pakistan, Haiti, Sahel West Africa region, Zimbabwe, North Korea and Tajikistan.

These evaluations globally confirm the appropriateness and relevance of DG ECHO funded projects and of the methodology for needs assessment.

The evaluation reports are widely distributed and discussed in depth with the stakeholders as they provide an important contribution to DG ECHO's operational strategy.

More details on these evaluations are on DG ECHO's internet site [http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/evaluation/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/comm/echo/evaluation/index_en.htm).

## **2. 2. Outside assessments**

In 2007, there were 2 **outside assessments** which touched upon the performance of DG ECHO as a humanitarian donor:

- The DAC Peer Review<sup>15</sup> was overall very positive in respect of the added value of the humanitarian assistance provided by the Community in relation to its member states and of the overall donor performance of DG ECHO. Its main recommendations related to the need to increase DG ECHO's influence on humanitarian international policies and to address the significant under-funding of the DG ECHO's base budget.
- The DAC Peer Review report is available in the OECD website "Review of the Development Co-operation Policies and Programmes of the European Community"<sup>16</sup>.
- DARA, an independent organisation committed to improving the quality of development and humanitarian organisations through evaluation, made a comparative assessment in

---

<sup>15</sup> The Development Co-operation Directorate (DCD-DAC) within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

<sup>16</sup> [http://www.oecd.org/document/48/0,3343,en\\_2649\\_201185\\_39758640\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/48/0,3343,en_2649_201185_39758640_1_1_1_1,00.html)

2007 on the adherence of humanitarian donors to the indicators of "good humanitarian Donorship". In this comparative analysis, the European Commission was ranked in the 5<sup>th</sup> place overall amongst the 23 main governmental donors.

- The results are available on DARA's website [http://www.daraint.org/web\\_en/dara1.html](http://www.daraint.org/web_en/dara1.html)

**PART VI. FINANCIAL TABLES**

**1. DG ECHO budget and decisions for Humanitarian aid 1993 - 2007**

YEAR	BUDGET COMMISSION (1)			Total	LOME (EDF+BUDG)	TOTAL BUDGET (Com Appr.)	FINANCIAL DECISIONS	Implemen- tation rate
	Initial Budget	Reinforcements Em. Aid Res.	Other					
1993	171.400	209.000	136.010	516.410	90.180	606.590	604.800	99,7%
1994	266.000	212.000	21.200	499.200	263.770	762.970	764.100	100,1%
1995	256.000	254.500	132.000	642.500	46.455	688.955	694.100	100,7%
1996	321.500	324.000	13.970	659.470	10.380	669.850	656.700	98,0%
1997	315.100	0	122.720	437.820	7.420	445.240	441.600	99,2%
1998	325.100	150.000	5.113	480.213	37.387	517.600	517.642	100,0%
1999	330.850	346.000	50.000	726.850	83.432	810.282	812.910	100,3%
2000	471.050 (2)	0	21.410	492.460	2.850	495.310	491.715	99,3%
2001	473.000	40.000	10.000	523.000	20.750	543.750	543.704	100,0%
2002	441.845	80.000	0	521.845	17.475	539.320	537.790	99,7%
2003	441.690	100.000	44.910	586.600	14.105	600.705	600.349	99,9%
2004	490.000	0	28.184	518.184	52.228	570.412	570.342	100,0%
2005	495.500	130.000	5.156	630.656	23.170	653.826	652.499	99,8%
2006	495.729	140.000	7.561	643.290	28.060	671.350	671.007	99,9%
2007	732.160	0	8.854	741.014	28.200	769.214	768.530	99,9%
<b>TOTAL 1993-2007</b>	6.026.924	1.985.500	607.088	8.619.512	725.862	9.345.374	9.327.788	99,8%
<b>AVERAGE YEARS 1993-2007</b>	401.795	132.367	40.473	574.634	48.391	623.025	621.853	99,8%
<b>AVERAGE LAST 5 YEARS</b>	531.016	74.000	18.933	623.949	29.153	653.101	652.545	99,9%

(1) Total of chapter B7-21 (lines 210A,210,214,217,219) - As of 01.01.2004 (23.0104 & 23.0201 & 23.0202)

(2) Part of the emergency reserve was transferred to the budget line B7-210. The emergency reserve (line B7-910) was reduced from 346 MEUR in 1999 to 203 MEUR in 2000 and the budget in chapter B7-21 was increased by 140 MEUR. It is important to note that the budget was not increased - it was only an increase of the chapter B7-21 (humanitarian aid) with a corresponding decrease in the chapter B7-91 (emergency aid reserve)



## 2. Evolution of Humanitarian Aid's budget over the last 10 years

The gradual erosion of the humanitarian aid budget is in sharp contrast with both the evolution of humanitarian needs and assistance provided by other main donors.

Although specific trends fluctuate from one year to the next, the overall need for humanitarian aid is on a continuous rise. While the effects of wars and civil conflicts, on which the Commission spends roughly three quarters of its humanitarian aid budget, are relatively stable – although refugee numbers have recently increased – the frequency and severity of natural disasters is clearly rising much faster than any humanitarian aid budget. Consequently, the Commission's international partners' appeals for financing are increasing: for instance, the overall annual operational budget of the International Committee of the Red Cross has increased by 46% since 1996.

The graph below provides an overview of the EC humanitarian assistance and the assistance by the EU (Member States included<sup>17</sup>) as compared to the official worldwide humanitarian assistance<sup>18</sup>. It shows a steeply rising trend in international humanitarian aid is not mirrored by the Community humanitarian aid budget, which has been in decline. As a consequence, in real terms, the share Commission's humanitarian assistance in official humanitarian assistance decreased over this period by 30%<sup>19</sup>.


---

<sup>17</sup> Before 1997, no consolidated information is available

<sup>18</sup> Since the official humanitarian aid is expressed in US\$ and give the sharp currency fluctuations in the rate US\$/Euro, the aid volume has been calculated at the yearly rate and at an average rate. The year 2007 is an estimated figure for the total official humanitarian aid (source : <http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org>)

<sup>19</sup> Global data are only available until 2006 – but it is likely that this trend continued as Member States and others keep increased ODA.

Global Official Humanitarian Aid 1995-2007 (in million EUR)



	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
—◆— TOTAL HA (EUR - yearly rate)	3935	3217	3269	3282	6259	5591	5511	5910	5964	5539	8153	6767	6114
—■— TOTAL HA (EUR - average rate)	4420	3494	3146	3247	5417	4156	4206	5044	6048	6303	8260	7647	7739
—▲— EC HA (EUR)	1057	1021	714	786	1065	742	792	767	814	772	851	878	769
—×— EC+MS (EUR)			1226	1708	1961	1402	1712	1497	1818	1745	2471	2276	1949

### 3. DG ECHO's finalised contracts 1998-2007\*

Signature Year**	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Number of contracts signed	1 206	1 202	1 214	1 119	891	878	926	885	1 086	1 148

\* include grant agreements for humanitarian aid and contracts for support expenditure (audits, evaluations, information) and for technical assistance

\*\* includes contracts from financial year N and any contract from previous financial years but signed in financial year N

#### 4. Geographical breakdown of funding decisions 2002-2007 – Global overview

Country/Region	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>Africa, Caribbean, Pacific</b>	<b>199.450.000</b>	<b>225.285.000</b>	<b>301.555.000</b>	<b>244.216.500</b>	<b>322.060.000</b>	<b>418.760.000</b>
All Africa						2.000.000
<b>HORN of AFRICA</b>	<b>44.695.000</b>	<b>52.200.000</b>	<b>151.088.000</b>	<b>99.120.000</b>	<b>175.550.000</b>	<b>217.950.000</b>
Chad / Burkina Faso	175.000	2.000.000	12.000.000	14.000.000	14.500.000	30.500.000
Eritrea	1.750.000	1.300.000	1.000.000	4.620.000	6.000.000	6.000.000
Ethiopia	7.750.000	2.000.000	6.998.000	4.500.000	5.000.000	20.000.000
Kenya	2.500.000		3.850.000	2.000.000	9.050.000	9.000.000
Somalia	4.500.000	9.000.000	9.150.000	9.000.000	10.000.000	18.000.000
Sudan	18.000.000	22.000.000	91.000.000	45.000.000	97.000.000	110.450.000
Uganda	2.120.000	8.000.000	18.620.000	14.000.000	19.000.000	24.000.000
Regional drought					5.000.000	
Drought preparedness					10.000.000	
Echo-Flight (1)	7.900.000	7.900.000	8.470.000	6.000.000		
<b>GREAT LAKES / CENTRAL AFRICA</b>	<b>83.400.000</b>	<b>88.500.000</b>	<b>76.890.000</b>	<b>71.000.000</b>	<b>84.050.000</b>	<b>89.500.000</b>
Burundi	17.500.000	15.000.000	18.990.000	17.000.000	17.000.000	19.500.000
Central African Republic		1.000.000	470.000			8.000.000
Congo (Dem. Rep.)	38.100.000	44.000.000	40.000.000	38.000.000	43.000.000	42.500.000
Congo-Brazzaville		4.000.000	2.000.000	2.000.000		
Gabon	300.000	24.000.000				
Great lakes / Regional					1.000.000	
Tanzania	27.000.000		14.900.000	13.500.000	16.050.000	12.000.000
Echo-Flight (1)	500.000	500.000	530.000	500.000	7.000.000	7.500.000

Country/Region	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>WEST AFRICA</b>	<b>21.250.000</b>	<b>31.185.000</b>	<b>25.300.000</b>	<b>38.550.000</b>	<b>41.650.000</b>	<b>46.600.000</b>
Benin		600.000		1.050.000		
Epidemics					1.250.000	
Guinea Bissau					1.000.000	
Liberia, Ivory Coast, Guinea	20.500.000	29.740.000	25.300.000	29.200.000	26.500.000	19.100.000
Mali, Niger, Mauritanie		845.000		8.300.000	12.000.000	
Regional					900.000	2.000.000
Sahel						25.500.000
Senegal	750.000					
<b>SOUTHERN AFRICA/INDIAN OCEAN</b>	<b>49.500.000</b>	<b>52.000.000</b>	<b>30.800.000</b>	<b>27.750.000</b>	<b>19.200.000</b>	<b>50.400.000</b>
Angola	12.000.000	8.900.000	8.800.000	2.000.000	3.000.000	
Africa, Southern - Regional (Lesotho/Swaziland)	30.000.000	25.000.000	2.000.000	1.750.000		5.819.167
Madagascar	1.000.000		2.000.000	500.000		5.380.833
Malawi	1.500.000			5.000.000		
Mozambique / Botswana					2.000.000	7.000.000
Namibia		100.000	1.000.000			
Zambia	3.000.000	5.000.000	2.000.000	3.500.000	2.200.000	2.000.000
Zimbabwe	2.000.000	13.000.000	15.000.000	15.000.000	12.000.000	30.200.000

Country/Region	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>CARIBBEAN / PACIFIC</b>	<b>605.000</b>	<b>1.400.000</b>	<b>17.477.000</b>	<b>7.796.500</b>	<b>1.610.000</b>	<b>12.310.000</b>
<b>Caraibbean / Pacific</b>	605.000	1.400.000	17.477.000	6.496.500	910.000	7.260.000
<b>Haiti</b>						4.500.000
<b>Solomon Island</b>						550.000
<b>Comoros</b>				1.100.000		
<b>Papua New Guinea</b>				200.000		
<b>Suriname</b>					700.000	
<p>(1) Echo-flight was used mostly for Air Operations in the Horn of Africa but as of 2001 also for Air Operations in Central Africa. From 2006, it is only used in Central Africa  For the years 2001-2003 a detailed breakdown by region was not available in the funding decision and the breakdown for these years is therefore indicative.</p>						

Country/Region	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>Eastern Europe, NIS, Mediterranean, Middle East</b>	<b>147.430.000</b>	<b>191.141.261</b>	<b>90.705.000</b>	<b>84.087.000</b>	<b>177.900.000</b>	<b>124.897.118</b>
<b>NIS and MONGOLIA</b>	<b>40.500.000</b>	<b>39.200.000</b>	<b>41.850.000</b>	<b>35.200.000</b>	<b>33.000.000</b>	<b>25.807.118</b>
Caucasus, Northern (Chechnya)	28.000.000	26.000.000	28.500.000	26.300.000	26.000.000	20.807.118
Caucasus, South (Georgia)	1.800.000	2.200.000	4.000.000	2.000.000	2.000.000	2.000.000
Moldova						3.000.000
Mongolia	700.000	1.000.000	1.000.000	900.000		
Tajikistan	10.000.000	10.000.000	8.350.000	6.000.000	5.000.000	
<b>WESTERN BALKANS</b>	<b>43.000.000</b>	<b>7.660.000</b>				
FRY - Serbie	37.000.000	7.660.000				
FRY - Kosovo	2.000.000					
fyROM	3.000.000					
Regional	1.000.000					
<b>MIDDLE EAST</b>	<b>49.590.000</b>	<b>137.138.761</b>	<b>39.880.000</b>	<b>39.576.000</b>	<b>134.000.000</b>	<b>89.090.000</b>
Iraq crisis	13.000.000	97.138.761				17.800.000
Palestinian Territories, Lebanon, Jordan, Syria	35.000.000	38.000.000	37.350.000	36.576.000	134.000.000	70.300.000
Yemen	1.590.000	2.000.000	2.530.000	3.000.000		990.000
<b>MEDITERRANEAN / NORTH AFRICA</b>	<b>14.340.000</b>	<b>7.142.500</b>	<b>8.975.000</b>	<b>9.311.000</b>	<b>10.900.000</b>	<b>10.000.000</b>
Algeria		2.000.000				
Morocco			975.000			
Western Sahara (Sahrawi)	14.340.000	5.142.500	8.000.000	9.311.000	10.900.000	10.000.000

Country/Region	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>Asia, Central &amp; South America</b>	<b>157.615.000</b>	<b>127.060.000</b>	<b>123.323.630</b>	<b>256.945.370</b>	<b>105.491.305</b>	<b>141.865.678</b>
<b>ASIA</b>	<b>137.969.000</b>	<b>116.949.000</b>	<b>111.123.630</b>	<b>239.245.370</b>	<b>86.891.305</b>	<b>109.800.695</b>
Afghanistan/Iran/Pakistan	73.254.000	55.839.000	42.821.000	68.000.000	23.500.000	27.000.000
Bangladesh			5.763.000			9.925.000
Burma/Myanmar/Thailand	8.965.000	11.560.000	19.720.000	16.500.000	15.700.000	19.000.000
Cambodia	5.500.000	4.000.000	3.500.000	2.000.000		
China / Tibet	4.450.000	4.800.000	2.000.000			
East Timor	1.935.000	2.000.000	250.000	2.500.000	3.000.000	3.000.000
India	5.000.000	2.650.000	3.000.000		6.000.000	2.630.000
Indonesia	3.540.000	3.500.000	3.500.000	2.000.000	9.867.000	1.600.000
Laos	1.130.000	1.700.000	1.500.000	1.200.000		
Nepal / Bhutan	3.675.000	4.000.000	4.000.000	6.000.000	7.800.000	6.000.000
North Korea	21.025.000	17.000.000	16.750.000	13.715.000	8.000.000	2.000.000
Philippines		1.000.000	1.650.000	500.000	564.305	2.145.695
Regional		800.000				19.500.000
Sri Lanka	8.300.000	8.100.000	6.500.000	4.000.000	12.000.000	15.000.000
Tsunami			169.630	122.830.370		
Vietnam	1.195.000				460.000	2.000.000

Country/Region	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>CENTRAL &amp; SOUTH AMERICA</b>	<b>19.646.000</b>	<b>10.111.000</b>	<b>12.200.000</b>	<b>17.700.000</b>	<b>18.600.000</b>	<b>32.064.983</b>
Bolivia					1.000.000	1.000.000
Central America	6.028.000	520.000	1.000.000	5.700.000	2.000.000	
Colombia	9.200.000	8.000.000	8.500.000	12.000.000	12.000.000	13.000.000
Cuba	600.000					
Ecuador					1.000.000	
Guatemala					2.600.000	
Honduras						500.000
Nicaragua						6.000.000
Paraguay						1.500.000
Peru						10.064.983
South America (Colombia excluded)	3.818.000	1.591.000	2.700.000			



Country/Region	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>THEMATIC FUNDING</b>	<b>11.700.000</b>	<b>23.196.000</b>	<b>19.430.000</b>	<b>20.500.000</b>	<b>19.500.000</b>	<b>27.500.000</b>
Protection of refugees (UNHCR)	11.700.000	11.000.000		5.000.000	4.000.000	
Humanitarian Information systems (OCHA)		1.200.000	4.000.000	4.000.000	3.000.000	3.500.000
Protection of victims of armed conflicts (ICRC)		10.000.000		4.000.000	3.000.000	
Protection of children and women (UNICEF)		996.000	2.000.000		1.800.000	1.500.000
Preparedness and response capacity to hum.crisis (UNICEF)			5.430.000		4.200.000	4.500.000
Humanitarian logistic capacities - Response Depot Network (WFP)						4.300.000
Emergency Shelter Cluster (UNHCR)						900.000
Response to Natural Disasters (IFRC)				3.500.000		4.000.000
Assessing Emergency Needs in food security (WFP)			4.500.000		3.500.000	4.500.000
Support Health Emergencies (WHO)			3.500.000	4.000.000		4.300.000
<b>GRANTS AND SERVICES</b>					<b>1.000.000</b>	<b>1.400.000</b>

Country/Region	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>DISASTER PREPAREDNESS</b>	<b>8.000.000</b>	<b>12.000.000</b>	<b>13.700.000</b>	<b>17.500.000</b>	<b>19.050.000</b>	<b>19.500.000</b>
Andean Communities	1.640.000	4.000.000		4.500.000		6.500.000
Carribbean		2.500.000		3.500.000		4.000.000
Central Asia		3.000.000	2.500.000	3.500.000	6.050.000	
South Asia		2.500.000	5.200.000	6.000.000	7.000.000	7.500.000
South East and Central America	6.360.000		6.000.000		6.000.000	1.500.000
<b>OTHER EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>13.595.000</b>	<b>21.666.000</b>	<b>21.628.000</b>	<b>29.250.000</b>	<b>26.005.627</b>	<b>34.607.038</b>
Experts	8.000.000	12.037.000	13.500.000	18.750.000	14.350.000	20.500.000
Regional Imprest Accounts/Regional offices	1.025.000	4.880.000	1.800.000	4.000.000	4.650.000	4.900.000
Support Ependiture (audit, eval, info)	4.570.000	4.749.000	6.328.000	6.500.000	6.188.894	8.900.262
Use of re-assigned revenue					816.733	306.776
<b>BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION 2002-2007</b>	<b>537.790.000</b>	<b>600.348.261</b>	<b>570.341.630</b>	<b>652.498.870</b>	<b>671.006.932</b>	<b>768.529.834</b>

## 5. Funding decisions for humanitarian aid in 2007

a) Decisions adopted by the Commission as of 31.12.2007

Country/sub-region	Decisions in €
<b>AFRICA, CARIBBEAN, PACIFIC</b>	<b>418.760.000</b>
All Africa	2.000.000
Regional West Africa	2.000.000
Regional Sahel	25.500.000
Regional Southern Africa	5.819.167
Burundi	19.500.000
Chad	30.500.000
Caribbean	7.260.000
Central African Republic	8.000.000
Côte d'Ivoire	500.000
Congo (Democratic Republic)	50.000.000
Eritrea	6.000.000
Ethiopia	20.000.000
Guinea	2.000.000
Haiti	4.500.000
Kenya	9.000.000
Liberia	16.600.000
Madagascar	5.380.833
Mozambique	7.000.000
Solomon Island	550.000
Somalia	18.000.000
Sudan	110.450.000
Tanzania	12.000.000
Uganda	24.000.000
Zambia	2.000.000
Zimbabwe	30.200.000
<b>Eastern Europe, NIS</b>	<b>25.807.118</b>
Georgia	2.000.000
Moldova	3.000.000
Northern Caucasus (Chechnya crisis)	20.807.118
<b>Middle East/North Africa</b>	<b>99.090.000</b>
Western Sahara (Sahrawi)	10.000.000
Iraq crisis	17.800.000
Middle East (Palestinian population)	60.000.000
Middle East (Lebanon)	10.300.000
Yemen	990.000

Country/sub-region	Decisions in €
<b>ASIA</b>	<b>109.800.695</b>
Bangladesh	9.925.000
East Timor	3.000.000
India	2.630.000
Indonesia	1.600.000
Myanmar/Burma/Thailand	19.000.000
Nepal	6.000.000
North Korea	2.000.000
Pakistan/Iran/Afghanistan	27.000.000
Philippines	2.145.695
Sri Lanka	15.000.000
Vietnam	2.000.000
Regional South Asia	19.500.000
<b>Latin America</b>	<b>32.064.983</b>
Bolivia	1.000.000
Colombia	13.000.000
Honduras	500.000
Nicaragua	6.000.000
Paraguay	1.500.000
Peru	10.064.983
<b>DIPECHO</b>	<b>19.500.000</b>
Central America	1.500.000
South America	6.500.000
South Asia	7.500.000
Caribbean	4.000.000
<b>Thematic funding</b>	<b>27.500.000</b>
Supporting HA reform	23.000.000
Assessment & analysis of hum. Needs	4.500.000
<b>OTHER FUNDING</b>	<b>36.007.038</b>
Technical assistance	25.400.000
Evaluation/Communication/Audit	5.550.000
Grants and Services	1.400.000
Other	3.657.038

<b>Total ECHO funding 2007</b>	<b>768.529.834</b>
--------------------------------	--------------------

b) Execution countries of Decisions adopted by the Commission as of 31.12.2007

Country/sub-region	Decisions in €
<b>AFRICA, CARIBBEAN, PACIFIC</b>	<b>422.760.000</b>
Angola	44.444
Belize	600.000
Benin	44.444
Botswana	44.444
Burkina Faso	5.861.111
Burundi	19.544.444
Cameroon	44.444
Cape Verde	44.444
Central African Republic	8.044.444
Chad	35.494.444
Congo	44.444
Congo (Democratic Republic)	50.044.444
Côte d'Ivoire	544.444
Djibouti	44.444
Dominica	600.000
Dominican Republic	3.010.000
Equatorial Guinea	44.444
Eritrea	6.044.444
Ethiopia	20.044.444
Gabon	44.444
Gambia	44.444
Ghana	711.111
Guinea	2.044.444
Guinea Bissau	44.444
Haiti *	10.350.000
Jamaica	600.000
Kenya	9.044.444
Lesotho	2.954.028
Liberia	16.644.444
Madagascar	5.425.277
Malawi	44.444
Mali	3.044.444
Mauritania	4.044.444
Mauritius	44.444
Mozambique	7.044.444
Namibia	44.444
Niger	5.644.444
Nigeria	44.444
Rwanda	44.444
Sahel	2.300.019
Saint Lucia	600.000
Sao Tome e Principe	44.444
Senegal	44.444
Sierra Leone	44.444
Solomon Islands	550.000
Somalia	18.044.444
Sudan	110.494.444
Swaziland	2.954.028
Tanzania	12.044.444
Togo	1.211.111
Uganda	24.044.444
Zambia	2.044.444
Zimbabwe	30.244.444
<b>Middle East/North Africa</b>	<b>106.090.000</b>
Algeria (Western Sahara)	10.000.000
Egypt	2.000.000
Iran	7.000.000
Iraq	7.800.000
Jordan	12.750.000
Middle East (Palestinian population)	34.050.000
Middle East (Lebanon)	16.750.000
Syrian Arab Republic	12.750.000
Turkey	2.000.000
Yemen	990.000

Country/sub-region	Decisions in €
<b>Eastern Europe, NIS</b>	<b>25.807.118</b>
Georgia	2.000.000
Moldova	3.000.000
Northern Caucasus (Chechnya crisis)	20.807.118
<b>ASIA</b>	<b>110.300.695</b>
Afghanistan *	14.071.426
Bangladesh *	17.496.429
Bhutan *	1.071.429
East Timor	3.000.000
India *	15.201.429
Indonesia	1.600.000
Myanmar/Burma	10.000.000
Nepal *	9.071.429
North Korea	2.000.000
Pakistan *	8.071.429
Philippines	2.145.695
Sri Lanka *	15.571.429
Thailand	9.000.000
Vietnam	2.000.000
<b>Latin America</b>	<b>40.064.983</b>
Argentina *	650.000
Bolivia *	1.650.000
Brazil *	650.000
Chile *	650.000
Colombia *	11.850.000
Costa Rica *	250.000
Ecuador *	1.850.000
El Salvador *	250.000
Guatemala *	250.000
Honduras *	750.000
Nicaragua *	6.250.000
Panama *	250.000
Paraguay *	2.150.000
Peru *	10.714.983
Uruguay *	650.000
Venezuela *	1.250.000
<b>DIPECHO *</b>	<b>19.500.000</b>
<i>Central America</i>	<i>1.500.000</i>
<i>South America</i>	<i>6.500.000</i>
<i>South Asia</i>	<i>7.500.000</i>
<i>Caribbean</i>	<i>4.000.000</i>
<b>Thematic funding</b>	<b>27.500.000</b>
Supporting HA reform	23.000.000
Assessment & analysis of hum. Needs	4.500.000
<b>Other funding</b>	<b>36.007.038</b>
Technical assistance	25.400.000
Evaluation/Communication/Audit	5.550.000
Grants and Services	1.400.000
Other	3.657.038
<b>Total ECHO funding 2007</b>	<b>768.529.834</b>


\* Dipecho decisions are split in the recipient countries. The amounts given under the Dipecho label are for information only

**6. Partners in DG ECHO's humanitarian assistance**


*6.1. Partners categories*

DG ECHO does not implement assistance programmes itself. It is a donor who implements its mission by funding Community humanitarian actions through **partners** which have signed either the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) such as European NGOs and International Organisations (Red Cross family) or the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) for the UN agencies.


The relative share of these 3 categories of partners is illustrated below:



Over the last five years there has been a decrease in NGO funding against an increase of UN funding as shown in the picture below:



However, the 2007 figures are not entirely comparable with previous years, given the integration of the food aid budget line whereby food aid is largely implemented by a small number of UN and International Organisations. If food aid is excluded, funding by category of partners is the following and the decrease tendency of NGO funding is reversed (increase of % in comparison with 2006).



## 6.2. Contracts by Category and Nationality of Partners 2007

Contracts signed with NGOs are summarised below, ranked by nationality of partner in the table below. The two next tables show a repartition of contracts signed with UN agencies and International Organisations.

Nationality of partner	TOTAL	% all	% NGO
AUSTRIA	8.843.114	1,2%	2,5%
BELGIUM	8.864.156	1,2%	2,5%
CANADA	7.500.000	1,0%	2,1%
CZECH REPUBLIC	545.000	0,1%	0,2%
DENMARK	17.241.416	2,3%	4,9%
FRANCE	77.332.276	10,4%	21,9%
GERMANY	32.344.729	4,4%	9,1%
GREECE	1.676.220	0,2%	0,5%
IRELAND	10.515.187	1,4%	3,0%
ITALY	25.342.327	3,4%	7,2%
LUXEMBURG	210.000	0,0%	0,1%
NETHERLANDS	25.754.196	3,5%	7,3%
NORWAY	10.300.443	1,4%	2,9%
POLAND	1.394.367	0,2%	0,4%
PORTUGAL	1.379.519	0,2%	0,4%
SPAIN	28.856.679	3,9%	8,2%
SWEDEN	1.133.000	0,2%	0,3%
SWITZERLAND	5.333.171	0,7%	1,5%
UNITED KINGDOM	89.048.002	12,0%	25,2%
<b>Subtotal NGOs</b>	<b>353.613.801</b>	<b>47,7%</b>	<b>100,0%</b>
INTERNATIONAL	387.062.847	52,3%	
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>740.676.648</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	

UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES			TOTAL	INTERNATIONAL ORG.	TOTAL	% all
	% all					
FAO	15.611.623	2,1%	Red Cross (ICRC)	54.625.000	7,4%	
OCHA	10.288.295	1,4%	Red Cross (IFRC)	14.594.307	2,0%	
PAHO	2.355.000	0,3%	International Org. For Migration	9.583.653	1,3%	
UNCHS-HABITAT	1.113.068	0,2%	Mekong River Commission	283.027	0,0%	
UNDP	10.287.818	1,4%	<b>Total</b>	<b>79.085.987</b>	<b>10,7%</b>	
UNESCAP	461.000	0,1%				
UNFPA	1.104.000	0,1%				
UNHCR	49.367.700	6,7%				
UNICEF	29.515.529	4,0%				
UNRWA	19.981.857	2,7%				
WFP	156.334.560	21,1%				
WHO	11.556.409	1,6%				
<b>Total</b>	<b>307.976.859</b>	<b>41,6%</b>				

6.3. List of contracts for humanitarian aid operations by partner

CONTRACTS FOR HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS IN 2007					
HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%
ACH- ESP	6000056743	ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	NGO	10.401.909	1,40%
ACF - FRA	6000054039	ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	NGO	15.548.121	2,10%
ACTIONAID	6000055953	ACTIONAID (GBR)	NGO	3.584.375	0,48%
ADRA - DK	6000057779	ADVENTIST DEVELOPMENT AND RELIEF AGENCY - DENMARK	NGO	1.204.089	0,16%
ADRA - DEU	6000053698	Adventistische Entwicklungs- und Katastrophenhilfe e.V.	NGO	1.000.000	0,14%
AGA KHAN	6000055954	AGA KHAN FOUNDATION (United Kingdom)	NGO	1.209.299	0,16%
ACTED	6000055547	AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	NGO	7.664.113	1,03%
AMI - FRA	6000055590	AIDE MEDICALE INTERNATIONALE, (FR)	NGO	7.787.756	1,05%
ASB - DEU	6000053398	ARBEITER-SAMARITER-BUND DEUTSCHLAND e.V.	NGO	650.000	0,09%
MSF - NLD	6000054030	ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN (NLD)	NGO	2.037.003	0,28%
ACP	6000055731	ASAMBLEA DE COOPERACION POR LA PAZ, (E)	NGO	1.190.207	0,16%
ACSUR - MADRID	6000055754	Asociación para la Cooperación con el Sur ¿LAS SEGOVIAS¿	NGO	315.000	0,04%
AVSI	6000056014	ASSOCIAZIONE VOLONTARI PER IL SERVIZIO INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	NGO	3.097.277	0,42%
ASF-BELGIUM	6000074230	Aviation sans Frontières Belgique/Piloten zonder Grenzen België	NGO	2.302.388	0,31%
AYUDA EN ACCIÓN	6000084697	AYUDA EN ACCIÓN, (E)	NGO	250.000	0,03%
BBC-TRUST	6000074339	BBC World Service Trust	NGO	349.036	0,05%
CROIX-ROUGE - BEL	6000055024	BELGISCHE RODE KRUIS/CROIX ROUGE DE BELGIQUE, (BEL)	NGO	1.649.523	0,22%



HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%
CARE - FR	6000054722	CARE FRANCE, (FR)	NGO	5.227.778	0,71%
CARE - DEU	6000054038	CARE INTERNATIONAL DEUTSCHLAND E.V. (DEU)	NGO	2.572.026	0,35%
CARE - UK	6000055956	CARE INTERNATIONAL UK	NGO	7.261.869	0,98%
CARE - AUT	6000054941	CARE ÖSTERREICH - VEREIN FÜR ENTWICKLUNGSZUSAMMENARBEIT UND HUMANITÄRE HILFE	NGO	6.258.793	0,85%
CARITAS - AUT	6000058966	CARITAS AUSTRIA, (AUT)	NGO	984.321	0,13%
CARITAS - ESP	6000056762	CARITAS ESPANOLA, (E)	NGO	400.000	0,05%
CARITAS - FRA	6000055573	CARITAS FRANCE - SECOURS CATHOLIQUE, (FR)	NGO	530.000	0,07%
CARITAS - BEL	6000055022	CARITAS INTERNATIONAL	NGO	285.006	0,04%
CAFOD	6000059489	CATHOLIC AGENCY FOR OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT (GBR)	NGO	800.000	0,11%
CORDAID	6000055816	CATHOLIC ORGANISATION FOR RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT AID (NLD)	NGO	2.604.300	0,35%
CRIC	6000055955	CENTRO REGIONALE D INTERVENTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE (ITA)	NGO	1.650.000	0,22%
CHRISTIAN AID - UK	6000059497	CHRISTIAN AID (GBR)	NGO	1.754.754	0,24%
PEOPLE IN NEED	6000056658	Clovek v tísní, o.p.s.	NGO	545.000	0,07%
COSV - MILAN	6000055963	COMITATO DI COORDINAMENTO DELLE ORGANIZZAZIONI PER IL SERVIZIO VOLONTARIO (ITA)	NGO	2.336.848	0,32%
CAM	6000068308	COMITE D'AIDE MEDICALE	NGO	775.000	0,10%
ICRC-CICR	6000055654	COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	IO	54.625.000	7,38%
CISV	6000055958	COMUNITA'IMPEGNO SERVIZIO VOLONTARIATO	NGO	249.400	0,03%
CONCERN UNIVERSAL	6000055957	CONCERN UNIVERSAL (GBR)	NGO	305.687	0,04%
CONCERN WORLDWIDE	6000057507	CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	NGO	6.523.742	0,88%
COOPI	6000055976	COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	NGO	11.864.899	1,60%

HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%
CROIX-ROUGE - ITA	6000061062	CROCE ROSSA ITALIANA (ITA)	NGO	625.000	0,08%
CROIX-ROUGE - FRA	6000000646	CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	NGO	5.905.835	0,80%
CROIX-ROUGE - ESP	6000056766	CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	NGO	7.298.819	0,99%
DAC AVIATION INTL	6000176094	DAC Aviation International Limited	SUP	7.500.000	1,01%
DRC	6000058798	DANSK FLYGTNINGEHJÆLP	NGO	10.404.131	1,40%
CROIX-ROUGE - DNK	6000058807	DANSK RODE KORS, (DNK)	NGO	2.189.753	0,30%
GTZ	6000057485	DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR TECHNISCHE ZUSAMMENARBEIT	GOV	450.000	0,06%
GERMAN AGRO ACTION	6000055234	DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	NGO	8.695.263	1,17%
CARITAS - DEU	6000055305	DEUTSCHER CARITASVERBAND e.V, (DEU)	NGO	3.645.000	0,49%
CROIX-ROUGE - DEU	6000055102	DEUTSCHES ROTES KREUZ, (DEU)	NGO	1.123.132	0,15%
DIA	6000055541	DIA, (FR)	NGO	528.677	0,07%
DIAKONIE	6000055019	DIAKONISCHES WERK der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (DEU)	NGO	979.924	0,13%
UNESCAP	6000100147	ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMISSION ASIA-PACIFIC	UN	461.000	0,06%
IFRC-FICR	6000055660	FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	IO	14.594.307	1,97%
DANCHURCHAID - DNK	6000058809	FOLKEKIRKENS NODHJÆLP, (FKN)	NGO	2.100.518	0,28%
CARITAS - LUX	6000056898	FONDATION CARITAS LUXEMBOURG	NGO	210.000	0,03%
TERRE DES HOMMES (TDH) - ITA	6000057918	FONDAZIONE TERRE DES HOMMES ITALIA ONLUS	NGO	1.060.000	0,14%
STCH	6000196970	Fundación Save The Children	NGO	350.000	0,05%
GOAL	6000057512	GOAL, (IRL)	NGO	3.403.063	0,46%

HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%
GCIDS	6000059146	GREEK COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY, (GRC)	NGO	420.000	0,06%
GROUPE URD	6000102221	Groupe Urgence Réhabilitation Développement	NGO	100.000	0,01%
GVC	6000055977	GRUPPO DI VOLONTARIATO CIVILE (ITA)	NGO	3.137.819	0,42%
HAMMER FORUM	6000055011	HAMMER FORUM e.V.	NGO	900.000	0,12%
HANDICAP (BEL)	6000055027	HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (BEL)	NGO	468.000	0,06%
HANDICAP (FR)	6000055532	HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	NGO	5.223.770	0,71%
HEALTH NET INT.	6000055825	HEALTH NET INTERNATIONAL, (NLD)	NGO	531.212	0,07%
HELP	6000055223	HELP- HILFE ZUR SELBSTHILFE E.V. (DEU)	NGO	2.157.269	0,29%
HELPAGE INTERNATIONAL - UK	6000055962	HELPAGE INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	NGO	1.487.652	0,20%
CROIX-ROUGE - NLD	6000055722	HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS (NLD)	NGO	4.666.815	0,63%
HILFSWERK AUSTRIA	6000054947	HILFSWERK AUSTRIA	NGO	300.000	0,04%
ICCO	6000055831	Interkerkelijke Organisatie voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking	NGO	6.476.197	0,87%
PA_05	6000056270	INTERMEDIATE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT GROUP LTD	NGO	548.240	0,07%
INTERMON	6000056746	INTERMON OXFAM, (E)	NGO	2.585.259	0,35%
IMC UK	6000099796	International Medical Corps UK	NGO	2.424.121	0,33%
IOM	6000055563	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	IO	9.583.654	1,29%
IRC - UK	6000055964	International Rescue Committee UK	NGO	7.968.005	1,08%
ISLAMIC RELIEF	6000055965	ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE	NGO	4.990.391	0,67%
ICU	6000055978	ISTITUTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE UNIVERSITARIA - ONLUS (ITA)	NGO	1.005.618	0,14%
DIE JOHANNITER, (DEU)	6000055229	JOHANNITER-UNFALL-HILFE e.V. (DEU)	NGO	220.000	0,03%

HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%
MALTESER HILFSDIENST	6000054029	MALTESER HILFSDIENST e.V., (DEU)	NGO	4.895.864	0,66%
MEDAIR CH	(blank)	Medair	NGO	400.000	0,05%
MEDAIR UK	6000055972	MEDAIR UK (GBR)	NGO	4.099.435	0,55%
MDM - FRA	6000055581	MEDECINS DU MONDE	NGO	5.533.984	0,75%
MDM - GRC	6000057870	MEDECINS DU MONDE, (GRC)	NGO	1.256.220	0,17%
MSF - CHE	6000057526	MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES - SUISSE (CH)	NGO	600.000	0,08%
MSF - BEL	6000002431	MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES BELGIQUE/ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN BELGIE(BEL)	NGO	750.000	0,10%
MERLIN	6000071402	MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	NGO	8.116.044	1,10%
MEDICO INTERNATIONAL	6000055225	MEDICO INTERNATIONAL, (DEU)	NGO	600.000	0,08%
MDM - ESP	6000056756	MEDICOS DEL MUNDO ESPAÑA	NGO	20.159	0,00%
MSF - ESP	6000056751	MEDICOS SIN FRONTERAS, (E)	NGO	200.000	0,03%
MEKONG RIVER COMMISSION	6000100128	Mekong River Commission	IO	283.027	0,04%
MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND	6000055399	MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND (GBR)	NGO	2.608.303	0,35%
MAG - UK	6000055974	MINES ADVISORY GROUP (GBR)	NGO	1.555.518	0,21%
MADERA-FR	6000055608	MISSION D'AIDE AU DEVELOPPEMENT DES ECONOMIES RURALES	NGO	1.080.000	0,15%
MISSION OST - DNK	6000057764	MISSION OST	NGO	1.098.903	0,15%
MPDL	6000055749	MOVIMIENTO POR LA PAZ, EL DESARME Y LA LIBERTAD, (E)	NGO	1.429.326	0,19%
MUSLIM AID	6000238558	Muslim Aid	NGO	300.000	0,04%
NOVIB	6000055196	Nederlandse Organisatie voor Ontwikkelingssamenwerking	NGO	340.587	0,05%

HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%
CROIX-ROUGE - NOR	6000057646	NORGES RODE KORS (NORWEGIAN RED CROSS)	NGO	1.029.289	0,14%
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL	6000057638	NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	NGO	9.271.154	1,25%
OIKOS	6000100137	OIKOS - COOPERAÇÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO	NGO	1.379.519	0,19%
OXFAM - UK	6000055981	OXFAM (GB)	NGO	21.060.145	2,84%
OXFAM - BEL	6000062792	OXFAM-Solidarite(it), (BEL)	NGO	2.609.238	0,35%
PSF - FRA/CLERMONT-FERRAND	6000053712	PHARMACIENS SANS FRONTIERES COMITE INTERNATIONAL	NGO	1.398.500	0,19%
PLAN INTERNATIONAL UK	6000057475	PLAN INTERNATIONAL (UK)	NGO	1.104.394	0,15%
PMU INTERLIFE	6000060221	PMU INTERLIFE/PINGST FFS	NGO	1.133.000	0,15%
POLISH HUMANITARIAN ORGANISATION	6000056007	Polska Akcja Humanitarna	NGO	1.394.367	0,19%
PREMIERE URGENCE	6000055612	PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	NGO	8.005.951	1,08%
PTM	6000166011	PTM-mundubat, (E)	NGO	3.500.000	0,47%
SCD-RB	6000061869	Red Barnet	NGO	244.022	0,03%
REDR	6000063967	RedR - Engineers for Disaster Relief	NGO	527.915	0,07%
SAVE THE CHILDREN - NLD	6000055914	SAVE THE CHILDREN (NLD)	NGO	3.862.332	0,52%
SI	6000056745	SOLIDARIDAD INTERNACIONAL, (E)	NGO	916.000	0,12%
SOLIDARITES	6000055549	SOLIDARITES, (FR)	NGO	9.018.323	1,22%
SOS KINDERDORF INT.	6000055201	SOS-KINDERDORF INTERNATIONAL (AUT)	NGO	1.300.000	0,18%
CARE NEDERLAND (FORMER DRA)	6000055823	Stichting CARE Nederland	NGO	3.585.750	0,48%

HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%
TEARFUND - UK	6000057468	TEARFUND (GBR)	NGO	3.649.548	0,49%
TSF, FRANCE	6000055567	TELECOMS SANS FRONTIERES	NGO	475.945	0,06%
TERRE DES HOMMES - CHE	6000057524	TERRE DES HOMMES-CHE	NGO	3.483.171	0,47%
ICMC	6000062768	THE INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC MIGRATION COMMISSION (CHE)	NGO	850.000	0,11%
SAVE THE CHILDREN - UK	6000057469	THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	NGO	11.661.088	1,57%
TRIANGLE	6000055141	TRIANGLE Génération Humanitaire, (FR)	NGO	2.528.523	0,34%
TROCAIRE	6000057559	Trocaire, (IRL)	NGO	588.382	0,08%
UNICEF	6000055643	UNICEF	UN	29.515.529	3,98%
FAO	6000055556	UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	UN	15.611.623	2,11%
PAHO	6000067529	UNITED NATIONS - PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION	UN	2.355.000	0,32%
UNDP-PNUD	6000055554	UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME	UN	10.287.818	1,39%
UNHCR	6000055529	UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	UN	49.367.700	6,67%
UNCHS - HABITAT	6000068998	United Nations Human Settlements Programme	UN	1.113.068	0,15%
UNFPA	6000055534	UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND	UN	1.104.000	0,15%
UNRWA	6000067513	UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN NEAR EAST	UN	19.981.857	2,70%
OCHA	6000067546	UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	UN	10.288.295	1,39%
VSF - BE	6000055036	Vétérinaires Sans Frontières- Belgique - Dierenartsen Zonder Grenzen - Belgie um	NGO	800.000	0,11%
WA-UK	6000073643	Welfare Association	NGO	250.000	0,03%
WFP-PAM	6000067587	WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	UN	156.334.560	21,11%
WHO	6000053109	WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	UN	11.556.409	1,56%

HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%
WORLD VISION - UK	6000055982	WORLD VISION - UK	NGO	1.432.183	0,19%
WORLD VISION DEU	6000053871	WORLD VISION, (DEU)	NGO	4.456.251	0,60%
ZOA	6000054025	ZOA-Vluchtelingen <span>z</span> org	NGO	1.650.000	0,22%
CUAMM	6000057961	MEDICI CON L'AFRICA (ITA)	NGO	315.467	0,04%
		<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>740.676.648</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

6.4. List of contracts for humanitarian aid operations – Top 25 partners

<b>CONTRACTS FOR HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS IN 2007 - TOP 25 PARTNERS</b>						
<b>HOPE SHORT NAME</b>	<b>LE KEY</b>	<b>PARTNERS LONG NAME</b>	<b>FPA Cat.</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Cumul %</b>
WFP-PAM	6000067587	WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	UN	156.334.560	21,11%	21,11%
ICRC-CICR	6000055654	COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	IO	54.625.000	7,38%	28,48%
UNHCR	6000055529	UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	UN	49.367.700	6,67%	35,15%
UNICEF	6000055643	UNICEF	UN	29.515.529	3,98%	39,13%
OXFAM - UK	6000055981	OXFAM (GB)	NGO	21.060.145	2,84%	41,98%
UNRWA	6000067513	UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN NEAR EAST	UN	19.981.857	2,70%	44,67%
FAO	6000055556	UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	UN	15.611.623	2,11%	46,78%
ACF - FRA	6000054039	ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	NGO	15.548.121	2,10%	48,88%
IFRC-FICR	6000055660	FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	IO	14.594.307	1,97%	50,85%
COOPI	6000055976	COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	NGO	11.864.899	1,60%	52,45%
SAVE THE CHILDREN - UK	6000057469	THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	NGO	11.661.088	1,57%	54,03%
WHO	6000053109	WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	UN	11.556.409	1,56%	55,59%
DRC	6000058798	DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP	NGO	10.404.131	1,40%	56,99%
ACH- ESP	6000056743	ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	NGO	10.401.909	1,40%	58,40%
OCHA	6000067546	UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	UN	10.288.295	1,39%	59,79%



HOPE SHORT NAME	LE KEY	PARTNERS LONG NAME	FPA Cat.	Amount	%	Cumul %
UNDP-PNUD	6000055554	UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME	UN	10.287.818	1,39%	61,17%
IOM	6000055563	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	IO	9.583.654	1,29%	62,47%
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL	6000057638	NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	NGO	9.271.154	1,25%	63,72%
SOLIDARITES	6000055549	SOLIDARITES, (FR)	NGO	9.018.323	1,22%	64,94%
GERMAN AGRO ACTION	6000055234	DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	NGO	8.695.263	1,17%	66,11%
MERLIN	6000071402	MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	NGO	8.116.044	1,10%	67,21%
PREMIERE URGENCE	6000055612	PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	NGO	8.005.951	1,08%	68,29%
IRC - UK	6000055964	International Rescue Committee UK	NGO	7.968.005	1,08%	69,36%
AMI - FRA	6000055590	AIDE MEDICALE INTERNATIONALE, (FR)	NGO	7.787.756	1,05%	70,42%
ACTED	6000055547	AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	NGO	7.664.113	1,03%	71,45%

6.5. List of contracts for humanitarian aid operations in 2007 - by country and partners

<b>PARTNERS BY COUNTRY (SIGNATURE YEAR 2007)</b>	
<b>Partner's long name</b>	<b>Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)</b>
<b><u>AFGHANISTAN</u></b>	<b>24.999.062</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	1.278.707
CARE INTERNATIONAL UK	1.058.767
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	3.075.000
DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP	1.639.928
DEUTSCHER CARITASVERBAND e.V, (DEU)	295.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	860.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	649.815
MEDAIR	400.000
MEDAIR UK (GBR)	805.931
MISSION D'AIDE AU DEVELOPPEMENT DES ECONOMIES RURALES	1.080.000
MISSION OST DNK	503.903
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	1.319.936
OXFAM (GB)	465.000
PEOPLE IN NEED	545.000
SOLIDARITES, (FR)	860.000
TEARFUND (GBR)	608.261
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME	353.814
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	200.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	7.000.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	2.000.000
<b><u>ALGERIA</u></b>	<b>10.507.399</b>
MEDECINS DU MONDE, (GRC)	1.256.220
MEDICOS DEL MUNDO ESPAÑA	20.159
MOVIMIENTO POR LA PAZ, EL DESARME Y LA LIBERTAD, (E)	169.892
OXFAM-SOLIDARITE(it), (BEL)	1.583.438
PTM-MUNDUBAT, (E)	3.500.000
TRIANGLE GÉNÉRATION HUMANITAIRE (FR)	927.690
UNICEF	250.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	1.500.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.000.000
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	300.000
<b><u>BANGLADESH</u></b>	<b>11.421.501</b>
ACTIONAID (GBR)	1.199.672
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	449.700
CARE INTERNATIONAL UK	1.270.020
CHRISTIAN AID (GBR)	300.000
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	1.580.000
DANCHURCHAID - DNK	250.000
DEUTSCHER CARITASVERBAND e.V, (DEU)	300.000
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	1.006.494
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	147.464
ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE	1.849.348

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
Muslim Aid	300.000
OXFAM (GB)	250.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	593.803
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.925.000
<b><u>BOLIVIA</u></b>	<b>1.000.000</b>
AYUDA EN ACCIÓN, (E)	250.000
OXFAM (GB)	320.000
PLAN INTERNATIONAL (UK)	120.000
UNITED NATIONS - PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION	160.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	150.000
<b><u>BURKINA FASO</u></b>	<b>6.122.594</b>
BELGISCHE RODE KRUIS/CROIX ROUGE DE BELGIQUE, (BEL)	1.374.663
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	210.000
INTERMON OXFAM, (E)	350.000
TERRE DES HOMMES-CHE	1.673.171
UNICEF	1.150.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.000.000
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	364.760
<b><u>BURUNDI</u></b>	<b>18.934.133</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	1.451.000
ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN (NLD)	410.000
CARITAS BEL	285.006
CATHOLIC ORGANISATION FOR RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT AID (NLD)	700.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	300.000
COMUNITA'IMPEGNO SERVIZIO VOLONTARIATO	249.400
DEUTSCHER CARITASVERBAND e.V., (DEU)	1.750.000
DEUTSCHES ROTES KREUZ, (DEU)	200.000
GRUPPO DI VOLONTARIATO CIVILE (ITA)	1.220.450
INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CORPS UK	194.903
MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES BELGIQUE/ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN BELGIE(BEL)	750.000
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	977.240
SOLIDARITES, (FR)	1.030.000
UNICEF	500.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	916.134
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	4.000.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	4.000.000
<b><u>CARIBBEAN</u></b>	<b>7.568.216</b>
ACP	190.207
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	247.296
CROIX ROUGE - FRA	906.547
CROIX ROUGE - NOR	832.289
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	1.641.280
INTERMON OXFAM, (E)	378.400
OXFAM (GB)	2.064.000
UNITED NATIONS - PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION	670.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
PLAN INTERNATIONAL (UK)	338.197
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	300.000
<b><u>CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC</u></b>	<b>6.673.210</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	479.771
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	640.000
AIDE MEDICALE INTERNATIONALE, (FR)	350.000
ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN (NLD)	450.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	500.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	500.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	400.000
PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	615.000
SOLIDARITES, (FR)	877.650
TRIANGLE GÉNÉRATION HUMANITAIRE (FR)	360.789
UNICEF	500.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.000.000
<b><u>CENTRAL AMERICA</u></b>	<b>6.255.000</b>
AC SUR	315.000
ACTED	350.000
CARE -FR	345.000
CARE NEDERLAND	235.000
CHRISTIAN AID (GBR)	280.000
CROIX ROUGE - ESP	800.000
CROIX ROUGE - ITA	315.000
CROIX ROUGE - NLD	310.000
DANCHURCHAID - DNK	285.000
GOAL	360.000
GVC	405.000
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	305.000
OIKOS	285.000
OXFAM - BE	245.000
OXFAM (GB)	345.000
TROCAIRE	290.000
UNDP	415.000
UNICEF	370.000
<b><u>CENTRAL ASIA</u></b>	<b>5.699.354</b>
ACTED	109.734
AGA KHAN	415.000
CARE NEDERLAND	330.000
CARITAS LUX	210.000
CHRISTIAN AID (GBR)	119.965
CROIX ROUGE - NLD	914.903
GERMAN AGRO ACTION	380.000
HILFSWERK AUSTRIA	300.000
IOM	296.563
MISSION OST - DNK	595.000
OCHA	360.000
OXFAM (GB)	230.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
UNDP-PNUD	550.000
UNICEF	265.000
WHO	399.984
WORLD VISION DEU	223.205
<b><u>CHAD</u></b>	<b>25.795.342</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	959.404
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	300.140
CARE FRANCE, (FR)	871.008
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	3.000.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	1.485.974
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	1.000.000
HELP- HILFE ZUR SELBSTHILFE E.V. (DEU)	399.966
INTERMON OXFAM, (E)	400.000
OXFAM (GB)	400.000
PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	1.176.150
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	6.652.700
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	8.500.000
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	650.000
<b><u>COLOMBIA</u></b>	<b>12.874.896</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	883.326
CARITAS ESPANOLA, (E)	400.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	3.200.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	300.000
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	350.000
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	250.000
DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP	149.990
DIAKONISCHES WERK der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (DEU)	979.924
HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS (NLD)	250.066
MEDECINS DU MONDE	550.000
MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND (GBR)	200.000
MOVIMIENTO POR LA PAZ, EL DESARME Y LA LIBERTAD, (E)	240.000
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	500.000
OXFAM (GB)	780.000
SOLIDARIDAD INTERNACIONAL, (E)	550.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	291.500
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	2.150.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	200.090
UNITED NATIONS - PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION	250.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	400.000
<b><u>CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF</u></b>	<b>51.415.000</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	601.141
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	2.511.258
AIDE MEDICALE INTERNATIONALE, (FR)	2.560.000
ASSOCIAZIONE VOLONTARI PER IL SERVIZIO INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	432.500
AVIATION SANS FRONTIERES BELGIQUE/PILOTEN ZONDER GRENZEN BELGIË	302.388

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
CARITAS FRANCE - SECOURS CATHOLIQUE, (FR)	230.000
CATHOLIC ORGANISATION FOR RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT AID (NLD)	184.300
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	2.000.000
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	614.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	2.454.496
DAC AVIATION INTERNATIONAL LIMITED	7.500.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	1.138.120
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	2.002.263
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	1.067.017
MALTESER HILFSDIENST e.V., (DEU)	2.678.281
MEDAIR UK (GBR)	980.000
MEDECINS DU MONDE	889.261
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	650.490
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	696.000
OXFAM-SOLIDARITE(IT), (BEL)	338.800
PMU INTERLIFE/PINGST FFS	633.000
PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	2.679.200
SOLIDARITES, (FR)	3.115.985
TEARFUND (GBR)	656.500
UNICEF	2.500.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	3.000.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	1.000.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	8.000.000
<b><u>COTE D'IVOIRE</u></b>	<b>500.000</b>
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	500.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	2.300.000
<b><u>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</u></b>	<b>1.500.000</b>
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	900.000
INTERMON OXFAM, (E)	400.000
UNITED NATIONS - PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION	200.000
<b><u>EAST TIMOR</u></b>	<b>2.850.000</b>
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	688.350
PLAN INTERNATIONAL (UK)	439.971
TRIANGLE GÉNÉRATION HUMANITAIRE (FR)	221.679
WFP	1.000.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	500.000
<b><u>ERITREA</u></b>	<b>7.757.456</b>
CARE INTERNATIONAL UK	1.000.858
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	2.000.000
INTERKERKELIJKE ORGANISATIE VOOR ONTWIKKELINGSSAMENWERKING	476.197
MEDECINS DU MONDE	500.000
OXFAM (GB)	500.038
UNICEF	1.780.363
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	1.500.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
<b><u>ETHIOPIA</u></b>	<b>20.821.233</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	1.150.000
ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN (NLD)	447.003
CARE ÖSTERREICH - VEREIN FÜR ENTWICKLUNGSZUSAMMENARBEIT UND HUMANITÄRE HILFE	799.800
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	1.850.000
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	450.000
INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CORPS UK	500.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	649.578
ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE	600.000
MEDECINS DU MONDE	1.000.000
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	1.025.313
OXFAM (GB)	800.000
SOS-KINDERDORF INTERNATIONAL (AUT)	400.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	750.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	399.539
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	10.000.000
<b><u>GEORGIA</u></b>	<b>2.791.844</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	297.860
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	500.000
DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP	1.199.984
PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	794.000
<b><u>GHANA</u></b>	<b>700.000</b>
UNICEF	250.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	100.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	350.000
<b><u>GUINEA</u></b>	<b>2.380.000</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	580.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	350.000
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	300.000
MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES - SUISSE (CH)	150.000
TERRE DES HOMMES-CHE	200.000
UNICEF	800.000
<b><u>HAITI</u></b>	<b>3.149.492</b>
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	99.510
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	634.113
MEDECINS DU MONDE	200.333
OXFAM (GB)	1.150.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	1.065.536
<b><u>HONDURAS</u></b>	<b>500.000</b>
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	500.000
<b><u>INDIA</u></b>	<b>7.730.000</b>
ACTIONAID (GBR)	850.000
ADVENTISTISCHE ENTWICKLUNGS- UND KATASTROPHENHILFE E.V.	500.000
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	250.000
ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN (NLD)	230.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
CARE INTERNATIONAL UK	498.287
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	1.360.000
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	375.952
DEUTSCHER CARITASVERBAND e.V., (DEU)	300.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	295.761
FOLKEKIRKENS NODHJAELP, (FKN)	500.000
HELPAGE INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	200.000
MEDICOS SIN FRONTERAS, (E)	200.000
OXFAM (GB)	1.000.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	290.000
UNICEF	880.000
<b><u>INDONESIA</u></b>	<b>1.589.889</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	320.000
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	125.000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	570.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	88.612
MEDECINS DU MONDE	190.000
STICHTING CARE NEDERLAND	200.000
WORLD VISION, (DEU)	96.277
<b><u>IRAN</u></b>	<b>750.000</b>
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	750.000
<b><u>IRAQ</u></b>	<b>4.500.000</b>
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	4.000.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	500.000
<b><u>JORDAN</u></b>	<b>3.109.725</b>
CARE ÖSTERREICH - VEREIN FÜR ENTWICKLUNGSZUSAMMENARBEIT UND HUMANITÄRE HILFE	850.000
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	399.896
ISTITUTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE UNIVERSITARIA - ONLUS (ITA)	499.829
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	1.360.000
<b><u>KENYA</u></b>	<b>12.650.000</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	399.269
AVIATION SANS FRONTIERES BELGIQUE/PILOTEN ZONDER GRENZEN BELGIË	2.000.000
CARE INTERNATIONAL UK	900.748
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	550.000
DANSK RODE KORS, (DNK)	150.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	400.000
ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE	900.000
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	400.000
OXFAM (GB)	400.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	549.983
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	2.000.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	4.000.000



Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
<b><u>KOREA, DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF</u></b>	<b>6.892.826</b>
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	710.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	504.826
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	1.060.000
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (BEL)	468.000
PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	420.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	1.730.000
UNICEF	1.500.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	500.000
<b><u>LEBANON</u></b>	<b>23.535.084</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	502.700
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	1.549.000
ASSOCIAZIONE VOLONTARI PER IL SERVIZIO INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	514.777
CARITAS AUSTRIA, (AUT)	984.321
DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP	1.001.367
DIA, (FR)	458.665
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	474.000
HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS (NLD)	633.798
ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE	312.605
ISTITUTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE UNIVERSITARIA - ONLUS (ITA)	505.789
MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND (GBR)	1.160.717
MINES ADVISORY GROUP (GBR)	987.190
MOVIMIENTO POR LA PAZ, EL DESARME Y LA LIBERTAD, (E)	1.019.434
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	3.787.977
PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	1.621.601
RED BARNET	244.022
TERRE DES HOMMES-CHE	600.000
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME	4.068.731
UNITED NATIONS HUMAN SETTLEMENTS PROGRAMME	1.113.068
UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN NEAR EAST	1.855.322
WORLD VISION, (DEU)	140.000
<b><u>LESOTHO</u></b>	<b>3.215.840</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	543.613
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	1.172.227
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.500.000
<b><u>LIBERIA</u></b>	<b>15.119.643</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	1.000.000
ADVENTIST DEVELOPMENT AND RELIEF AGENCY - DENMARK	800.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	1.800.000
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	419.288
DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP	900.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	550.000
MEDECINS DU MONDE	400.000
MEDECINS SANS FRONTIERES - SUISSE (CH)	450.000
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	1.150.000
OXFAM (GB)	186.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
PMU INTERLIFE/PINGST FFS	500.000
TEARFUND (GBR)	824.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	847.355
UNICEF	600.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	2.000.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	2.500.000
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	193.000
<b><u>MADAGASCAR</u></b>	<b>4.996.770</b>
CARE FRANCE, (FR)	1.496.770
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	404.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	350.000
MEDAIR UK (GBR)	195.000
MEDECINS DU MONDE	151.000
UNICEF	1.100.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.300.000
<b><u>MALI</u></b>	<b>2.181.478</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	598.000
CHRISTIAN AID (GBR)	553.000
OXFAM (GB)	1.030.478
<b><u>MAURITANIA</u></b>	<b>2.051.283</b>
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	646.283
UNICEF	405.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.000.000
<b><u>MOLDOVA</u></b>	<b>3.000.000</b>
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME	3.000.000
<b><u>MOZAMBIQUE</u></b>	<b>7.028.419</b>
BELGISCHE RODE KRUIS/CROIX ROUGE DE BELGIQUE, (BEL)	274.860
CARE-AUT	633.122
CATHOLIC AGENCY FOR OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT (GBR)	200.000
CHRISTIAN AID (GBR)	200.000
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	650.000
CUAMM	315.467
GRUPPO DI VOLONTARIATO CIVILE (ITA)	512.369
INTERMON OXFAM, (E)	300.000
INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CORPS UK	439.218
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	546.205
NORGES RODE KORS (NORWEGIAN RED CROSS)	197.000
OIKOS - COOPERAÇÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO	414.519
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	594.508
UNICEF	1.052.167
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	500.000
WORLD VISION - UK	198.984
<b><u>MYANMAR</u></b>	<b>7.740.000</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	900.000
AIDE MEDICALE INTERNATIONALE, (FR)	1.980.000
ARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN (NLD)	500.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	500.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	500.000
FONDAZIONE TERRE DES HOMMES ITALIA ONLUS	400.000
MALTESER HILFSDIENST e.V., (DEU)	260.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	1.700.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.000.000
<b><u>NEPAL</u></b>	<b>8.000.000</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	430.000
CARE ÖSTERREICH - VEREIN FÜR ENTWICKLUNGSZUSAMMENARBEIT UND HUMANITÄRE HILFE	700.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	950.000
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	270.000
DANSK RODE KORS, (DNK)	700.000
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	250.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	320.000
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	500.000
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	440.000
UNICEF	1.100.000
UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND	340.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	2.000.000
<b><u>NICARAGUA</u></b>	<b>5.720.981</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	520.000
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	670.981
ARBEITER-SAMARITER-BUND DEUTSCHLAND e.V.	350.000
CARE FRANCE, (FR)	200.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	320.000
HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS (NLD)	300.000
OIKOS - COOPERAÇÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO	290.000
OXFAM (GB)	600.000
TELECOMS SANS FRONTIERES	100.000
UNICEF	300.000
UNITED NATIONS - PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION	670.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.400.000
<b><u>NIGER</u></b>	<b>9.634.565</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	1.165.000
ACTIONAID (GBR)	325.940
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	400.000
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	1.099.290
GOAL, (IRL)	1.143.063
HELP- HILFE ZUR SELBSTHILFE E.V. (DEU)	916.350
MEDECINS DU MONDE	503.390
NEDERLANDSE ORGANISATIE VOOR ONTWIKKELINGSSAMENWERKING	340.587
TELECOMS SANS FRONTIERES	340.945
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	1.400.000
UNICEF	1.000.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.000.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
<b><u>PAKISTAN</u></b>	<b>750.000</b>
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	750.000
<b><u>PALESTINIAN TERRITORY, OCCUPIED</u></b>	<b>57.985.000</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	1.645.000
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	383.000
ASAMBLEA DE COOPERACION POR LA PAZ, (E)	1.000.000
CARE FRANCE, (FR)	2.315.000
CARE ÖSTERREICH - VEREIN FÜR ENTWICKLUNGSZUSAMMENARBEIT UND HUMANITÄRE HILFE	2.900.000
CENTRO REGIONALE D INTERVENTO PER LA COOPERAZIONE (ITA)	1.350.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	4.500.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	2.000.000
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	350.000
DANSK RODE KORS, (DNK)	650.000
FONDAZIONE TERRE DES HOMMES ITALIA ONLUS	660.000
GREEK COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY, (GRC)	420.000
GRUPPO DI VOLONTARIATO CIVILE (ITA)	1.000.000
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	550.000
JOHANNITER-UNFALL-HILFE e.V. (DEU)	220.000
MEDECINS DU MONDE	650.000
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	800.000
MEDICO INTERNATIONAL, (DEU)	600.000
MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND (GBR)	1.000.000
OXFAM (GB)	940.000
OXFAM-SOLIDARITE(IT), (BEL)	442.000
POLSKA AKCJA HUMANITARNA	729.280
PREMIERE URGENCE, (FR)	700.000
SAVE THE CHILDREN (NLD)	1.940.000
TERRE DES HOMMES-CHE	360.000
UNICEF	1.255.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	795.720
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	1.250.000
UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN NEAR EAST	17.150.000
WELFARE ASSOCIATION	250.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	9.000.000
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	180.000
<b><u>PARAGUAY</u></b>	<b>1.500.000</b>
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	300.000
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	700.000
INTERMON OXFAM, (E)	500.000
<b><u>PERU</u></b>	<b>10.064.983</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	400.000
CATHOLIC ORGANISATION FOR RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT AID (NLD)	420.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	350.000
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	375.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	350.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	515.000
HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS (NLD)	275.000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	425.000
OIKOS - COOPERAÇÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO	390.000
OXFAM (GB)	500.000
SOLIDARIDAD INTERNACIONAL, (E)	366.000
STICHTING CARE NEDERLAND	550.000
TELECOMS SANS FRONTIERES	35.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	775.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	275.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	250.000
UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND	314.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	3.014.983
WORLD VISION, (DEU)	485.000
<b><u>PHILIPPINES</u></b>	<b>2.710.000</b>
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	850.000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	1.260.000
OXFAM (GB)	600.000
<b><u>RUSSIA</u></b>	<b>20.765.618</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	1.150.000
CARITAS FRANCE - SECOURS CATHOLIQUE, (FR)	300.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	4.200.000
DRC	4.185.531
HAMMER FORUM e.V.	900.000
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	430.000
HELP- HILFE ZUR SELBSTHILFE E.V. (DEU)	400.000
INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CORPS UK	790.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	1.435.000
MEDECINS DU MONDE	500.000
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	500.000
POLSKA AKCJA HUMANITARNA	665.087
UNICEF	710.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	600.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	2.800.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.200.000
<b><u>SAHEL</u></b>	<b>2.300.000</b>
FAO	2.300.000
<b><u>SOLOMON ISLANDS</u></b>	<b>547.939</b>
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	350.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	197.939
<b><u>SOMALIA</u></b>	<b>17.300.000</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	1.745.000
ADVENTISTISCHE ENTWICKLUNGS- UND KATASTROPHENHILFE E.V.	500.000
COMITATO DI COORDINAMENTO DELLE ORGANIZZAZIONI PER IL SERVIZIO VOLONTARIO (ITA)	1.130.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	5.500.000

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	470.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	1.500.000
ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE	975.000
OXFAM (GB)	900.000
SOLIDARITES, (FR)	580.000
SOS-KINDERDORF INTERNATIONAL (AUT)	900.000
STICHTING CARE NEDERLAND	1.500.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	1.300.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	300.000
<b><u>SOUTH AMERICA</u></b>	<b>6.500.000</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	370.000
CARE NEDERLAND	430.000
CARE INTERNATIONAL UK	350.000
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	400.000
CRIC	300.000
CROIX-ROUGE - IT	310.000
CROIX-ROUGE - NLD	300.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	970.000
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	245.000
GERMAN AGRO ACTION	400.000
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	470.000
OXFAM (GB)	555.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	300.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	405.000
UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND	130.000
STCH	350.000
PA05	215.000
<b><u>SOUTH ASIA</u></b>	<b>7.191.942</b>
ACTIONAID (GBR)	804.864
AGA KHAN	794.299
BBC TRUST	349.036
CARE AUT	375.871
CARE UK	250.000
CHRISTIAN AID (GBR)	301.789
CONCERN UNIVERSAL	305.687
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	186.842
CROIX ROUGE DNK	323.240
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	212.500
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	330.000
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	478.193
ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE	353.438
MERCY CORPS SCOTLAND (GBR)	247.586
PA_05	333.240
PLAN INTERNATIONAL (UK)	206.226
TROCAIRE	298.382

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
UNDP	760.749
UNICEF	280.000
<b><u>SOUTH EAST ASIA</u></b>	<b>5.510.442</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	261.911
ACTIONAID (GBR)	300.000
CARE DEU	428.430
CARE NEDERLAND	340.750
CROIX ROUGE DNK	366.513
CROIX ROUGE NLD	293.049
DANCHURCHAIID - DNK	295.518
GTZ	450.000
OCHA	320.000
MEKONG RIVER COMMISSION	283.027
OXFAM (GB)	113.572
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	346.800
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	461.000
UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND	1.009.524
WORLD VISION, (DEU)	240.348
<b><u>SRI LANKA</u></b>	<b>14.228.747</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	198.747
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	500.000
CARE INTERNATIONAL DEUTSCHLAND E.V. (DEU)	530.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	3.500.000
DANSK FLYGTNINGEHAELP	400.000
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	1.300.000
FOLKEKIRKENS NODHJAELP, (FKN)	200.000
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	300.000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	400.000
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	800.000
OXFAM (GB)	500.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	300.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES	1.500.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	500.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	2.000.000
ZOA-VLUCHTELINGENZORG	1.300.000
<b><u>SUDAN</u></b>	<b>119.343.764</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	696.000
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	3.253.911
ADVENTIST DEVELOPMENT AND RELIEF AGENCY - DENMARK	404.089
AGENCE D'AIDE A LA COOPERATION TECHNIQUE ET AU DEVELOPPEMENT, (FR)	400.000
AIDE MEDICALE INTERNATIONALE, (FR)	1.047.756
ASSOCIAZIONE VOLONTARI PER IL SERVIZIO INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	700.000
CARE INTERNATIONAL UK	2.283.189
CATHOLIC AGENCY FOR OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT (GBR)	600.000
CATHOLIC ORGANISATION FOR RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT AID (NLD)	1.300.000
COMITATO DI COORDINAMENTO DELLE ORGANIZZAZIONI PER IL SERVIZIO VOLONTARIO (ITA)	1.206.848

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
COMITE D'AIDE MEDICALE	775.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	9.700.000
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	500.854
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	1.604.429
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	423.819
DANSK FLYGTNINGEHJÆLP	927.331
DEUTSCHES ROTES KREUZ, (DEU)	923.132
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIÉTÉS DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	1.541.533
FOLKEKIRKENS NODHJÆLP, (FKN)	570.000
GOAL, (IRL)	700.000
HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL (FR)	466.850
HEALTH NET INTERNATIONAL, (NLD)	531.212
HELPPAGE INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	1.287.652
INTERMON OXFAM, (E)	256.859
INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CORPS UK	500.000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	2.160.436
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	2.250.000
MALTESER HILFSDIENST e.V., (DEU)	887.582
MEDAIR UK (GBR)	1.118.504
MEDICAL EMERGENCY RELIEF INTERNATIONAL (GBR)	3.590.241
MINES ADVISORY GROUP (GBR)	568.328
OXFAM (GB)	4.189.368
PHARMACIENS SANS FRONTIÈRES COMITE INTERNATIONAL	1.398.500
RedR - ENGINEERS FOR DISASTER RELIEF	527.915
SAVE THE CHILDREN (NLD)	1.922.332
SOLIDARITES, (FR)	2.554.688
TEARFUND (GBR)	1.560.787
TERRE DES HOMMES-CHE	300.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	1.000.000
TRIANGLE GÉNÉRATION HUMANITAIRE (FR)	898.377
UNICEF	2.518.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	3.200.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	1.500.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	1.200.000
UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND	450.000
VETERINAIRES SANS FRONTIÈRES- BELGIQUE - DIERENARTSEN ZONDER GRENZEN - BELGIE	800.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	47.669.577
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	3.188.665
WORLD VISION, (DEU)	940.000
ZOA-VLUCHTELINGENZORG	350.000
<b><u>SWAZILAND</u></b>	<b>2.603.327</b>
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	1.103.327
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	1.500.000



Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
<b><u>SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC</u></b>	<b>3.566.534</b>
HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS (NLD)	1.389.999
TERRE DES HOMMES-CHE	350.000
THE INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC MIGRATION COMMISSION (CHE)	850.000
UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN NEAR EAST	976.535
<b><u>TAJKISTAN</u></b>	<b>50.000</b>
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	50.000
<b><u>TANZANIA</u></b>	<b>16.430.000</b>
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	2.300.000
UNICEF	600.000
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	8.530.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	5.000.000
<b><u>THAILAND</u></b>	<b>9.470.000</b>
AIDE MEDICALE INTERNATIONALE, (FR)	1.850.000
INTERKERKELIJKE ORGANISATIE VOOR ONTWIKKELINGSSAMENWERKING	6.000.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	550.000
MALTESER HILFSDIENST e.V., (DEU)	1.070.000
<b><u>TOGO</u></b>	<b>1.719.819</b>
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	239.819
UNICEF	750.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	250.000
WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE	480.000
<b><u>TURKEY</u></b>	<b>500.000</b>
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES	500.000
<b><u>UGANDA</u></b>	<b>23.840.000</b>
ACCION CONTRA EL HAMBRE, (ESP)	1.200.000
ARBEITER-SAMARITER-BUND DEUTSCHLAND e.V.	300.000
ASSOCIAZIONE VOLONTARI PER IL SERVIZIO INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	1.450.000
COMITE INTERNATIONAL DE LA CROIX-ROUGE (CICR)	1.290.000
CONCERN WORLDWIDE, (IRL)	650.000
COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE (ITA)	400.000
DEUTSCHER CARITASVERBAND e.V, (DEU)	650.000
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	1.125.000
GOAL, (IRL)	1.200.000
INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE UK	1.075.000
MEDAIR UK (GBR)	1.000.000
NORWEGIAN REFUGEE COUNCIL (NOR)	250.000
OXFAM (GB)	1.075.000
UNICEF	700.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	1.250.000
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	500.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	9.075.000
WORLD VISION, (DEU)	650.000
<b><u>VIET NAM</u></b>	<b>1.999.107</b>
ACTIONAID (GBR)	103.899
CARE INTERNATIONAL DEUTSCHLAND E. V. (DEU)	296.008

Partner's long name	Amount contract sum (Contract Financial)
CROIX-ROUGE FRANCAISE	760.000
CRUZ ROJA ESPAÑOLA, (E)	445.000
THE SAVE THE CHILDREN FUND (GBR)	394.200
<b><u>YEMEN</u></b>	<b>990.000</b>
DIA, (FR)	70.012
TRIANGLE GÉNÉRATION HUMANITAIRE (FR)	119.988
UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES - BELGIUM	800.000
<b><u>ZAMBIA</u></b>	<b>2.126.689</b>
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	960.000
OXFAM	1.166.689
<b><u>ZIMBABWE</u></b>	<b>21.545.501</b>
ACTION CONTRE LA FAIM, (FR)	519.970
CARE INTERNATIONAL DEUTSCHLAND E.V. (DEU)	1.317.588
DEUTSCHE WELTHUNGERHILFE / GERMAN AGRO ACTION, (DEU)	999.943
HELP- HILFE ZUR SELBSTHILFE E.V. (DEU)	440.953
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION (INT)	1.210.082
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	1.234.140
UNITED NATIONS, OFFICE FOR THE COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS	408.205
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	12.500.000
WORLD VISION, (DEU)	1.681.421
WORLD VISION - UK	1.233.199
<b><u>THEMATIC FUNDING</u></b>	<b>27.375.000</b>
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DES SOCIETES DE LA CROIX-ROUGE ET DU CROISSANT ROUGE	4.000.000
OCHA	3.500.000
UNHCR	775.000
UNICEF	6.400.000
WORLD FOOD PROGRAM	7.800.000
WHO	4.300.000
UNITED NATIONS - FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION	600.000
<b><u>GRANT FACILITY</u></b>	<b>100.000</b>
GROUPE URD	100.000
<b>TOTAL CONTRACTS 2007</b>	<b>740.676.648</b>

## PART VII. LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACTED	Agence d'aide à la coopération technique et au développement
CSP	Country Strategy Paper (EDF)
DIPECHO/DPP	DG ECHO's Disaster Preparedness and Prevention Programme
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DG ECHO	Humanitarian Aid Directorate-General
EDF	European Development Fund
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUMS	Military Staff of the European Union
FAFA	The EC/UN Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement
FPA	Framework Partnership Agreement (between DG ECHO and its operational partners)
GHD	Good Humanitarian Donorship
HOLIS	Humanitarian Office Local Information System
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDP	Internally displaced persons
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
INGO	International Non-governmental organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
LRRD	Linking relief, rehabilitation and development
MCDA	Military and Civil Defence Assets
MSF	Médecins sans Frontières

NOHA	Network on Humanitarian Assistance
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
SPD	Strategic Planning Dialogue
SPP	Strategic Planning and Programming
UN-CHS- HABITAT	United Nations Centre for Human Settlements - Habitat (UNCHS)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UN-FAO	United Nations – Food and Agriculture Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNOCHA	United Nations - Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UN-PAHO	United Nations – Pan American Health Organisation
UNRWA	United Nations - Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
UN-WFP	United Nations - World Food Programme
UN-WHO	United Nations-World Health Organisation
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance