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Executive summary

Humanitarian work is central to Christian Aid’s identity and part of our core business. Through this work, we aim to significantly reduce the loss of lives and assets of vulnerable people and enable them to manage risks and face disasters with dignity. We champion an approach that integrates preparedness, response, disaster risk reduction, advocacy and development in order to deliver programmes that respond to the multiple and complex risks faced by the communities we aim to assist.

Our approach is founded on a vision that empowers local partners and disaster-affected communities to decide what is needed and how best it can be delivered. Central to this is our partnership model. We build the capacity of local organisations, civil society and local authorities to anticipate, prepare for, respond to and reduce risks. Christian Aid is also determined to play a significant role in a wider movement seeking to make the humanitarian sector fit for purpose.

We strive to deliver quality programmes which make a meaningful impact on the lives of people affected by disasters, and are determined to reflect, learn and improve on how we can do this to best effect.

This report is part of that commitment. It covers the financial year 2014/15 and draws on organisational data, the judgements and perceptions of humanitarian staff, as well as on external evaluations of humanitarian interventions. It is intended to provide a summary of and reflection on all Christian Aid’s humanitarian work, capturing achievements, challenges, new thinking and progress over time, so as to inform future strategic thinking and practice.

Summary of achievements

In 2014/15, Christian Aid delivered humanitarian assistance to an estimated 1.8 million people affected by disasters. The Humanitarian Division gave £10.4m in grants to partners, which equated to 72% of the total outgoings of the division. Running costs including salaries were kept to less than 30%. The largest emergency programmes were in Sierra Leone, the Philippines and Gaza.

Christian Aid’s strong track record has enabled us to continue the trend of increased breadth and depth in our humanitarian programming over recent years. We worked in 29 countries in 2014/15, compared to 26 in 2013/14 and 18 in 2011/12. Christian Aid’s total humanitarian spending across the International Department increased from £24.2m in 2011/12 to £25.9m in 2014/15 – from 26% to 27% of Christian Aid’s total expenditure. This total sum covers all our work with disaster-affected communities beyond direct humanitarian grants, and was 46% of Christian Aid’s total grant expenditure in 2014/15.

Over the past year we have increased our access to key humanitarian funds such as DFID’s Start Fund, Irish Aid and ECHO and received funding from donors such as USAID for the first time. Christian Aid humanitarian staff assess our performance in emergency responses against eight Humanitarian Quality Standards. Over the past 18 months, we have seen a gradual

Our vision

Christian Aid’s humanitarian work focuses on the prevention of and appropriate response to disasters. In doing so, we deliver on three key areas:

1. Helping vulnerable people to reduce the likelihood and impact of disasters by managing risks and increasing their resilience to them.
2. Acting quickly to save lives and livelihoods and to reduce suffering so that people affected by disaster can live with dignity, their livelihoods restored and their communities safe.
3. Engaging in humanitarian policy and advocacy work in order to reduce the impact disasters have on poor communities, and to make humanitarian action more inclusive and effective.
increase in our scoring, alongside improved compliance with our key quality assurance indicators. We believe we are delivering better quality programming year on year.

Among other achievements, and in line with our strategic priorities, we have increased the value of cash-based programming from 9% to 21% of our grant expenditure; and have driven forward innovative practice in disaster risk reduction and resilience work, most notably in conflict settings, through our CHASE Programme Partnership Agreement (PPA).

Through our humanitarian advocacy work, Christian Aid has been recognised as a leading voice in promoting the role of local and national NGOs in humanitarian action, which is seen as a critical issue for the upcoming World Humanitarian Summit. We have been rated highly by our coalition partners. In responding to the Ebola crisis, Christian Aid was the only agency highlighting the link between tax incentives and the under-funded health sector in Sierra Leone in our advocacy work.

The size and complexity of humanitarian crises continues to grow. Global humanitarian spending is at a record high. In a recent paper from Future Humanitarian Financing, *Looking Beyond the Crisis*, the authors state: "The changing nature of crises has resulted in a widening gap between humanitarian needs and resources available. As this gap widens, so do the challenges. Business as usual is no longer an option."

In the face of such challenges, Christian Aid continues to demonstrate the capacity to deliver quality humanitarian programmes rooted in the readiness of local actors to respond to the needs of communities affected by disaster.

**2014/15 Humanitarian Division grants at a glance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spend</th>
<th>No of projects</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>£88,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>£4,447,993</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery</td>
<td>£4,090,046</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR/resilience</td>
<td>£1,779,971</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£10,406,010</strong></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christian Aid made 49 emergency responses in 2014/15 in 23 countries, including three new large-scale emergencies – the refugee crisis in Syria and Iraq, the Ebola epidemic in Sierra Leone and the Gaza crisis. In addition to other response funding streams, we invested £450,000 of core unrestricted funds in order to respond immediately to crises. These were recharged to appeal funds and revolved, so that effectively Christian Aid committed nearly £600,000 to upfront emergency funding from core funds.

**Implications for practice**

During 2014/15, Christian Aid commissioned a series of evaluations of our response and resilience programming. The findings are documented in this report. We are determined to learn from our programmes and from good practice in the sector. Some of the key learning which we plan to take forward over the coming year focuses on:

- **Monitoring and evaluation (M&E):** Christian Aid has demonstrated good M&E practice in a number of situations. But the challenge continues to ensure implementation plans are informed by solid baseline information and that field monitoring is regular and incorporates validation through observation.

- **Gender and power:** In a rapid response, based on incomplete information, there is a risk of local partners failing to tackle or reinforcing existing inequalities. Gender and power analysis should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity and project activities adapted accordingly. We need a ‘good enough’ rapid standard on gender and inclusion against which all assessments, proposals and evaluation ToRs can be screened.

- **Advocacy:** To ensure the best and measurable outcomes, Christian Aid’s in-country advocacy work is best guided by a
formal strategy document which captures the overall goal, specific and measurable objectives, milestones, key messages and distinct influencing approaches for key stakeholders.

- **Value for money (VFM):** Christian Aid’s emphasis on building long-term resilience and on accountability and partnerships feeds into a strong VFM proposition. But the Humanitarian Division and country programmes need to be more explicit in putting in place and documenting VFM measures.

- **Links between response, recovery and resilience programming:** Working through long-term partners, Christian Aid is well-placed to make smooth transitions between phases in an intervention. But at every stage, the implementation plan should be revisited, roles and respective inputs re-clarified and a progress review undertaken. Country programme staff need to recognise when to move out of the response phase; how to build linkages as soon as possible between their humanitarian and development work; and that they need to reformulate their development programmes to respond to a new reality.

- **Links between preparedness and resilience:** Through our increased focus on preparedness planning in disaster-prone countries and our leadership of the Disasters and Emergencies Preparedness Programme (DEPP) funded Start consortium ‘Linking Preparedness Resilience and Response’, we see an excellent opportunity for organisational learning. We recognise the link between partners’ organisational preparedness and resilient communities. We want to explore further how resilience building can strengthen humanitarian operations and bridge the gap between short-term humanitarian response and longer-term development initiatives.

*Below:* In Marsabit County, northern Kenya, we have used a combination of emergency appeal funds and PPA funding to promote links between response, recovery and resilience.
Section 1: Response

In 2014/15, Christian Aid responded to 49 emergencies in 23 countries, providing support to an estimated 1.76 million people affected by disasters through £4.4m of grants to national actors.

Christian Aid knows that in emergency situations there is an urgent need to undertake immediate life-saving work. But we see emergencies as an integral part of the longer term development cycle – a cycle that links response and recovery to development, especially in building resilience to disasters.

Key findings, achievements and challenges

Christian Aid has responded to a series of major humanitarian disasters during 2014/15 – Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines, the Gaza crisis, the Ebola epidemic in Sierra Leone and the refugee crisis in the Middle East. External evaluations have shown that in every case Christian Aid has mobilised local partners and coordinated with national response mechanisms to ensure a timely and effective response.

The ultimate outcome which Christian Aid is seeking to achieve in our response programmes is:

‘Our humanitarian responses are effective in saving lives and livelihoods.’

In order to achieve this, the intermediate outcomes are for our response programmes to be needs-based, timely, measured against SPHERE, recognise power and gender inequalities, accountable, improving and learning, and increase community resilience to future disasters.

Below: Philippines response
Christian Aid has been successful in accessing funds for our emergency response work from a wide variety of sources which has allowed us great flexibility. For large-scale rapid onset emergencies such as the Gaza crisis, we launched our own appeal and were a part of the DEC appeal. For smaller emergencies such as ongoing displacement in the DRC, we acquired ECHO funding. Additionally, we responded to a series of small but critical situations that caused huge suffering but received minimal media attention, including in Bangladesh, Somalia and Colombia, by accessing Start funds and utilising our own and Irish Aid rapid response funds.

Christian Aid has been the largest recipient of Start funds between April 2014 and May 2015, targeting frontline CSOs for more low-profile, underfunded emergencies. Having been awarded more than £900k from Start during this period, Christian Aid was the only INGO to have a 100% funding success rate.

Humanitarian Quality Standards

Christian Aid has developed a set of eight standards against which our humanitarian staff assess every response. These are: needs-based, timely, accountable, monitoring and evaluation, SPHERE, power and gender, resilience and preparedness.

Over the three semesters that we have collated humanitarian quality standards, we have seen a gradual increase in the total average score from 3.0 to 3.5 out of a possible 6.0.

The highest score was for the needs-based standard with an average of 4.3 over the three semesters, and 4.5 in the most recent. The lowest score was for SPHERE with an average of 2.6. The largest increase was for participation/accountability from 2.7 to 3.9 between the first and third semester.

For the most important life-saving standards of needs-based and timely, Christian Aid scored a high average of 4.3 and 4.5 in the most recent semester.
The findings outlined below are based on evaluations undertaken in the Philippines, Lebanon and Sierra Leone.

1. Needs-based

Responses have been designed on the basis of information from numerous sources, including partners’ local knowledge, though not always from systematic needs assessments. Different partners use different targeting approaches for distributions which allow for flexibility, but in the Typhoon Haiyan response, these were sometimes undermined or circumvented by local officials or community leaders.

In Sierra Leone, there were particular operational challenges, notably travel restrictions. Consequently, partners made assessments of need based on telephone calls to community leaders. In coordinating with national agencies, Christian Aid’s response targeted survivors and distributed aid packages based on government lists. However, we found these lists were incomplete and survivors were not always the most vulnerable. For example, households where the breadwinner had died were excluded.

In the Philippines, one partner undertook a strict screening of beneficiaries. They made field visits to the official government list of ‘totally damaged houses’ and found that some households had been missed while others had double claimed. As a result, the partner’s response was well-targeted to individuals with the greatest needs. Beneficiaries in both the Philippines and Lebanon told evaluators that they understood selection criteria.

In a disaster like Haiyan, needs change rapidly and significantly over time and the response has to adapt. At the outset, it was appropriate to distribute food and NFI, but the evaluators highlighted one partner’s voucher-based approach to shelter support, which allowed recipients to choose whatever materials they needed. The rebuilding rate was not as high as anticipated, however, thought to be due to a lack of skilled craftsmen or land tenure issues. Greater use of cash could have re-established markets more quickly but there would also have been a risk of monopoly pricing.

2. Timely

In Lebanon, partners distributed 1,000 winter kits before the onset of the harshest weather. Through an ACT appeal, Christian Aid’s partner IOCC in Syria provided rapid emergency support to nearly 20,000 refugees who had lost homes and possessions.

In the Haiyan response, while Christian Aid Philippines and its partners were among the first to gain entry to affected areas and submit needs assessments to the UN, they acted as a second-wave responder because most beneficiaries had already received aid from other sources. The delay was largely due to logistical challenges in distribution, and suggests a need for preparedness-building of partners in disaster-prone countries in supply chain management, complemented by surge capacity.

3. Accountable

Evaluators talked of the positive engagement by partners with their target populations. They report information-sharing, joint decision
making and beneficiary participation in targeting and determining assistance, even in Lebanon by camp inhabitants. This was largely not the case in the Ebola response, where logistical challenges (particularly around travel restrictions) meant beneficiaries were not consulted in advance about what would be in their aid packages, who would receive them, or who to contact so they could complain if their aid packages were incomplete. Better monitoring across all the programmes could have facilitated more and better beneficiary feedback. One example of very good practice was a child-led psychosocial project in Lebanon, in which families were at the centre of decision making.

4. Other important quality issues

Evaluations in both the Philippines and Lebanon stated that while activities were not routinely monitored against SPHERE standards, humanitarian principles were routinely demonstrated. SPHERE standards were adhered to in the design of relief packages.

In its Partnership for Change strategy, Christian Aid emphasises power and gender. In our response programme in Lebanon, partners were commended for addressing gender dynamics within what was culturally acceptable.

Local partners were aware of local power dynamics but not always able or willing to address them. This was evident in the Philippines, where partners failed on occasions to challenge gatekeepers’ manipulation of relief efforts, and risked inadvertently reinforcing power imbalances.

In every response over the past year, it is clear that Christian Aid country programme staff and partners made great efforts to coordinate with local authorities and other agencies.

In the Haiyan response, Christian Aid partners distributed aid to many people who had also received aid from other agencies. Costs for every agency could have been reduced if agencies had been directed to work in different locations through better centralised planning.

Advocacy

Alongside its practical support, Christian Aid recognises the importance of emergent in-country advocacy in response programming. We made a significant and timely intervention in the Ebola crisis. The focus on the link between tax incentives and underfunded health systems leveraged the existing expertise of partners who had been working on tax justice and community health before the crisis. No other agency tackled advocacy from this angle.

In a debate on Ebola in the UK Parliament in December 2014, shadow minister Anas Sarwar quoted Christian Aid’s briefing at length. Christian Aid’s Parliamentary and Political Advisor stated that the tax issues were unlikely to have been mentioned without the briefing. Christian Aid has also been party to an interagency briefing on the role of faith leaders in the response and ongoing recovery plans.

Helping young people through photography

Christian Aid worked with 150 Syrian and Lebanese children aged 11 to 17 in an appeal-funded psychosocial project run by the Lebanese organisation Mouvement Social.

The children were given cameras, photography training and mentoring, and kept online photo diaries of the world around them, both the hardships and the beauty. The photography provided a medium through which the children could express themselves, talk about the issues affecting them and build confidence in themselves and relationships with others.

Not only did the project help the children come to terms with their situation, but their pictures also helped others to understand their world.

See their stories in ‘Beirut Friends’ at christian-aid.org.uk

‘Partners are sensitive to the highly complex environment in which they are working and are successfully navigating the political, economic and cultural dynamics to negotiate access and deliver assistance.’

Lebanon evaluation
Section 2: Resilience

In 2014/15 Christian Aid implemented disaster-focused resilience programmes in 12 countries, reaching over 44,000 people with a total grant expenditure of £1.8m.

The processes and approaches underpinning our work are as important as the technical interventions we deliver. A successful community-led process will lead to well-informed action plans that address community priorities related to disaster and other risks. They will also involve advocacy to ensure that the policy environment is favourable to the most vulnerable. Our increased investment in resilience work reflects the need to build the long-term capacity of vulnerable communities and recognises that changes to social norms and practices take time.

Through our CHASE PPA funding, partners have developed community action plans on the basis of Participatory Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments (PVCA). These cover a wide range of issues (see chart below), which communities are committed to taking forward locally and as advocacy issues for national and local authorities and wider civil society.

Key findings, achievements and challenges

Christian Aid is recognised as a leading agency in the UK in the field of resilience through partnership-based approaches, and has been promoting new thinking and good practice in DRR. We have developed a more integrated approach, linking humanitarian, development and climate change approaches within one conceptual model.

DRR is becoming a higher donor priority. In April 2014, Justine Greening, the Secretary of State for International Development, identified preparing for disaster as the first of five priorities for DFID and subsequently established DEPP to strengthen national preparedness systems. To the end of the 2014/15, Christian Aid had been awarded £2.3m in DEPP funding.

Christian Aid's disaster risk reduction and resilience work aims to:

‘Enable communities to act together, anticipate and adapt, in order to reduce their vulnerability to the disaster risks they face, and to reduce the impact that disasters have on their lives and livelihoods.’

In order to achieve this, the intermediate outcomes for our resilience programmes are:

- to be rooted in communities’ understanding of the risks they face and in their priorities for tackling them
- to display the essential technical elements required for reducing community vulnerability to disasters
- to contribute to a policy environment that enables community disaster risk reduction.

‘I feel wealthy because when it rains, I don’t get wet. Everyone came together to help build my house and this has strengthened our relationships.’ Beneficiary, Haiti
In the past year Christian Aid co-chaired the BOND DRR group and hosted a PPA Learning Partnership ‘complexity event’ on resilience.

Evaluations and impact studies provide evidence of Christian Aid’s success in bridging the disconnect between response and long-term resilience work. We have taken a lead within the UK INGO sector in exploring how to implement resilience programmes in conflict settings. A learning paper was compiled based on research into resilience programmes in DRC, occupied Palestinian territory (oPt) and Kenya, and the findings have informed ongoing PPA work in conflict settings. In October 2014, Christian Aid secured DEPP funding of £978k as consortium lead for the project Linking Preparedness Resilience and Response, based on a conflict prevention methodology.

The most significant findings of evaluations of Christian Aid’s resilience programmes are outlined below.

**Effectiveness and impact:** There are examples of real success across Christian Aid’s resilience programmes alongside some important learning. In East Africa, planned outcomes were achieved and sustained into a long-term development phase. The external evaluator reported on successful livestock diversification, small business growth, improved agricultural practices leading to greater food security, and enhanced water infrastructure which built communities’ climate change adaptation capabilities. However, the evaluation highlighted that with limited, targeted additional funding, certain aspects of the programme could have been significantly more successful, for example, fencing for kitchen gardens.

Evaluators of the West Africa programme described ‘bridge funding’ for immediate needs and questioned whether without further funding DRR would be sustainable. They were critical of the division of funds between response, rehabilitation and longer-term development work; and of the geographic coverage – while more people were reached, the support was insufficient to embed behavioural change.

In the Haiti programme, the shelter support was extremely positively evaluated by recipients, in that it was earthquake and hurricane resistant and of a high standard. But the unit cost was high and risked creating unrealistic expectations of future interventions. Parts of the Haiti livelihoods support failed, due to drought, disease or market conditions. Income baseline data was not collated nor an assessment undertaken of the risks associated with each livelihood intervention.

Risk assessments are also important to identify unintended negative outcomes. In East Africa, conflicts arose between IDPs and host communities and between project participants and other farmers over water sources. Neither had been foreseen or a mitigation plan put in place. By contrast in Haiti, the programme purposefully targeted vulnerable members of host communities alongside IDPs to promote acceptance of the programme. Conflict and risks analyses at the design stage are key.

The Irish Aid-funded Humanitarian Programme Plan in DRC pioneered a cash-based approach to income generation, targeting women who had been victims of sexual violence. It improved their livelihoods and helped to establish viable savings associations. The women talked of ‘rediscovering their dignity’, by coming together and

---

**Transforming communities in Bolivia**

PVCAs were carried out in the Bolivian Amazon following catastrophic flooding that affected more than 5,800 families living in remote areas alongside the Rio Beni river. Despite their constant vulnerability to floods and forest fires, this was the first time these communities had looked at disaster risk reduction.

PVCAs provided a platform for the whole community to participate in identifying risks and agreeing action plans to address them, and for regional leaders to hear the concerns and proposals of the communities that they represent.

In a historically male-dominated culture, the plans saw women and children taking responsibility for many decisions and activities for the first time. The regional women’s organisation CIMTA worked to ensure women’s proposals were prioritised. With better community organisation, the communities successfully lobbied authorities and NGOs to gain support for improving water systems and transport.

---

The Irish Aid-funded Humanitarian Programme Plan (HPP) is designed to provide funding for protracted, predictable and recurring crises. HPP aims to address acute humanitarian needs in a way that builds resilience and lays the groundwork for sustainable development.
having economic power, and evaluators reported a ‘better climate of understanding and cooperation between men and women’.

There were good examples of synergy and successful transitions between appeals work and PPA resilience programming in East and West Africa. Sustainability was promoted in the Sahel through support to a regional network of NGOs tackling the multi-dimensional crisis. Haiti staff flagged the importance of planning for exit within the design phase. They phased down financial support to partners over the final two years of the project.

**Community organisation:** Programmes were largely developed on the basis of PVCAs, undertaken with a cross-section of target community members and drawing on input from community groups and local authorities. These helped to ensure programmes responded to the needs of the target communities, and had the right geographic coverage. For example, in Haiti the programme delivered shelter and livelihood support to IDPs relocated to rural locations, which was a priority group identified by the government. In the HPP project in Mali, conflict resolution emerged as one of the most important community issues, often linked to the exploitation of natural resources.

PVCAs not only provided sound information on communities, but across the PPA programmes partners reported on the contribution the process made to building community platforms, ownership and cohesion. Communities with a longer intervention period demonstrated increased understanding of risk and greater confidence in using a risk-based approach. In the Kenya PPA, communities began to recognise gender inequality and alcoholism as risks.

There were challenges in Kenya and Iraq in engaging nomadic or fragmented communities in the process. Because PVCAs address consensually-agreed risks, the priorities of marginalised groups can be sidelined in favour of actions to address community-wide risks. An example of this was in DRC, where one community recognised the need for support for women who had been victims of sexual violence, but this was not prioritised in their action plan. Rather, efforts focused on reducing erosion and banana leaf disease. PVCAs allow the views of marginalised community members to be raised and discussed; while the action plans might not address their concerns, they are more visible. Key learning is that PVCA action plans should not only inform interventions, but also should be reviewed on a regular basis as situations change.

**Community-level advocacy:** This has the potential to deliver a strong multiplier effect. In Haiti, advocacy on land and housing rights was critical to the success of the shelter component of the programme, and attracted international attention, including from Amnesty International. In oPt, partners successfully engaged local authorities and the media to raise awareness of human rights issues relating to water access.

The challenge is to support any potential multiplier effect through the development of long-term community advocacy strategies to engage with a wide range of actors, systematically linking to local and national networks and policies.

---

**Using mobile technology to give people a voice**

In northern Kenya, the CHASE PPA-funded pilot project SMS Voices was designed to take advantage of a recent government devolution of powers to county level. In Marsabit County, 47 citizen reporters were trained to gather community feedback and send it to government authorities via SMS.

During the four-month pilot, 500 reports were submitted across the 10 target wards, covering access to services, water, governance and justice, public works and security. Only four cases had been taken to authorities in the three years before the pilot. In comparison, communities recorded 25 cases in four months, demonstrating that ICT is an important tool in development.

**Below:** Community feedback via SMS led to vital water infrastructure repairs being carried out

‘It was impossible to take any action in this village because of leadership conflict between two neighbourhoods for several decades. Thanks to the project, tensions are resolved and people gather around various actions.’

Resident of Bendjéli village, Mali
Section 3: Global humanitarian advocacy

Over the past year, Christian Aid has collaborated in a number of alliances to take forward our advocacy agenda in respect of key global processes – the World Humanitarian Summit, the successor to the Hyogo Framework and the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

Key findings, achievements and challenges

Christian Aid is a well-connected, well-respected agency in the field of humanitarian advocacy. We are one of 24 leading NGOs which comprise the Start Network, a consortium working to strengthen the humanitarian aid system, and are a member of ACT Alliance, VOICE, BOND and ICVA.

Recognition of Christian Aid’s position within the global humanitarian community is reflected in the contributions we have been asked to make to coalition events. Examples include speaking on partnership at ICVA’s annual conference, and representing Start on the Head of CHASE/DFID-led Steering Board for the £40m DEPP fund. A causal link can be made between Christian Aid’s growing recognition as a humanitarian advocacy actor and our increased influence.

In a survey of coalition partners, four out of six rated Christian Aid as an excellent or good partner, and rated our contribution as critical or very significant in achieving or progressing the coalition’s policy and advocacy goals. They spoke highly of Christian Aid staff members’ commitment and competence.

The Head of Christian Aid’s Humanitarian Division has been chair of the Start network and invested a great deal of energy in reviving it. DFID restored Start’s funding in April 2014. He has also served on the HAP Board for the past two years and has worked on the joint standards initiative.

World Humanitarian Summit: The summit will take place in May 2016, and Christian Aid has been engaged in advocacy over the past year to influence the summit agenda in line with its three advocacy objectives. In terms of milestone achievements, all three objectives are within the seven emerging themes identified by ALNAP for wider consultation.

A series of agencies, including Irish Aid and the EC, have recently released WHS position papers calling for a more decentralised global humanitarian system. Christian Aid’s position paper ‘Making the WHS worth the climb’ was the third most downloaded paper from the WHS website as of March 2015, and a VOICE briefing to EU coalition partner survey respondent.

The ultimate outcome which Christian Aid is seeking to achieve in our advocacy work is:

‘Christian Aid contributes to the shaping of a humanitarian sector that is fit for purpose.’

In order to achieve this, the intermediate outcomes for this work are:

- Christian Aid participates in and contributes to sectorial debates and change processes.
- Thematic advocacy areas are researched, and learning and position papers put in place.

‘Christian Aid spearheaded work among a network of NGOs that provided high quality policy recommendations that have, to a large extent, been picked up in the global process. This is valuable for the issue Christian Aid works on, but also in showing the value of engaged NGO work.’

A million thanks to Christian Aid for their tremendous contribution, “Making the World Humanitarian Summit worth the climb.” Read their valuable input on localizing response, humanitarian financing, and accountability, below:

http://www.worldhumanitariansummit.org/node/471236
Member States repeatedly quotes it. Christian Aid was invited to lead a session on the WHS at Start’s annual conference and to lead ACT’s positioning on the WHS.

**DRR framework:** In March 2015, the new SENDAI 15-year framework for DRR – successor to Hyogo – was signed. Christian Aid worked with ACT and Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction in its advocacy, including representing ACT at the Head of UNISDR’s NGO consultation. Both worked closely with Christian Aid to agree key messaging, though the SENDAI framework was ultimately a mixed success in terms of NGO asks.

**Sustainable Development Goals:** The HD worked closely with colleagues in the Policy and Public Affairs Division to make the case for disaster resilience to be included in the SDGs. Christian Aid’s delegation held a side event with ACT Alliance at the Open Working Group in New York last year.

Christian Aid co-chairs the Beyond 2015 UK coalition, the main civil society platform organising around the post-2015 agenda. Three of the 17 SDGs incorporate targets relevant to our advocacy objectives. The SDG negotiations were complex and protracted and it is impossible to identify where Christian Aid’s contributions achieved influence, but we have played an active role in coalitions and continue to add our voice.

**The role of partnerships**

Additionally, momentum is growing around the role of NNGOs in humanitarian response.

Christian Aid is a member of a consortium of UK-based INGOs that commissioned the report *Missed Again: Making space for partnership in the Typhoon Haiyan response.* Published in September 2014, it is companion research to the 2013 *Missed Opportunities* report, and makes recommendations for actions to strengthen partnerships between national and international humanitarian systems in future responses.

The Christian Aid Advisor on Humanitarian Policy and Advocacy chaired a panel meeting on partnership in humanitarian work at the ALNAP Annual Meeting.

---

### Key advocacy objectives

Christian Aid’s three key advocacy objectives are:

1. a shift in power towards locally-owned and led response
2. greater investment in building resilience and reducing disaster risks
3. greater investment in accountability to vulnerable and disaster-affected populations.

‘I believe we need to rethink how we tailor the response to different situations. For natural disasters, the primary aim must be – as much as possible – to support countries to manage disasters by themselves, drawing on civil society and private sector support.’ Justine Greening, Secretary of State for International Development, speech to World Bank
Section 4: Learning and improving

Over a number of years, the Humanitarian Division has been working on a number of cross-cutting performance issues, seeking to enhance the quality of our programming, and to ensure our work is rooted in the needs, priorities and opinions of those we aim to assist.

Performance

The aim is to improve the quality of our performance information, and to use it to understand and improve the effectiveness of our programme delivery. In 2014/15 we commissioned evaluations to capture lessons from the early phases of three major emergencies (Haiyan, Ebola and Syria). They evaluated the responses against Christian Aid’s Humanitarian Quality Standards which were then compared to the six-monthly self-evaluations undertaken by HD staff.

A similar process of standardisation was introduced to our resilience programmes whereby we reviewed our CHASE PPA in seven countries against theories of change based on the same five essential components of Christian Aid’s approach to DRR/resilience. Standardisation of both processes has generated information which can be more easily aggregated. Since we introduced quarterly management reporting, ‘green’ (best) ratings for our internal performance for compliance with key quality assurance procedures have increased from 51% in the first quarter of 2013/14 to 60% in the same period a year later.

One of the most exciting new developments has been in the piloting of digital data gathering. In Sierra Leone, 30 community enumerators inputted 800 KAP survey responses directly onto smartphones. The technology worked perfectly, the community members grasped the process, and a significant amount of accurate data was compiled in a very short period, allowing for rapid analysis and more informed decision making. The learning from this pilot has laid the foundation for replication across different programmes in the coming year.

Accountability

The aim is for all humanitarian programmes to demonstrate minimum standards in accountability to disaster-affected populations.

Over the past year, training in the accountability framework and complaint response mechanisms has been carried out in the Middle East, Central America and Nigeria. There has been close collaboration with ACT Alliance members about the launch of the CHS. Christian Aid’s training materials have been uploaded onto the HAP/CHS website and shared across the sector. HAP principles have been incorporated into the internal self-assessment audit which Christian Aid’s country programmes are required to complete, and the audit team have been following up on recommended actions.

The ultimate outcome which Christian Aid is seeking to achieve is:

‘Christian Aid is learning from and improving on the delivery of our humanitarian programmes.’

In order to achieve this, the intermediate outcomes for this work are:

- Procedures and tools ensure systematic capture and utilisation of programme information.
- Programmes informed by Christian Aid tools, guidance and research on issues of quality and emerging thematic programme areas.

In the Philippines, a feedback session with community members on transitional shelter support led to the identification of a number of households that had been missed from the list of the most vulnerable.
In terms of changed practice, complaints have been received in a number of countries where training has been carried out – evidence that effective mechanisms are being put in place.

Over the three semesters for which HQS have been recorded, the score for accountability increased from 2.7 to 3.9 (out of a possible 6), a marked improvement.

**Gender and protection**

Across all of Christian Aid’s humanitarian projects over the past year, there is evidence of preferential targeting of women, not least of all in economic empowerment. Participation of women has been high, but there is not enough evidence to suggest it has been active or transformative. One notable exception was the Irish Aid-funded project in the DRC, which successfully addressed both practical gender needs (access to medical and psychosocial support) alongside strategic gender needs (advocacy and sensitisation).

The HD has developed a gender action plan which addresses organisational processes and incorporates power and gender analysis, though to date these have not been consistently applied at the planning stage, and there is little evidence of project adaptation for gender. A number of interventions purposefully targeted ‘most vulnerable groups’ and there were examples of innovative approaches to reaching them, such as able groups being assigned to help elderly people in shelter construction after Typhoon Haiyan. The Syria response provided services to disabled people and also raised awareness of inclusion.

None of the evaluations undertaken by the HD over the past year had gender as a priority objective, but gender and inclusion are captured in Christian Aid’s internal Humanitarian Quality Standards and there is an organisational determination to deliver inclusion-sensitive programming. Over the three semesters of the HQS, the score for gender and power increased from 2.4 to 3.1.

**Preparedness**

The aim is for country programmes to be better prepared to effectively, appropriately and in a timely way respond to large and small-scale emergencies. Over the past year, humanitarian capacity assessments or Country Level Emergency Preparedness Plan reviews have been undertaken in 15 country programmes. A preparedness policy has been finalised, including minimum preparedness requirements, and a preparedness indicator has been added as a Humanitarian Quality Standard.

In the three largest responses Christian Aid made over the past year – in Sierra Leone, the Philippines and the Middle East – country programmes report varying levels of preparedness, based on their experience of emergencies and capacity to predict them. In the Philippines, the country programme reports a high level of preparedness because of its experience of repeated typhoons and their seasonal nature. In Sierra Leone, Ebola was the first humanitarian crisis to hit the country in many years and the response was complicated by wider infrastructural and coordination challenges.
Cash and markets

The aim is for Christian Aid staff and partners to be able to deliver cash transfer programmes and markets-based interventions in times of crisis. Cash programming has been used at scale within the sector since the tsunami in 2004 and constitutes a growing proportion of our programming. However, many country programmes are reticent due to logistical and security concerns.

Advisers have begun a series of capacity-building interventions, including training materials and in-country training to five teams.

Christian Aid wants to move towards a position whereby cash programming is the default, reflecting the wider movement in the sector. However we recognise that in some contexts, such as in Syria and Iraq, anti-terror laws and the risk averseness of the banking sector work against this.

Below: A ‘voucher fair’ approach was adopted in South Sudan, which brought traders to markets set up near to target villages. The fairs meant that recipients could avoid long journeys to markets and a wide range of foods was available for families who had been displaced by fighting and were unable to plant crops.

In the Ebola response in Sierra Leone, for example, NFI were distributed to survivors which could have been bought in local markets (though of course this was not an option for quarantined families). Cash could have been distributed via mobile phone banking, even to remote areas.
Section 5: Resourcing

Christian Aid believes that our partnership-based humanitarian work is often the most effective means of responding to disasters.

As we enhance our practice, we believe that we are delivering high-quality, VFM interventions. Christian Aid is continually seeking to grow our portfolio of work, including the size and diversification of our funding base; our geographic coverage, not least of all in responding to forgotten or neglected crises; and the technical expertise of our staff and partners.

Funding

Christian Aid acquired humanitarian funding from 22 different donors in 2014/15. Of these, six are new donors, including USAID. While the funds managed directly by the HD have fluctuated over the past four years, as a result of the nature of the disasters we have responded to, overall the total of Christian Aid’s funding for projects reaching disaster-affected communities has risen from £24.2m in 2011/12 to £25.9m in 2014/15, which was 26% and 27% respectively of Christian Aid’s total expenditure in those periods. This reflects a growing trend for us to be working in fragile contexts, where the HD continues to have an advisory engagement.

Table 1: Humanitarian Division annual total outgoings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>£16,460,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>£15,407,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>£16,575,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>£13,323,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: 2014/15 breakdown of Humanitarian Division annual outgoings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outgoing</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total grants</td>
<td>£10,406,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>£1,467,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other team costs</td>
<td>£600,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy on Christian Aid and DEC appeals</td>
<td>£799,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Rapid Response</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other costs</td>
<td>£2,917,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£13,323,190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ultimate outcome which Christian Aid is seeking to achieve in resourcing is:

‘Christian Aid has the resources, capacities and relationships required to deliver our humanitarian programmes.’

In order to achieve this, the intermediate outcomes for this work are:

- Capacity assessment, induction, training and guidance ensure staff and partner humanitarian knowledge.
- Well-functioning internal and external relationships.
- Funding opportunities identified and secured.
Table 3: Humanitarian Division grant income and expenditure 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Aid rapid response core funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>599,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Aid appeal funds</td>
<td>4,860,437</td>
<td>2,010,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebola</td>
<td>1,129,459</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>1,372,147</td>
<td>161,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza</td>
<td>2,033,872</td>
<td>349,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiyan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>503,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>324,959</td>
<td>260,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>390,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC appeal funds</td>
<td>4,382,713</td>
<td>2,119,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional funds</td>
<td>6,423,908</td>
<td>6,099,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>START Fund</td>
<td>736,576</td>
<td>664,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>971,999</td>
<td>823,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID RRF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>611,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Aid</td>
<td>1,227,780</td>
<td>764,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAC</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>126,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Aid</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>50,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>783,038</td>
<td>65,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>623,784</td>
<td>26,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Communities UK (Bruderhof)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roddick Foundation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Alliance</td>
<td>271,327</td>
<td>878,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>494,700</td>
<td>16,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim Hands</td>
<td>88,981</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEKS</td>
<td>144,352</td>
<td>166,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>503,733</td>
<td>852,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>82,638</td>
<td>903,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£15,667,059</td>
<td>£10,406,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

Over the past year, Christian Aid has been driving forward our organisational understanding and practice relating to VFM. In October 2014, we compiled a practical ‘How To’ guide for country programmes, which incorporated a section on VFM in humanitarian work. This highlighted the three measures of a successful response – quality, speed and cost – and recognises that there are always trade-offs to be made between these. A speedier response may be of poorer quality, a higher quality response may cost more. In rapid onsets simplicity generally trumps a more rigorous methodology. The key issue for a country programme is to make these decisions very consciously and be able to make a defensible case for why it took the decision it did.
The success Christian Aid has achieved in fundraising for our humanitarian work over the past year is an indication that our projects are deemed VFM by donors. Our emphasis on building long-term resilience and on accountability and partnerships feed into a strong VFM proposition.

The evaluation of the East Africa appeal programme states: ‘The outcomes and sustainability prospects of the intervention represent value for money.’ However, the statement is not supported by specific evidence. This is the challenge – to not only deliver but also to capture VFM.

**Added value**

Partnership has been the cornerstone of Christian Aid’s approach since our inception and Christian Aid is recognised as one of the leading partnership organisations in the sector. To the extent that a coalition partner stated in an anonymous HD survey last June: ‘Only criticism would be that it is often possible to predict in advance what a Christian Aid representative will say in a meeting (ie, prioritise partner organisations). Though this message is important, its predictability may lessen its impact in the eyes of advocacy targets.’

Christian Aid has undertaken a research project called Value for People, exploring how working through a partnership model adds value. On the basis of discussions with Christian Aid humanitarian programme staff, the research has identified a number of perceived benefits to both Christian Aid and partners:

- **Speed of response**: Local partners are already present in their communities. They can provide up-to-date information on the disaster impact; they have existing relationships with and acceptance by local populations; they have the organisational structures in place to mobilise a rapid response. The Missed Again report echoed this finding. Additionally, Christian Aid can pre-fund from our unrestricted resources pending appeals, and very rapidly get money to partners through existing channels. However, Christian Aid acted effectively as a second-wave responder in the Philippines due largely to logistical challenges experienced by local partners in distribution.

- **Reach**: Many Christian Aid partners work in remote areas, and can target hard-to-reach communities where other INGOs are unable to deliver a response.

- **Better tailored and continuity of response**: Knowing the target populations, local partners are better placed than outside organisations to undertake a rapid needs assessment which recognises local power dynamics and how capacity and vulnerabilities have changed as a consequence of the disaster. Long-term partners can make a smooth transition from response to recovery through to long-term development work. Missed Again found that ‘the proximity to and knowledge of communities brought by NNGOs to partnerships strengthened the relevance of humanitarian assistance.’

- **Capacity-building and technical expertise**: This is highlighted in many of the evaluations of the humanitarian interventions over the past year. Partners talk of Christian Aid’s *accompaniment*, not merely one-off training events. They welcome the capacity-
building in project and financial management, power, gender and accountability which strengthen them as organisations beyond the delivery of Christian Aid-funded projects. In the research, Christian Aid staff related how sharing concepts, such as the Resilience Livelihoods Framework, enabled partners to increase their knowledge base.

- **Relationship brokering:** The research identified one of the challenges local partners face is in engaging with coordinating agencies, such as participation in UN response meetings. They are either not invited or struggle to contribute in a meaningful way. Christian Aid links local partners to response mechanisms, donors, the media and other partners. Christian Aid has the systems to manage big projects, and can reassure donors of its capacity to manage risk.

- **Advocacy:** Christian Aid can amplify the voices of our partners. This was clearly the case in the work of the HD advocacy and policy staff on Ebola. Christian Aid facilitated a local partner to make its case on the link between tax incentives to foreign business and under-funded health systems to a global audience.

- **Security:** Security is integrated into our projects and programming. An example of when effective security risk management facilitated work in an extremely insecure environment was in May 2014, when two Christian Aid staff made an end-of-project evaluation visit to the Upper Nile State in South Sudan. Despite an unstable ceasefire, by working with a partner agency they were able to complete their task successfully and exit safely, having the necessary contingency plans in place.

**Challenges**

Not every local partner has responded to an emergency in the past or has the organisational or technical capacity to do so. The pressures they face can be daunting. The evaluation of the West Africa emergency response was critical of the rapid surge demanded of partners. There was a scale-up followed by a scale-down which was difficult for partners to manage. The implementation plan was not developed collaboratively and the evaluation suggests an exit strategy should have been put in place from the outset, as was the case in the Haiti programme. Christian Aid’s partnership research highlights how tensions can arise when we take a more directive role in an emergency response and partners feel as if they are only implementers.
Section 6: Implications for practice

As the funding and geographic coverage of Christian Aid’s humanitarian work continues to grow, Christian Aid is determined to maintain and improve on the quality of its humanitarian programming. At least, all of its work will adhere to the new Core Humanitarian Standard. It will continue to make the forceful case through its practice and advocacy work for a shift in power towards NGOs and locally-owned and led responses. This report highlights a number of implications for practice:

Monitoring and evaluation: Despite the pressures of time and logistical challenges in a disaster response, Christian Aid is committed to improving its M&E. There are examples of good practice, such as the ‘dashboards’ of quantitative data compiled by partners in the Haiyan response and the validation of government beneficiary lists.

The main challenge is in undertaking systematic needs assessments. Implementation plans must be informed by better baseline information; be collaboratively developed with partners, especially in agreeing KPIs; and be regularly updated. From the outset they should include an exit strategy, even if only loosely framed. All evaluations should use rolling implementation plans as a starting point. Christian Aid staff need to make frequent field monitoring visits, in accordance with an agreed M&E plan, and include validation through observation. Christian Aid has an accountability responsibility direct to communities which it can only fulfil by talking with project beneficiaries.

Using Christian Aid’s own Humanitarian Quality Standards as a means of evaluating response projects is a sound approach and allows for comparison between responses. There is a case for adding criteria relating to results, coordination and partnership, and for weighting criteria. Every project must have a clear target for beneficiary numbers, disaggregated as a minimum by gender. Good practice in Christian Aid is now capturing direct, indirect and wider beneficiary numbers (the latter being those impacted by policy and advocacy work).

Gender and power: Under Partnership for Change, Christian Aid has been placing increasing emphasis on gender and power, and specifically on analysis shaping the design of projects. This is more problematic in emergencies which demand a rapid response based on incomplete information. Partners rely heavily on their local knowledge. However, there is a risk of partners being co-opted into local power dynamics; of failing to tackle or reinforcing inequalities.

Partners and emergency programme staff need to ensure that within a short period of a response (ideally no more than eight weeks), a formal if slightly curtailed gender and power analysis, including a Do No Harm element, is undertaken and project activities are reviewed and adapted accordingly. We want a ‘good enough’ rapid standard on gender and inclusion against which all assessments, proposals and evaluation ToRs can be screened.

Advocacy support to country programmes: Christian Aid was rated highly by its coalition partners, not least of all in its willingness to speak out. The advocacy support given to Sierra Leonean
partners during the Ebola crisis was powerful, timely and appropriate. Though based on thorough research and in-country consultations, there was no formal advocacy strategy document. The country team was overwhelmed, and the situation unclear and rapidly changing with many actors. This will almost always be true in an emergency response. Nevertheless, to ensure the best outcomes from Christian Aid’s country-based emergent advocacy work in humanitarian responses, it is critical to have an advocacy strategy which captures the overall goal, specific and measurable objectives, milestones, key messages and distinct influencing approaches for key stakeholders. Without this, it is difficult to measure success in a meaningful way.

**Value for money:** VFM is a growing preoccupation of donors. Christian Aid’s emphasis on building long-term resilience and on accountability and partnerships feeds into a strong VFM proposition. But it is not enough to strive for cost-effectiveness in humanitarian programming. Christian Aid needs to be seen to be putting in place cost-saving measures, taking VFM decisions during project design and implementation, keeping good records of these, and ensuring that VFM is reflected on as part of programme evaluations. There is a real opportunity for Christian Aid to evidence that the partnership model provides value for money, especially in terms of effectiveness and equity.

**Links between response, recovery and long-term development:** There are thin lines between different phases in a humanitarian response. Working through long-term partners, Christian Aid is well-placed to make smooth transitions between phases. This was successfully achieved in the response in Kenya, for example. But at every stage, the implementation plan should be revisited, roles and respective inputs re-clarified and a progress review undertaken.

In the Ebola response, the humanitarian and development programmes in the country office did not coordinate well enough. In such a situation, country programme staff need to recognise when to move out of the response phase; how to build linkages as soon as possible between their humanitarian and development work; and that they need to reformulate their development programmes to respond to a new reality.

**Links between preparedness and resilience work:** Christian Aid recognises the need to upgrade our programmes’ preparedness planning in disaster-prone countries. Through Humanitarian Capacity Assessments and Country-Level Emergency Preparedness Plans, we are building a thorough understanding of the level of readiness and humanitarian capacities of our country offices and their main humanitarian partners. Christian Aid recognises the link between partners’ organisational preparedness and community preparedness, between robust organisations and resilient communities. Resilience includes preparedness and responsiveness elements. The better a community is prepared and the more it is able to appropriately respond increases its overall resilience to threatening events.
Endnotes

1 Countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Bosnia, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Gaza/oPt, Haiti, Honduras, India, Iraq, Kenya, Lebanon, Malawi, Mali, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan and Syria.


3 Countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bosnia, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, El Salvador, Gaza/oPt, Honduras, India, Iraq, Kenya, Lebanon, Malawi, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Philippines, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan and Syria.

4 Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies, a network of European humanitarian NGOs advocating to the European Parliament.

5 International Council of Voluntary Agencies whose mission is to make humanitarian action more principled and effective.


8 15% of all funds raised from Christian Aid appeals and 7% of all DEC appeals is transferred to Christian Aid core funds.

9 Christian Aid appeal funds are being held pending full spend of DEC, ICCO and USAID funds.

10 Christian Aid appeal funds will largely be utilised for longer-term work, while DEC funds are expended first.

11 Christian Aid appeal funds will largely be utilised for longer-term work, while DEC funds are expended first.

12 DEC funds are expended over a 2-year period.

13 These contracts were secured in the first quarter of 2015 and the spend period extends into 2015/16.

14 These contracts were secured in the first quarter of 2015 and the spend period extends into 2015/16.

15 These funds were secured in December 2014 for a 2.5 year implementation period.

16 Funds were spent in full during 2014/15, but funding allocation was processed after financial year end.
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