

Table ES-1 / Humanitarian performance, SOHS 2012 and 2015

Sufficiency/coverage	Effectiveness	Relevance/appropriateness		Connectedness	Efficiency	Coherence/principles
<b>SOHS 2012 (2009–2011 compared to 2007–2008)</b>						
						
<b>No progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding shortfalls and coverage gaps continued.</li> <li>Coverage of stated requirements remained static.</li> <li>Perceptions of sufficiency among humanitarian actors surveyed dropped to 34% (from 36% in 2010).</li> </ul>	<b>Mixed progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme objectives were largely met.</li> <li>However, weaknesses were identified in leadership and timeliness.</li> </ul>	<b>Improvement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modest improvements occurred in aligning with host government priorities.</li> <li>Progress was made in needs assessment methods and tools for communicating with affected populations.</li> <li>Weakness persisted in local consultation on projects, especially with recipients.</li> </ul>		<b>Improvement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements, mostly driven by the host states, have occurred with the establishment of national disaster management authorities (NDMAs) and legislated cluster links.</li> <li>Growing norm and tools for accountability, but under-investment in the capacities of local partners.</li> </ul>	<b>No progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant new savings of money or time were noted.</li> <li>Donors seeking greater efficiencies by using fewer funding channels were perceived as creating inefficiencies down the line, such as cascading overhead costs and tougher reporting requirements.</li> </ul>	<b>Decline</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing strain on principles was noted, as many humanitarian NGOs were seen to align with political and military agendas.</li> <li>The gulf widened between strictly humanitarian and multi-mandated organisations.</li> <li>Continued disconnection and friction were noted with longer-term development agendas.</li> </ul>
<b>SOHS 2015 (2012–2014 compared to 2009–2011)</b>						
						
<b>Decline (with a few exceptions)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite an increase in funding, overall coverage decreased.</li> <li>Most gaps were seen in support for chronic crises, including deficits in funding, technical capacity, and recruitment, as well as access constraints.</li> <li>Some coverage improvements were cited in responses to natural disasters.</li> <li>Perceptions of sufficiency among humanitarian actors surveyed dropped to 24% (from 34% in 2012).</li> <li>More pessimism was expressed about ability to reach people in need in conflicts, mostly due to insecurity.</li> </ul>	<b>Mixed progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements were noted in both timeliness and mortality/morbidity outcomes in rapid responses to major natural disasters.</li> <li>Improvements were noted in coordination, and in quality of leadership and personnel in major emergencies.</li> <li>Performance was poor in conflict settings.</li> <li>A majority of survey respondents graded effectiveness low.</li> <li>Crosscutting issues have not yet been systematically addressed. Most progress has been in the area of gender, but more needs to be done in the areas of age and disability.</li> </ul>	<b>No progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A slight majority (51%) said needs assessment had improved but saw no progress in engaging local participation.</li> <li>Some methodological innovations occurred in needs assessment, but no consensus was reached on tools.</li> <li>More feedback mechanisms were developed, but there is little evidence of affected populations' input to project design or approach.</li> </ul>		<b>Little progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited progress in Asia was outweighed by lack of progress in many other regions.</li> <li>Survey participants saw little participation and consultation of local authorities.</li> <li>Consultation and participation of recipients ranked poorest among practitioners.</li> </ul>	<b>Little progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant change or new development was noted since the last review.</li> <li>A few small-scale (project-level) examples of new efficiencies were noted.</li> <li>Some inefficiencies were cited in surge response to Typhoon Haiyan and in the Syrian refugee response.</li> </ul>	<b>No progress</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stabilisation and counter-terror agendas continued to influence donors' humanitarian funding decisions.</li> <li>Donor firewalling of humanitarian aid, and their consideration of principles, has weakened.</li> <li>There is a perception of increasing instrumentalisation and politicisation of humanitarian assistance, including by affected states.</li> <li>Despite the rise of the resilience concept, no progress occurred in changing aid architecture to suit, or in phasing in development resources earlier in the response and recovery phases.</li> </ul>