

FOCUS:
The humanitarian sector:
perspectives on current
trends and future
challenges

From the VOICE Secretariat

This issue of VOICE Out Loud is a special edition, as we have given the floor to individuals with particularly longstanding experience in the humanitarian sector. These are people who have, each in their own way, left their mark on humanitarian work in their respective countries and beyond. We asked them to reflect on the issues and challenges that the humanitarian sector, and NGOs in particular, have to tackle, now and in the future. The result is a broad picture of personal concerns and views, which aims to stimulate debate, rather than present one particular perspective from VOICE.

The subject is very timely, given that many institutional reforms are taking place at EU and global policy level, while at the same time humanitarian NGOs are facing evolving challenges in the field. Therefore they are more than ever engaged in planning for the future, which is why the VOICE network recently organised a roundtable on "*Humanitarian NGOs in a changing world: How do we adapt*". This newsletter is another contribution to this ongoing debate.

Many contributors touch upon the theme of cooperation with other actors in the field, in particular the military, and how these relationships could be handled and with what effect. Another recurrent topic is the professionalization of the sector. While this trend is widely supported in the sector, there are voices which raise the question to what extent the concentration on standardisation is obscuring the humanitarian spirit.

Equally challenging are the institutional changes at the level of the European Union, with the European External Action Service being the most visible outcome of the Lisbon Treaty so far. Could these developments lead to the instrumentalisation of humanitarian aid for political and security purposes? Why are the Humanitarian Principles still relevant? Will the search for funding lead to a mere "survival of the biggest"? These questions demonstrate the variety of subjects to be addressed.

VOICE OUT LOUD aims to contribute to the understanding of the professional reality of humanitarian NGOs and to give an insight into relevant humanitarian issues, relying upon the experience and input of VOICE members. It is addressed to European decision makers and other stakeholders of the humanitarian community.

VOICE

VOICE stands for Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies. It is a network representing 86 European non-governmental organisations (NGOs) active in humanitarian aid worldwide. VOICE is the main NGO interlocutor with the European Union on emergency aid, relief, rehabilitation and disaster preparedness. As a European network, it represents and promotes the values and specificities of humanitarian NGOs, in collaboration with other humanitarian actors.

VOICE Secretariat:
43, Avenue Louise
B-1050 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: +32 (0)2 - 541.13.60
Fax: +32 (0)2 - 534.99.53
E-mail: voice@ngovoice.org
Website: www.ngovoice.org



THE ISSUE

**THE HUMANITARIAN SECTOR:
PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES**

The future of humanitarian NGOs: three scenarios
Wolf-Dieter Eberwein, President VOICE **page 4**

The humanitarian sector- A French perspective
Michel Brugière, Médecins du Monde **page 6**

The relevance of the Humanitarian Principles in today's world
Paul Grossrieder, ICRC **page 7**

The evolution of the NGO sector- a historical perspective
Jacques Willemse, ICCO-Kerk in Actie **page 8**

Thoughts about the professionalization of the humanitarian sector
Francisco Rey Marcos, IECAH **page 10**

A VIEW ON THE EU

The European External Action Service:
What will the impact be on EU humanitarian action?
Ester Asin Martinez, CARE **page 12**

FIELD FOCUS

The Afghan humanitarian crisis and the instrumentalisation of aid
Valerie Ceccherini, MercyCorps **page 13**

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EUROPEAN UNION

VOICE General Policy Resolution 2010 **page 14**

VOICE AT WORK

Humanitarian Issues at EU level **page 15**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS THEMATIC ISSUE WERE

The people behind the words **back cover**



THE FUTURE OF HUMANITARIAN NGOS: THREE SCENARIOS

THE ISSUE

THE HUMANITARIAN SECTOR: PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

'It all boils down to the core question: what kind of international humanitarian order do we want for the future?'

Looking back over at least two decades, it is more than obvious that the international humanitarian system has undergone tremendous changes. These include a greater presence of humanitarian aid workers worldwide to bring relief to the victims of armed conflicts and natural disasters. This occurred thanks to the systematic upward trend in resources provided primarily by public but also private donors. Institutional reforms, in particular by the United Nations, and the professionalization of the humanitarian sector have further contributed to improve the overall performance of the humanitarian system.

Yet good is obviously not considered to be good enough. The recently published pilot study *"The State of the Humanitarian System – Assessing Performance and Progress"* by Harvey et al.¹ shows that the achievements thus far reveal **two contradictory trends**. On the one hand, the normative foundations of humanitarian action prescribed in the Geneva Conventions are increasingly being eroded through their subordination to political and security strategies of the states involved in armed conflicts. On the other hand, the performance of humanitarian actors has clearly improved both in terms of financing and aid delivery. What does this imply for the future of the international humanitarian system? Extrapolating this trend, does this mean relegating considerations of principle to the backstage and putting efficient management upfront?

There is an urgent need to think about the future. Thinking about it can be approached from two complementary perspectives. One approach consists of projecting the observed past trends into the future. The other puts at its centre the desired vision of the international humanitarian order. We do not know what the future will be, but we can speculate about probable and desired futures. The resulting scenarios as "thought experiments" can provide some intellectual guidance, freed from the bonds of "realism".

For such a speculative undertaking we can take as a point of departure a limited number of issues that are repeatedly addressed in the debates within the humanitarian world: firstly, the recurrent complaint about insufficient resources and the shortage of qualified personnel; secondly, the increase in natural

disasters, which reinforces the need to emphasize systematically the link between emergency relief and development; and finally, the concept of capacity building and partnership.

What could be the implications of the abovementioned resource shortage and the lack of sufficiently qualified personnel? One could think of an utterly pessimistic scenario which could be labelled as the **Darwinist "survival of the fittest"- scenario**. The **competition for scarce resources**, particularly in light of the ongoing economic crisis, becomes increasingly tough. Six humanitarian organisations with budgets beyond 250 million USD, 90,400 personnel of which 4,000 expatriates dominate the field, while at the bottom of the scale there are 179 small agencies with an annual budget under 10 million USD, and 13,900 employees of which 800 are expatriates.² Suppose that it is in the interest of the donors to streamline and further rationalise the funding process, i.e. allocating larger amounts of money (fewer but bigger projects) to those NGOs capable of absorbing big amounts of project funding. The smaller ones might become less competitive and either have to form consortia with the bigger ones or possibly become simply subcontractors of the bigger ones. The end result may be a limited number of multinational humanitarian organisations. The concept of diversity that the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid acknowledges may help to prevent such a trend.

Our second issue relates to the high probability of the **increasing number of natural disasters** in the future. According to a recently published forecast by Oxfam the annual average number of natural disaster affected victims between 1998 and 2007 was 243 million³. The forecast for 2015 assumes 375 million people affected, which is an increase of 54 percent. Natural disasters have two important properties: firstly, they are fully subordinated to national sovereignty, i.e. the **political prerogative of the state**. International Humanitarian Law does not apply. And second, the **linkage between emergency relief and development** is obvious as natural disasters are short-term events. This leads us to the scenario that John Borton has called the *Social Protection Scenario*⁴. It implies the dominance of and a role for the affected state, while national and international NGOs are likely

to become subcontractors of the government in charge. But if the above developments lead to an increasing dominance of civil protection, does this imply the end of humanitarian organisations and the humanitarian actors? Or should civil protection work in complementarity to humanitarian actors?

The third and final issue raised relates to **capacity building and partnership**. This concept has been in vogue for fifty years or so, primarily in the development area. It has now been integrated into the conceptual tool kit of donors and emergency relief organisations. Nobody would deny that this concept is plausible. But it is problematic as it is unclear whose capacities are to be strengthened and what partnership really means. If it means simply enhancing the capacities of the existing - primarily Western - NGOs through hiring Southern partners for the duration of their projects, this may in the long run well lead to a North-South divide. If in contrast this includes the capacity building of Southern NGOs, the emancipation process may lead to a restructuring of the Northern NGOs. Their operational activities should decline while simultaneously increasing training and organisation building. One possibility is then the growth of an international humanitarian system committed to the universal principles derived from the core principle of humanity based on cooperation and consensus among all NGOs delivering their services according to the humanitarian principles. But the other side of the coin of this optimistic version is a pessimistic one of a humanitarian North-South divide within the NGOs. Such a divide could be reinforced by the political level where the new emerging powers emancipate themselves from Western dominance. The process of regionalisation going hand in hand with a reaffirmation of state sovereignty could indeed include humanitarian action in the political agenda, simply mimicking the trend of instrumentalisation of humanitarian actors that can now be observed on the part of Western powers.

According to these projections, Dunant's intention of constructing an international humanitarian order will in the end remain but a 150 years' long footnote in history. Its main aim has then been the humanisation of war. But this focus is too narrow today. The primary victims are no longer the combatants in armed conflicts

but rather the civilian populations – not only in armed conflicts but also in natural disasters. If natural disasters occur in weak, failing or failed states,- which often seems to be the case- the probability cannot be excluded that the national emergency relief and reconstruction policies, if existent, may trigger violent conflicts.

Thus, if that proposition is plausible, this would lead to the conclusion that all the actors who are part of the international humanitarian system need to think about the implications of these scenarios. It all boils down to the core question: what kind of international humanitarian order do we want for the future?

Wolf-Dieter Eberwein
VOICE President

1. Harvey, P., Stoddard, A., Harmer, A., Taylor, G. with DiDomenic, V. and Brander, L. (2010) *The State of the Humanitarian System - Assessing Performance and Progress. A pilot study*. London: ALNAP c/o Overseas Development Institute
2. Harvey et al. (2010), *The State of the Humanitarian System*, p.20.
3. www.intermonoxfam.org/UnidadesInformacion/anexos/10730/090421_forecasting_disasters.pdf
4. Borton, J. (2009) *Future of Humanitarian System: Impacts of Internal Changes*. Berkhamsted: UK.

THE HUMANITARIAN SECTOR - A FRENCH PERSPECTIVE

THE ISSUE

THE HUMANITARIAN SECTOR: PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

'Humanitarian aid should remain a space where professional volunteers can express their solidarity towards crisis-affected people'

Before we think about the future of humanitarian aid, I consider it necessary to mention the principles that have up until now guided the "French Doctors"¹: a commitment to "Care and Bear Witness", along with the principles of humanity, impartiality and independence. Today, the "French Doctors" work in an environment totally different to the one at the time of their creation and as such they face a number of new challenges.

Firstly, there is the issue of climate change, which triggers an increase in the frequency and the impact of **natural disasters**. In such contexts, humanitarian aid rarely poses diplomatic problems. Therefore, the necessary requirements for humanitarian activities are speed and efficacy. On the other hand, a major concern in disaster-affected areas is the coordination of the multitude of actors in the field, which the UN-led humanitarian reform strives to improve. However, for the time being, the results are not convincing and the UN-led reform is rather regarded as an additional bureaucratic structure that does not meet the goal of making action easier.

In the case of **armed conflicts**, the situation is entirely different. While, as demonstrated by the statistics of the Armed Conflicts Database of the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), the number of conflicts is not diminishing, there is a widespread assumption that humanitarian space is shrinking. Humanitarian interventions are increasingly dangerous and security has become the priority concern of aid workers. The factors causing such an evolution are multifold:

- Armed conflicts are no longer justified by ideological or political goals. Instead, in many situations, violence has become a part of the internal struggle for power;
- NATO or UN- led military interventions are increasingly labelled as "humanitarian" interventions, which is highly confusing;
- Finally, violations of International Humanitarian Law are common.

The main challenge in such a context is to regain the **humanitarian space**. Only the assertion of our ideological, political, economic and religious independence can grant us access to suffering populations. In addition, it is crucial to avoid any confusion between humanitarians and the military as well as to gain the trust of our beneficiaries through coverage of their needs.

Another trend in humanitarian aid is the so-called "**professionalization**" of the sector. The implications of this concept, created by Anglo-Saxon NGOs ten years ago, are twofold. It both encourages the standardisation of humanitarian practices and has consequences for human resources management.

First of all, professionalization aims to standardise practices through a system of technical criteria that are to be respected. Personally, I do not believe that the quality of humanitarian aid can be reduced to technical standards. Humanitarianism deals with people and it is those people who should be put at the heart of any project. Only the beneficiaries of humanitarian activities are entitled to assess our action. The use of technical norms should be guided by an essential benchmark, namely the satisfaction of the people concerned.

With regards HR management, the main concern of NGOs is to be able to rely on trustworthy and competent personnel. That is why volunteers have progressively been replaced by paid staff. It is clear that high-level positions with a lot of responsibility should be reserved for experienced and qualified people. However, the risk of this trend is that it could create a closed, inward-looking and rigid professional community. I believe that humanitarian aid should remain a space where professional volunteers can express their solidarity towards crisis-affected people outside their normal professional activities. This ensures open-mindedness, since volunteers who have been involved in humanitarian activities have a different world vision and become passionate advocates for international solidarity.

In summary, I agree with the professionalization of humanitarian activities, but only on the condition that it is closely monitored and that it keeps the right balance between volunteerism and professionalism.

In conclusion, I would like to make a remark about the increasing challenges that we are facing with regards humanitarian space. Even if humanitarian space tends to be respected in the case of natural disasters, I have the feeling that the situation is entirely different in settings of armed conflict and political violence. States and international organisations that we have shaken up over the last thirty years are attempting to tackle the world's affairs and are limiting our space for action.

Michel Brugière
Former Director General
Medecins du Monde
www.medecinsdumonde.org

1. Explanatory note (ed.): "The French Doctors" is a movement created in the aftermath of the Biafra civil war by French medical professionals. They were opposed to the "silence law" imposed by absolute neutrality and considered that their duty as humanitarians was to testify about the atrocities they faced. They therefore enjoy a privileged relationship with the media. Moreover, they tended, in the early years of the movement, to favour voluntary engagement in order to demonstrate solidarity with crisis-affected people. Several of today's French NGOs were created out of this movement.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE HUMANITARIAN PRINCIPLES IN TODAY'S WORLD

THE ISSUE

THE HUMANITARIAN SECTOR: PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

'Independence, impartiality and neutrality are not only words but have real operational consequences'



The European Commission and the European Parliament adopted the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid relatively recently, in December 2007. The Consensus emphasizes that in its humanitarian activities, "The European Union is firmly committed to upholding and promoting the fundamental humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence". But do the people who voted to approve this text realise the concrete consequences of such a document? Are they aware of the fact that **independence, impartiality and neutrality are not only words but have real operational consequences?**

Nowadays, there are numerous actors in any conflict situation, as we have seen in Afghanistan, Somalia, DRC and Sudan. In addition to this increase in the number of actors, there is the influence of new economic, political, religious and criminal factors that often overlap and are interlinked. However, it is precisely this complex nature of modern conflicts which, rather than detracting from the fundamental humanitarian principles, makes them increasingly relevant. Faced with **appropriation of humanitarian aid for non-humanitarian purposes**, including the 'hijacking' of aid for political or military aims, the respect for these principles in action protects humanitarian operations from dangerous influences.

Impartiality - which is not to be confused with a kind of equal "50-50" material distribution of aid - shows the will to base action on an assessment of the real needs of crisis-affected people. This principle, which aims not to discriminate between persons, stands in opposition to partisan approaches designed to favour political allies, or people sharing the same beliefs and their converts.

Independence distinguishes humanitarian decisions from political decision-making. The respect for this principle is a kind of guarantee against the harnessing of humanitarianism by politicians to the benefit of their own agenda, provided that NGOs are very strict about this principle. The UN Agenda for Peace, for instance, which proposes the use of humanitarian activities as leverage to move the peace process forwards, is contrary to the principle of independence. It should not be tolerated for humanitarian actors to give up assisting suffering populations on the pretext that their leaders are blocking the setting-up of a peace agreement. Of course, humanitarians will never be opposed to a peace effort - they can even, contribute to it, albeit indirectly - but this contribution cannot be made at the expense of part of the affected population.

The principle of independence still is the condition governing the freedom of humanitarian action. Freedom to assess needs, freedom to build a network of contacts, freedom to monitor the impact of the intervention.

Finally, the **neutrality** of humanitarian action is an essential tool in order to ensure that humanitarianism is not reduced to a technical and logistical exercise (the 'SPHERE trend'). Under the label of the professionalisation of humanitarianism, its ultimate aim is sometimes forgotten: to restore the dignity of crisis-affected people through aid. For a humanitarian organisation, the fact of not siding with any particular party in a conflict enables humanitarians to regard the victims above all as human beings and not as clients. This principle paves the way for a potential effective protection of human beings facing the horrors of war. It considers only the suffering arising from adverse or conflict circumstances and not the political or religious identity as occurred during the conflict in ex-Yugoslavia.

In the same way, there is an added value to interventions which are guided by respect for neutrality, in comparison to "humanitarian wars" advocated by several Security Council resolutions (for example in Kosovo). These wars follow a logic of war and power, instead of a humanitarian logic. The respect for the principle of neutrality, provided that it is perceived as such by the warring parties, also plays a role in the security of humanitarian workers. Through its explicitly neutral action, a humanitarian organisation ceases to be a threat to either of the parties to the conflict. As a consequence, the incentive to attack is reduced or even disappears.

These thoughts on the operational usefulness of the humanitarian principles do not present a recipe for success of the operations carried out. Instead they emphasize that, without the respect for such principles, humanitarian action becomes hybridised and can "forget" the victims, some of whom would be regarded as "bad". However, we must remain realistic and acknowledge that, as soon as we are in the middle of a conflict, best intentions do not prevent the respect for the principles from being embodied in highly politicized contexts. Above all these principles must not be left as hollow words but **must be used as a compass** in order not to lose sight of the fact that humanitarianism is an end in itself, without any other political goal.

Paul Grossrieder
Former Director General
ICRC
www.icrc.org



THE EVOLUTION OF THE NGO SECTOR - A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

THE ISSUE

THE HUMANITARIAN SECTOR: PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

'The dilemma between the humanitarian imperative and the respect for indigenous capacity needs to be resolved'

★ The ongoing breakdown in social cohesion of (northern) European societies has many underlying reasons and perhaps even wider-ranging consequences. Here we will restrict ourselves to one aspect: that of the fragmentation of civil society, and more specifically, that sector of civil society dealing with development and humanitarian assistance. We do so from a (naturally limited) Dutch perspective. This article is a personal reflection and aims to stimulate thinking and debate, rather than offer a blue print for action.

The development and humanitarian aid sector as it emerged, roughly since the Sixties, grew out of the Christian tradition of "diakonia" and was firmly linked to missionaries (and colonialism). In spite of the rapid secularisation in (northern) European society, the underlying ethics and motivation of many actors involved still lay in that same Christian tradition. Some even claim that very successful organisations like the Médecins Sans Frontières family are a reinvention of the principles laid down in the story of the Samaritan. They certainly remind many in this country of their Calvinistic youth.

But changes have set in and will speed up in the next decade. These changes are resulting from changes in the European reality as we know it today.

★ EUROPE AT THE CROSSROADS

The demise of the Soviet Union and the upsurge of neo-conservatism have speeded up a shift in the economic balance and thus the political equilibrium in the world. Resources which were frozen by the bondage of the Cold War started to be released and new economic powerhouses have emerged. Europe has not kept pace. China, India, Brazil and the USA, rapidly followed by the new Russia, are increasingly overshadowing Europe in military might, economic power and global relevance.

Moreover, growing demographic changes in the whole of Europe have eroded its monolithic culture, or rather, the idea that such existed. The ongoing (im)migration of people from non-European origin is leading to multiple changes in European society, including the inevitable clashes of religion, culture and economic interest.

Contrary to what is often proclaimed, we do not believe that the globalised word of internet has led to better communication, increased knowledge or understanding. The

commercialisation and the global concentration of our media tend to create their own "reality" which might have little to do with that of a child soldier in Congo, a slum dweller in Calcutta or even an unemployed elderly Moroccan immigrant in Amsterdam.

★ WHERE DOES THE AID SECTOR COME FROM AND WHERE IS IT HEADING?

The development and aid sector started off in the second half of the last century as a fairly pure expression of civic organisation. In many cases it started as a response to a specific event by involved individuals or as a response to a moral call. Oxfam grew out of an initiative by British citizens who objected the Allied blockade of Greece in the latter part of World War II. The massive and devastating famines in India in that same period shocked the European public into action. The 1968 Uppsala Assembly of the World Council of Churches with its call to put aside 1% of its total income for development aid did not raise millions immediately, but became the motor for nationally-organised church-related development organisations. Let us now look at the changes in our sector against the broader shifts in European reality.

★ DIVERSIFICATION IN CIVIL SOCIETY

The melting pot of people and cultures in Europe creates challenges for civic expressions in general, but especially also in our sector. Most likely, the biggest challenge in the coming decade will be to **keep aid and development on the radar for European populations**. After all, there are strong and emotional tendencies to retreat to the old 'homestead', even when that no longer exists. Populist politicians not only promote segregation, but also isolationism. In addition, migrant communities tend to be inward-looking for one or two generations. As a result, we see very few cross-cultural civic initiatives. Development and aid initiatives are mainly restricted to in-family assistance or village projects. Despite these changes, **traditional European aid and development organisations are very slow in adapting to a multi-cultural environment**.

★ FUNDRAISING AND INSTITUTIONAL FUNDING

One of the most far-reaching changes of the last decades is the modification in the funding of the sector: **from private donations to institutional funding and to rapidly growing**

corporate funding. This development raises many questions and in our opinion it is a **major source of problems.** Whereas these types of funding already existed throughout the Cold War, their current scale is unprecedented. This development raises ethical questions vis-à-vis the Red Cross Code of Conduct and leads to security issues for both local and international personnel. The Taliban have reason to doubt the sole humanitarian motives of many aid and development agencies operating in Afghanistan, as did the Vietnamese during the time they tried to uproot the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia. However, there is an even more fundamental issue here. In this globalised world, where economic and political power gets concentrated in ever fewer centres, there is a need for stronger checks and balances by true expressions of civic organisation!

★ DOMINANCE AND PARTNERSHIP

Ever since its earliest days, the European aid and development sector has struggled with its relationship with people and structures in the so-called South. With the exception of a few mainly Christian fundamentalist groupings, the ideology was commonly based on “equality”, “sovereignty”, “self-determination” and similar slogans that you will find in public documents and statements. However, if you look at the reality on the next level down, operational reports are full of concerns about lack of capacity, lack of professionalism, corruption, lack of transparency and so on. In reality, there was an enormous discrepancy between the political correctness of the slogans and the practice on the ground. Even in fairly closely-knit family groupings like ACT International, this **dilemma between** what some call **the humanitarian imperative** - the obligation to give aid if you have the means - **and the respect for indigenous capacity** has not been resolved. Numerous initiatives have been launched over decades, but at the end of the day European agencies have failed to resolve this dilemma.

This dilemma has grown rapidly worse in recent years with donor demands for accountability and accompanying political pressures. As the dependence on institutional donor funding is growing, this issue becomes all the more important. This is, in our opinion, the biggest dilemma that the civil society in aid and development has to cope with in the coming decade. Failing to deal with it and grasp the true meaning of solidarity, namely a struggle for common cause, will render civil society futile,

regardless of whether the high-level rhetoric tries to convince us to believe otherwise.

At the same time the challenge to Southern civil society is to liberate itself from both the bondage of outside funding and the alienating aspiration to belong to the dominant political class. Development is still a matter of building counter-power against exploitation and marginalisation – much more than a set of technical skills. Both North and South therefore have a mammoth task ahead of them in the coming decade.

★ SPACE FOR DEBATE

The newly arriving powerhouses on the global scene like China or Brazil will inevitably further develop their own civil society structures. And like our own, these will export value settings derived from their culture and history. In the human rights sector, the debate on universality has been raging for quite some time already, and the same debate is emerging in the aid and development sector. It is very **important that the European aid and development arena open up for a debate with their colleagues now emerging on the scene.** After all, their expressions of civil society might be very different from ours - which does not mean that they are less genuine or valuable.

A similar debate is needed closer to home, namely between European North, South, East and West. When the communist empire started to crumble in the eighties, some of us entered the East with a kind of missionary zeal. As the economic systems started to collapse, people quickly lost most of what they had, both in material terms as well as in terms of security for themselves and their children. American and Western European civil society offered quick-fix 5000 dollar projects and an endless stream of workshops in good governance, human rights, democracy, etc. We missed the point, I am afraid. We could have done far better by assisting in alleviating poverty, helping to cushion the free economic fall of sectors like the elderly or the sick. Therefore, in the renewed debate, it would befit us to be somewhat modest.

Jacques Willemse
Former Senior Adviser
ICCO- Kerk in Actie
www.icco.nl

THOUGHTS ABOUT THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF THE HUMANITARIAN SECTOR

THE ISSUE

THE HUMANITARIAN SECTOR: PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE CHALLENGES

‘The professionalization of humanitarian workers belonging to NGOs is a fundamental necessity to better answer to the growing complexity of needs and demands that humanitarian crises engender’

Throughout the last decade, the major increase in humanitarian action has gone hand in hand with a significant rise in the number of people professionally dedicated to this area. According to some studies (Stoddard and Harmer 2006)¹, at least **250,000 people in the world are humanitarian workers**. The majority of these come from affected countries, but a considerable amount also come from donor countries. However, the latter group’s abilities have not really been studied yet, which has led to a critical debate on their origin, motivations, level of influence, added value and, above all, professional capacities and training. The lack of experience of some expatriates is often criticized and it is not rare to hear comments such as “they can’t find jobs at home” or “they come to take the jobs of our qualified engineers” (Donini 2010).² The fact that young staff in their first field mission are sometimes given responsibilities in complex emergency situations such as Darfur feeds into this criticism.

Humanitarian action requires a high level of professionalism, given that it takes place in difficult environments, and that it could be regarded as having received some of the most advanced technical means and sophisticated technologies in the aid sector. Nevertheless, some humanitarian organisations’ vision in terms of human resources and staff needs remains very simplistic. And this is the context in which the Lisbon Treaty specifically mentions the creation of a **European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps** in order to “establish a framework for joint contributions from young Europeans to the humanitarian aid operations of the Union” (European Union Treaty, article 214.5). This plan is in the same line as proposals of politicians wishing to create new Corps of intervention in cases of emergency, such as the so-called “red helmets”, or the proposals to use armed forces by default in the fulfilment of humanitarian aid tasks. It seems as if there is no space left for a professionalization of humanitarian aid in between interventions by young volunteers on the one hand and militaries on the other.

The debate around the professionalization of the humanitarian sector has been on-going for a long time in European humanitarian bodies like ECHO or member states’ agencies, as well as in UN civil agencies. However, that debate has been very technical and has put too much emphasis on corporate issues, which resulted in a poor understanding of the process *outside* the humanitarian community. At the end of the Eighties, various **initiatives concerning Quality and Accountability** (Q&A) were created, such as the Sphere Project, Compas, ALNAP³ and the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership (HAP). Without any doubt, these contributed to the strengthening of issues of quality, including those related to the needs for training in human resources and professionalization. The establishment in some EU member states of postgraduate courses and training activities specialised in the humanitarian sector has also contributed to a further professionalization of the sector. In that respect, the existence of NOHA (Master in International Humanitarian Action with a European scope), which takes place in various European universities with the European Commission’s support, is a positive initiative on a cross-continental scale.

In this context, a paradox is arising between the will for further professionalization on behalf of some institutions, and the support for non-professional volunteering or militarisation on behalf of others. What are the challenges for the humanitarian NGOs in such a context?

Firstly, it is important to understand that what is at stake is not just any kind of professionalization. Investing in further professionalization of the non-governmental humanitarian sector has to be compatible with the sector’s compromise between both advocacy tasks and the principles and ethical values of the humanitarian enterprise. **The sector’s professionalism can’t be as ‘clinical’ as some propose**. Some comparisons, presenting humanitarian workers as mere “pizza deliverers” orientated towards totally technical tasks, should not be accepted by NGOs.

There are further aspects such as cultural sensitivity or understanding issues of gender and team work that should be part of the requirements necessary to be a humanitarian worker. There are already too many mercenaries in other sectors.

A second challenge has to do with **human resources training and professionalization in the North and South**. Humanitarian action has for a long time been a northern enterprise but this approach should end. Capacity building tasks with counterparts in disaster-affected countries should be a substantial part of humanitarian NGOs work. In this context, professionalization of humanitarian workers from the South is a key aspect.

Thirdly, there are some important HR aspects that NGOs should seriously consider, such as **motivation, promotion and retention of humanitarian professionals**. The humanitarian sector is maybe one of the sectors with the highest turnover of professionals. While this presents certain advantages in terms of using others' experiences and lessons learned, it can also be very inconvenient. The elaboration of career plans, which is not very usual in the sector, should be considered. In addition, the introduction of professional standards and transparent recruitment procedures should be more widespread.

Fourthly, NGOs should make the **professionalization** of their structures and staff **compatible with the promotion of volunteering**. Indeed, professionals and volunteers with different but complementary tasks have to work together towards common goals. In addition, it is vital for NGOs to nurture strong ties with the civil society from which they come, as that is the only way to maintain support for European humanitarian action.

Humanitarian professionals cannot continue to stand at the crossroads of exhibitionism and voyeurism, as suggested by some authors (Donini 2010). The professionalization of humanitarian workers belonging to NGOs is a fundamental necessity to better answer to the growing complexity of needs and demands that humanitarian crises engender.


Francisco Rey
Co-Director
Institute of Studies of Conflicts
and Humanitarian Action
www.iecah.org

1. Stoddard, A., Harmer, A. and Haver, A. (2006) *Providing Aid in Insecure Environments: Trends in Policy and Operations*' HPG Report 23. ODI, London.
2. Donini, A., (2010) 'The far side: the meta functions of humanitarianism in a globalised world', in: *Disasters*, 34: 220-237.
3. Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in humanitarian action.

THE EUROPEAN EXTERNAL ACTION SERVICE (EEAS): WHAT WILL THE IMPACT BE ON EU HUMANITARIAN ACTION?

A VIEW ON THE EU

'The risk of humanitarian aid policy being subordinated to foreign and security policy interests remains'

 The Lisbon Treaty has led to a number of significant reforms of EU institutional structures. Amongst other changes, the post of High Representative (HR) of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy has been created, merging the former positions of European Commissioner for External Relations and High Representative. This HR permanently chairs the ministerial meetings of the Foreign Affairs Council and also serves as one of the Vice-Presidents of the Commission. To support the High Representative's work, the European External Action Service (EEAS) will be set up. The EEAS is supposed to lay the foundation of a more coherent and coordinated EU Foreign and Security Policy and should raise the profile of the EU as a global player.

Both development and humanitarian NGOs have been **advocating strongly for keeping these two policy areas outside the remit of the future EEAS**, mainly on the grounds that both development and humanitarian aid have distinct objectives and serve different purposes from the Foreign and Security policy.

Under the most recent proposal of the current HR, Lady Ashton, the EEAS would have unprecedented control over the definition and programming of EU development policy. The prospects for development aid thus do not look very optimistic. Humanitarian aid policy on the other hand would remain outside the formal structure of the EEAS. However, even for humanitarian aid policy, the risk of being subordinated to foreign and security policy interests remains. After all, the EEAS would have geographic desks covering all countries and be responsible for crisis management. Its remit would thus include countries facing natural or man-made disasters where humanitarian aid is to be delivered, providing analyses and designing programming strategies for these countries.

In addition, the EEAS is to be set up in a context where the so-called "**Comprehensive Approach**" or "**All of government approach**" is becoming more prominent. The "Comprehensive Approach" doctrine appeals for the use of defence, development and humanitarian aid tools in a more integrated way to address complex crisis situations. It constitutes a key policy agenda for NATO and increasingly for the EU and its member states. For example, NATO Secretary-General Anders Fogh Rasmussen stated that the military no longer provides "the complete answer" for complex conflicts such as the one in Afghanistan. Instead, he

reasons, it needs the support of international organisations and NGOs to provide the "soft power" necessary to prevail in such crises.

This kind of **instrumentalisation of aid** poses a serious challenge to humanitarian aid. Humanitarian NGOs are deeply concerned about this increased "blurring of lines" between on the one hand political and military objectives and on the other hand humanitarian assistance. This process puts our work at high risk as the effectiveness of our action and the possibility to reach those suffering ultimately depends on our distinction from other actors and objectives, particularly the military. Can the EU resist the trend towards the comprehensive approach? Or would the EEAS be the EU's response to the implementation of a "Comprehensive Approach"? In our view, the EEAS should not adopt a model of *integration* of humanitarian assistance with other policy areas, but rather of *coordination*. Humanitarian action must not become by any means the "soft" component of any kind of "EU comprehensive response".

Another important issue, given the context, is to ensure **coordination between the EEAS, ECHO and the Humanitarian Aid Commissioner**. This coordination should take place while still respecting humanitarian principles, protecting humanitarian space and avoiding the blurring of political and military objectives with humanitarian assistance. Safeguards would need to be put in place at political, institutional and strategic levels through: a) effective dialogue and coordination mechanisms between the High Representative, the EEAS and the relevant Commissioners and Commission services; b) clear lines of management, reporting and accountability, or c) enhancing staff expertise in both humanitarian and development policy and practice at all levels of the EEAS.

There is still a great deal of speculation about the final definition and set up of this EEAS, but political trends and reality in the field cannot be ignored. When presenting her proposal for the EEAS, High Representative Lady Ashton stated that this was the chance to have a new diplomacy. We sincerely hope that this diplomacy will not be carried out at the expense of those in need of the EU's humanitarian response.


Ester Asin Martinez
EU Representative
CARE International

www.care-international.org

THE AFGHAN HUMANITARIAN CRISIS AND THE INSTRUMENTALISATION OF AID

FIELD FOCUS

'The involvement of the military in the provision of relief or development activities (...) has blurred the line between military and humanitarian actors'

 Mercy Corps, together with several other NGOs and ENNA¹, recently contributed to a joint briefing entitled, "Humanitarian needs still low priority in Afghanistan". This paper aims to raise awareness regarding the continuing lack of political consideration and donor support for urgent humanitarian needs in Afghanistan, and includes several NGO recommendations to the European Commission and EU Member States.

More than a third (36%) of the Afghan population is **unable to meet its basic needs**² and the majority have no access to clean drinking water and sanitation. There is a severe health crisis³, and 54% of children under five suffer from malnutrition. The needs of returnees⁴ and internally displaced people and the challenges they face also continue to attract limited attention. Despite the reinstatement of UNOCHA in Kabul last year, Afghanistan's humanitarian crisis still lacks independent and

reliable humanitarian information and analysis as well as sufficient funding. Moreover, while the humanitarian caseload is growing as a result of natural disasters, escalating conflict and internal displacement, access to vulnerable communities is decreasing. Access is reduced because of the conflict⁵, but also due to the blurring of the lines between military and humanitarian actors.

The **instrumentalisation of aid** that has taken place in Afghanistan raises significant concerns for many NGOs. Mercy Corps and other NGOs working in Afghanistan have repeatedly stressed that the involvement of the military in the provision of relief or development activities in an attempt to win people's hearts and minds for tactical, counter-insurgency or other military objectives has blurred the line between military and humanitarian actors. **Access to local communities** in situations of conflict is fragile. Associations, real or perceived, between humanitarian actors and the military increase the level of insecurity for NGO staff. It jeopardizes their ability to negotiate humanitarian access contingent upon principles of the humanitarian imperative, independence and impartiality. In a recent study, Antonio Donini reported that NGO workers were rarely targeted in Afghanistan until 2002, but since then it is no longer taboo to do so⁶. Moreover, humanitarian agencies have suffered an increased number of security incidents last year, including abduction, looting and one assassination.⁷ This high level of insecurity considerably hinders NGOs' capacity to access the population in need.

Furthermore, military involvement in humanitarian or development assistance may also seriously **endanger beneficiaries**, as they may be perceived as party to the conflict as a result. Some Afghan communities have reported that if they receive assistance from the International Security Assistance Force, they may become targets of the Taliban. For instance, according to a representative from the Ministry of Education in Logar participating in a field assessment, Provincial Reconstruction Teams funded schools and girls' schools are the most vulnerable in terms of attacks⁸.

Finally, different studies have shown that 'hearts and minds' military activities are **not cost-effective and usually unsustainable**. Besides, there is little evidence that they achieve their tactical or strategic objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EU

- The EU should play a key role in advocating among its member states and other troop-contributing countries that their military forces should not use relief or development activities to serve military and political objectives. Aid delivery should be principled and based on needs. Instead, **military resources should be focused on activities where the military has a comparative advantage**, such as physical security and support to the security sector. 'Hearts and minds' military activities contravene the humanitarian principles, the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, Afghanistan's National Civil Military Guidelines and the Provincial Reconstruction Team Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Policy Note No 3.
- The EU should strongly advocate to its member states and other troop-contributing countries that military forces and their contractors should refrain from relief activities when there are civilian actors capable of delivering assistance. The provision of basic services by military and associated private contractors where civilian NGOs or government actors are operating - such as health facilities and projects in the east of Afghanistan - have compromised the security of vital humanitarian programmes. These activities contravene the MCDA Guidelines and the other documents mentioned above, as those all require the military to **engage in relief only as a last resort**.

1. The European Network of NGOs in Afghanistan.
2. Icon-Institute (2007/08) "National Risk and Vulnerability Assessment: A profile of Afghanistan".
3. As illustrated by a maternal mortality rate of 1600/100 000 births, and an infant mortality rate of 129/1000 live births – Source: 2009 HAP Mid Year Review (accessed 9th of April 2010 at <http://ochaonline.un.org>).
4. From Pakistan and Iran.
5. Much of the South, South East and parts of the East are largely inaccessible for aid agencies, and insecurity has spread to previously stable areas in the North, North East, Central and Western provinces.
6. Donini (2009), 'NGO Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination', an independent evaluation for the Humanitarian Reform Consortium, ActionAid, p.28.
7. OCHA Monthly Humanitarian Update, issue 12, Nov/Dec 2009. (Accessed 4th of April 2010 at <http://www.reliefweb.int>).
8. Knowledge on Fire: Attacks on Education in Afghanistan - Risks and Measures for Successful Mitigation (September 2009).

VOICE GENERAL POLICY RESOLUTION 2010¹

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE EUROPEAN UNION

The VOICE network,

WELCOMING the coming into force of the Lisbon Treaty in December 2009, as well as the legal basis it provides to EU humanitarian aid, and the reminder it gives that EU humanitarian aid is committed to the principles of impartiality, neutrality and non-discrimination;

WELCOMING the update in December 2009 of the EU Guidelines on promoting compliance with International Humanitarian Law (IHL) which aim to address compliance with IHL by third States, and, as appropriate, non-state actors operating in third States;

PREOCCUPIED by the increasingly complex nature of crises, the decline of humanitarian access and the shrinking of humanitarian space due to insecurity and/or to host government restrictions;

CONCERNED about the lack of respect for International Humanitarian Law and core humanitarian principles in many recent conflicts, not only on the part of warring parties, but also on the part of governments and their militaries;

NOTING that the strengthening of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy provided by the Lisbon Treaty can present a challenge for the independence of EU humanitarian aid;

DRAWING ATTENTION to the increased need to ensure independence of EU humanitarian aid in the framework of the European Common Foreign and Security Policy, in order to avoid instrumentalisation of humanitarian aid for political and security purposes;

OBSERVING that the visibility of the EU in crisis response is an important preoccupation of the EU decision-makers, especially after the Haiti quake; but stressing that this should not undermine effectiveness and efficiency of European humanitarian aid delivery;

ACKNOWLEDGING that EU humanitarian aid will not be part of the European External Action Service;

UNDERLINING that the response to the Haiti earthquake moreover proved that effective overarching leadership and coordination in the field and among donors are crucial to deliver efficient aid to crises affected populations;

EMPHASISING, in light of the inclusion of civil protection under the mandate of DG ECHO and the newly created portfolio of Commissioner for International Cooperation, Humanitarian Aid and Crisis Response, that there is a need to clarify roles and to strengthen complementarity among the External Relations actors of the European Union;

TAKING INTO ACCOUNT the creation of a European Voluntary Humanitarian Corps as provided for in the Lisbon Treaty;

CALLS UPON THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION (Council, European Parliament and European Commission) AND ITS 27 MEMBER STATES

1. To reconfirm, when reviewing the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid Action Plan, the commitments made to the principles of the Humanitarian Consensus, such as the respect of humanitarian principles, the diversity of civilian humanitarian actors, and the principled and needs-based delivery of aid. The EU institutions and Member States should focus on the practical implementation of these political pledges.
2. To provide that the implementation of civil protection as an integral part of ECHO's mandate complies with the European Consensus on Humanitarian Aid:
 - The use of civil protection assets must respect the principles governing the delivery of humanitarian aid. The crucial concept of "last resort" should be kept, and, the principle that deployment only takes place when requested by the host government should be maintained;
 - European civil protection has a clear mandate and role, concentrating on filling specific gaps in the provision of assistance, such as search and rescue in natural disasters, particularly in the first phase of the emergency;
 - When deployed in humanitarian crises, the use of civil protection assets has to be based on needs jointly identified in the field, and this in line with the principles contained in the Humanitarian Consensus;
 - Budget lines for humanitarian aid and civil protection need to be clearly distinguished.
3. To ensure that the objectives of the European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps (EVHAC), that is provided to be created under the Lisbon Treaty, are based on European values such as solidarity with crisis affected populations and awareness-raising, rather than serving EU visibility purposes:
 - Professional humanitarian aid organisations active in responding to crisis should be consulted in the process of defining and setting up an EVHAC;
 - The EVHAC should answer documented and identified human resources needs expressed by humanitarian actors, rather than being a political, supply-driven instrument;
 - It should not compromise the current trend towards a greater professionalism in the humanitarian sector;
 - Furthermore, the EVHAC concept should respect the current trend of increased capacity building and engagement of local volunteers and partners;
 - Finally, the creation of an EVHAC should be complemented with additional funding.

1. This Policy Resolution was approved by the VOICE General Assembly on March 16, 2010. It focuses on the key humanitarian challenges that the network wishes to bring to the attention of the EU institutions and member states.

HUMANITARIAN ISSUES AT EU LEVEL

VOICE AT WORK

- ★ **Briefing the new European Parliament (EP) on the Action Plan of the Consensus on Humanitarian Aid** - On the initiative of VOICE, the Development Committee of the EP organised a briefing on the mid-term review of the Humanitarian Consensus Action Plan. The main humanitarian stakeholders were invited, including UNOCHA and the Red Cross. VOICE seized this opportunity to call for more involvement from member states in implementing the Action Plan. Other points raised included the respect for humanitarian principles in the context of increasing demand for EU visibility; the key role of accountability in between donors, NGOs and the beneficiaries; and the need for an increased dialogue between humanitarian and military actors on their differing mandates and roles.
- ★ **EC Communication on Humanitarian Food Assistance** - VOICE was asked by DG ECHO to provide feedback on the EU Food Assistance Policy, leading to the EC Communication on Humanitarian Food Assistance in March 2010. The Communication was warmly welcomed by VOICE members as it largely reflects their input. It reasserts the importance of 1) the humanitarian principles, 2) a needs-based approach and 3) Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) thinking in the provision of food assistance to vulnerable people. The Communication reflects the priorities of the EU in terms of food assistance and it is likely to be used by ECHO in the renegotiation of the Food Aid Convention.
- ★ **Influencing the creation of the European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps (EVHAC)** - First introduced in the 2005 draft Constitution, the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009 leaves the European Parliament and the Council with the obligation to establish a framework for joint contributions from young Europeans to the humanitarian aid operations of the EU. Since 2005, VOICE has been engaged and consulted on this issue and the EVHAC is one of the priorities of the network for 2010. Given the relevance of such a corps for the humanitarian sector, it is vital that all relevant humanitarian actors are consulted in the preparatory process. VOICE recommends the following framework: that the EVHAC 1) answers identified needs and does not merely serve visibility purposes; 2) is deployed on a case-by-case basis (taking into account security risks); 3) does not contradict the increasing professionalization of the sector, detract from the focus on local capacity building or compromise existing volunteering programmes and 4) is accountable to DG ECHO without decreasing the budget for humanitarian aid.
- ★ **Working with the Spanish presidency** - Through its members, VOICE has access to hands-on information on countries where humanitarian aid is delivered. VOICE has taken the initiative of providing input on Burmese Rohingya refugees, Haiti and Afghanistan to the Spanish presidency for the meetings of the Council Working Party on Humanitarian Aid and Food Aid (COHAFA). The network also provided information during informal NGO briefings of the Political and Security Committee, raising NGO concerns on various countries. Towards the end of the Spanish Presidency, VOICE organised a roundtable in Madrid to provide Spanish humanitarian NGOs with an opportunity to discuss recent developments in EU humanitarian policies with other European NGOs and policy makers.
- ★ **VOICE events: Linking operational reality to humanitarian policy debates** - In December, VOICE set up an event on *"Aid Worker's Security: An increasing challenge"*, to trigger a dialogue between NGOs and EU policy makers on this vital issue. In March, a roundtable on *"Humanitarian NGOs in a changing world: How do we adapt?"* gave humanitarian actors the opportunity to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the humanitarian system. These events aimed at informing and promoting exchange between VOICE members and other humanitarian actors such as the Humanitarian Policy Group, ALNAP and the Humanitarian Futures Programme.
- ★ **VOICE Working Groups (WG)** - The WGs are the main forum for VOICE members to develop collective advocacy messages and share good practices while building internal capacity. In 2009, an Ad Hoc WG on UN-led humanitarian reform was created, which aims to look at the linkages between the UN Reform and the EU Consensus on Humanitarian Aid. The WG on civil-military relations has initiated a dialogue with military actors at EU and member state level raising awareness of humanitarian concerns, for example on the integrated approach. The Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) WG has published recommendations on the interlinkages between DRR and Climate Change Adaptation, widely advocated for in the relevant EC services. The FPA (Framework Partnership Agreement) Watch Group was asked to provide feedback on the guidelines relevant for the application of the FPA in the field, which has duly been taken into account by ECHO.

THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE WORDS

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS THEMATIC ISSUE WERE



Wolf-Dieter Eberwein is the President of VOICE. He was a Political Science Professor at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques in Grenoble, where he headed the Masters programme on International Organisations. Since 1971, he has held positions at various German Universities. Other professional activities include consultancies and evaluations for the Red Cross, as well as the provision of expertise to the Coordination Committee for Humanitarian Aid of the German government. Mr. Eberwein holds a PhD in political science from the University of Bielefeld. He retired in 2009.



Michel Brugière started his medical career as a doctor in the countryside of Auvergne (France). Ten years later, he re-oriented his work towards humanitarian medicine, and started working for Médecins du Monde (Mdm) in 1985. After various periods in Africa, he specialised in epidemiology and public health. At that stage, Mdm was in full growth and Mr. Brugière was asked to become the Director General of Mdm. He retired in 2010.



Paul Grossrieder has been the General Director of the ICRC from 1998-2002 and he is the former VOICE President. He started his career as a lecturer in philosophy and religion, after which he worked for the Vatican for eight years. In 1984, Mr. Grossrieder started working for the ICRC. He spent years working for the ICRC in Iraq, Angola, South Africa and Israel, after which he held various positions in the Geneva headquarters. Mr. Grossrieder holds a PhD in international relations from the Graduate Institute of International and Development Institutions (Geneva). He is Swiss and retired in 2002.



Jacques Willemse has over 20 years of development/humanitarian experience from Dutch Interchurch Aid. His last position was Senior Advisor on Emergencies and Migration Policies in ICCO-Kerk in Actie. He has been the Special Representative for Sudan for the World Council of Churches, and a Board Member of international organisations such as the Dutch Refugee Council and the International Exchange Fund. Moreover, he was the Chair of the Emergency Relief Desk, one of the biggest humanitarian assistance operations in recent history, and was one of the initiators of National Fundraising Coalition for Humanitarian Aid and ACT International. He retired in 2009.



Francisco Rey Marcos is Co-director of the Institute of Studies of Conflicts and Humanitarian Action (IECAH) based in Madrid. After many years of experience in the Red Cross Movement and with NGOs, he is now engaged with research, consultancy and training activities in the humanitarian sector. Mr. Rey is the author of the Spanish Strategy of Humanitarian Action.



This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Commission through its Humanitarian Aid department.

The views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Community.

VOICE out loud

Newsletter published by VOICE asbl

Editor: Kathrin Schick

Co-Editor: Inge Brees

VOICE wishes to thank the contributors of this Issue. Views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of the VOICE network.

Voluntary Organisations in Cooperation in Emergencies (VOICE)

43, Avenue Louise, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium

Tel: +32 (0)2 - 541.13.60 • Fax: +32 (0)2 - 534.99.53

E-mail: voice@ngovoice.org • Website: www.ngovoice.org

