



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited  
12 June 2025

Original: English

---

## Committee for Programme and Coordination

Sixty-fifth session

New York, 12 May–13 June 2025

### Draft report

*Rapporteur:* Mr. Rodrigue Edgar Tchoffo Mongou (Cameroon)

### Addendum

## Programme questions: proposed programme budget for 2026

(Item 3 (a))

### Programme 23

#### Humanitarian assistance

1. At its 15th meeting, on 21 May 2025, the Committee considered programme 23, Humanitarian assistance, of the proposed programme plan for 2026 and programme performance in 2024 ([A/80/6 \(Sect. 27\)](#)).

#### Discussion

2. Delegations expressed appreciation and support for the work of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. Delegations also acknowledged the important role of both Offices in supporting principled and effective humanitarian coordination, and commended humanitarian personnel and leadership for delivering assistance under difficult conditions.

3. Concerns were raised regarding the growing burden on the humanitarian system. It was observed that increasing need, operational constraints and a widening gap between requirements and available resources had placed pressure on the ability of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to deliver. Clarification was sought on how Member States and stakeholders could better support the work of the Office.

4. A delegation commended the Office's coordination role in supporting 123 million forcibly displaced persons, noted that the humanitarian funding model no longer met current challenges, and called for investment in long-term, locally led, self-reliant responses. Clarification on how the Office had reduced redundancy with other United Nations entities was sought, and the delegation indicated that a



comprehensive review of its participation in international organizations, conventions and treaties was under way, and urged broader burden-sharing among donors. The need for durable solutions, locally led responses and innovation to address protracted crises was emphasized, and the importance of upholding the Office's core mandate was reiterated.

5. While matters relating to parts of the programme dealing with resources were not within the mandate of the Committee, the drive for efficiencies, collaboration, focus and elimination of overlaps was noted and supported. A delegation emphasized that future humanitarian action ought to be local, with resources channelled to local organizations and beneficiaries included in aid decisions. Another delegation supported efforts to improve operational efficiency, reduce duplication and strengthen response strategies that were results oriented and cost-effective.

6. A delegation welcomed the Office's efforts to mobilize financing for host communities and populations affected by emergencies, highlighted the importance of predictable, timely funding and expressed support for coordination with other humanitarian actors, including the International Committee of the Red Cross.

7. A delegation referenced its Government's coordination with the Office in implementing national reconstruction plans and welcomed the support provided by humanitarian teams. While the need for continued partnership was emphasized, concern was expressed over the Office's decision to reduce its in-country presence, without consulting government authorities or field offices, which could negatively affect refugees and displaced populations.

8. A number of delegations expressed support for anticipatory action and innovative financing. A delegation welcomed the flexibility of the Central Emergency Response Fund and encouraged continued development of results-based management systems, broadening the donor base and engaging with international financial institutions.

9. A delegation raised concerns about data quality in humanitarian reporting, requested clarification on how the Office ensured impartiality and accuracy when information originated from local sources affiliated with non-State actors, and asked whether slowing the reporting cycle might improve credibility.

10. With regard to ongoing unilateral coercive measures, clarification was sought on whether the Office had completed guidelines to exempt humanitarian assistance from economic sanctions, and the urgency of resolving that issue was emphasized.

11. A delegation reflected on past support received from the Office during natural disasters and reaffirmed the importance of uninterrupted humanitarian assistance, particularly in protracted crisis situations. The delegation expressed the hope that current programme mandates would remain unaffected by ongoing reform processes.

12. Several delegations welcomed the emphasis on gender inclusion, the promotion of women's leadership in decision-making and strengthened gender cooperation across activities and results. A delegation expressed concern about the emphasis on gender analysis, women's participation in decision-making, and the fight against sexual violence, instead of on urgent operational needs and the core functions of United Nations humanitarian entities.

13. A question was raised regarding the Office's internal efforts to combat racism, with a request for concrete examples of measures taken, lessons learned and good practices to inform future efforts.

14. A delegation questioned the selective reference to the Global Humanitarian Policy Forum held in December 2024 and expressed concern that other key

humanitarian events had been treated as less important in shaping collective approaches. The delegation referred specifically to the humanitarian debates of the General Assembly and during the humanitarian segment of the Economic and Social Council, and pointed to an imbalance in the assessment of the causes of rising humanitarian needs. It was noted that while armed conflicts played a role in that rise, extreme weather events, natural disasters and economic shocks also contributed. The delegation also questioned the use of the ReliefWeb platform as a source of “reliable” information and recalled that ReliefWeb served only as an aggregator and did not always reflect official United Nations or Member State positions.

15. With regard to paragraph 27.I.3, a delegation welcomed references to anticipatory and innovative financing mechanisms and strengthened partnerships with international financial institutions, and voiced strong support for the language on access, the safety of humanitarian personnel and respect for international humanitarian law. With regard to paragraph 27.I.6 (c), the delegation noted that external factors remained similar to past years and sought clarification on the implications of developments since the start of the year.

16. With regard to subprogramme 1, Policy and analysis, and table 27.I.2, it was suggested that additional details – attendance figures, geographical diversity and the participation of local and national actors – could enable comparison over time, and the same approach could be applied to result 3 on improved collective learning through the integration of local perspectives.

17. With regard to table 27.I.4, clarification was sought on whether related performance measures were linked to the flagship initiative, and whether the initiative and its associated targets remained relevant.

18. A delegation noted that, while the role of local actors was mentioned in tables 27.I.4 and 27.I.5, it was not reflected in table 27.I.6. It was observed that most data focused on meetings and documentation rather than field activity. Greater focus on field operations directly benefiting local actors, and the prioritization of tangible projects over training, were encouraged. The delegation also called for host country views and guidelines to be gathered in advance.

19. With regard to subprogramme 2, Coordination of humanitarian action and emergency response, efforts to simplify and shorten the humanitarian assistance cycle in emergencies, as reflected in table 27.I.7, were welcomed. The absence of indicators specifically addressing internally displaced persons was noted by a delegation which opined that clear, measurable indicators dedicated to their care should be included in accordance with General Assembly resolution [78/185](#).

20. With regard to subprogramme 3, Emergency support services, the Office’s assistance in conflict zones and major disasters in a challenging global context was recognized. The delegation noted that, in paragraph 27.I.31, it was highlighted that 2024 had been the most dangerous year on record for humanitarian personnel.

21. A delegation emphasized the role of host countries in providing humanitarian assistance to victims of emergencies and natural disasters, and proposed amendments to the text of paragraphs 27.I.42 and 27.I.43.

22. Another delegation referred to paragraph 27.I.46 and sought clarification on the concept of interlocutors influencing humanitarian access through diplomacy. The delegation enquired whether the planned decrease in the number of trained emergency personnel, noted in figure 27.I.VII, reflected cost-cutting efforts or shifts in programme priorities.

23. With regard to the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, a delegation referred to paragraph 27.II.4 (a) and highlighted the value of the Office’s

work on risk knowledge and management, and the importance of supporting and localizing risk information and establishing open data platforms. The delegation emphasized that if humanitarian action was to be local, risk data should also be locally managed and understood.

24. A delegation commended the Office for its role in building disaster risk reduction platforms and promoting international cooperation. The delegation affirmed its commitment to global disaster risk reduction and noted its active implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030. It expressed its intention to deepen cooperation with the Office in the context of the Global Development Initiative: building on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development for stronger, greener and healthier global development and the 2030 Agenda.

25. Another delegation sought clarification on how the Office ensured that disaster risk reduction efforts remained focused on practical, cost-effective solutions and avoided being used as a platform for advancing political agendas that could detract from its core mandate.

#### **Conclusions and recommendations**

**26. The Committee recommended that the plenary or the relevant Main Committee or Main Committees of the General Assembly, in line with Assembly resolution [79/247](#), consider the programme plan for programme 23, Humanitarian assistance, of the proposed programme budget for 2026 under the agenda item entitled “Programme planning” at the eightieth session of the Assembly.**

---