



Australian Government
AusAID

Quality at Entry Report and Next Steps to Complete Design for Humanitarian Partnership Agreements (HPA)

A: AidWorks details *completed by Activity Manager*

Initiative Name:	Humanitarian Partnership Agreements 2011-2014		
AidWorks ID:	INJ593	Total Amount:	\$9 million
Start Date:	1 March 2011	End Date:	1 March 2014

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details *completed by Activity Manager*

Initial ratings prepared by:	Leisa Gibson
Meeting date:	13 July 2010
Chair:	Jamie Isbister, ADG AHB
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sarah Willis, Manager HPS - Sid Chakrabati, Manager NGOs
Other peer review participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Therese Postma, Gender Adviser - Sally Cobb, DIDT

C: Safeguards and Commitments *(new!) completed by Activity Manager*

Answer the following questions relevant to potential impacts of the activity.

1. Environment	Have the environmental marker questions been answered and adequately addressed by the design document in line with legal requirements under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act?	<i>No (to be actioned)</i>
2. Child Protection	Does the design meet the requirements of AusAID's Child Protection Policy?	<i>No (to be actioned)</i>

D: Initiative/Activity description *completed by Activity Manager (no more than 300 words per cell)*

3. Description	<p>Following the PFA Review of late 2009, HER has worked in consultation with AusAID stakeholders and ACFID Humanitarian Reference Group member NGOs to develop the AusAID-NGO Humanitarian Partnership Agreements (HPA). This design will replace the Periodic Funding Agreement for Disaster Risk Management (PFA) as the formal mechanism for engagement between AusAID and selected fully accredited Australian NGOs in rapid-onset humanitarian emergency responses. It will also provide three-year funding of \$0.5 million per annum for each HPA NGO for programmed Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Risk Management capacity building initiatives.</p>
-----------------------	--

3. Description	<p>Following the PFA Review of late 2009, HER has worked in consultation with AusAID stakeholders and ACFID Humanitarian Reference Group member NGOs to develop the AusAID-NGO Humanitarian Partnership Agreements (HPA). This design will replace the Periodic Funding Agreement for Disaster Risk Management (PFA) as the formal mechanism for engagement between AusAID and selected fully accredited Australian NGOs in rapid-onset humanitarian emergency responses. It will also provide three-year funding of \$0.5 million per annum for each HPA NGO for programmed Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Risk Management capacity building initiatives.</p>
4. Objectives Summary	<p>The goal of the HPA is:</p> <p>To ensure Australian humanitarian assistance is timely, predictable and flexible and contributes to safer, more resilient communities.</p> <p>The purpose of the HPA is:</p> <p>To strengthen the strategic humanitarian partnership between AusAID and Australian Non-Government Organisations to respond effectively to disasters and to strengthen community resilience and preparedness.</p> <p>The anticipated outcomes of the HPA are</p> <p>Quick-turn around of emergency response funding – the target being 24-48 hours from the call to HPA ANGOs for proposals to advice of funding decision. Better decision making and more flexible, targeted, coordinated and accountable emergency responses. Reduced community vulnerability and enhanced resilience to disasters. Strengthened DRM capacities and systems of HPA ANGOs and their in-country NGO partners.</p>

E: Quality Assessment and Rating (no more than 300 words per cell)

completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

Criteria	Assessment	Rating (1-6) *	Required Action (if needed)
5. Relevance	<p>The relevance of the HPA to improved humanitarian response and DRR was rated as good as it reflects GoA's strengthened commitment to partnerships in this area. It reflects priorities in the DRAFT AusAID Humanitarian Action Policy (HAP), including rapid, predictable and flexible response funding; support for humanitarian preparedness and strengthened humanitarian-development program linkages; and a strong focus on accountability and visibility. However, the Framework should better articulate the 'goal' of the HPA to ensure that it clearly reflects GoA's commitment and the strategic relevance of HPA. The Framework should require inclusiveness of gender, disability, and child protection considerations and a participatory approach in all aspects of HPA. It should require consistency with 'Good Humanitarian Donorship' and 'Development for All' guiding principles, and reference the ACFID Disability and Development Working Group as a compliance resource. The Framework should reference commitment to, and, if possible attach Draft HAP principles (without reference to HAP given its draft status).</p>	5	<p><i>Recommended action</i></p> <p>Amend Framework to:</p> <p>(i) ensure that the goal clearly demonstrates the strategic relevance of the HPA;</p> <p>(ii) require participatory approach and gender, disability and child protection inclusiveness;</p> <p>(iii) reference (and consider attaching) Draft HAP principles;</p> <p>(iv) reference GHD and DfA principles; and</p> <p>(iv) reference ACFID Disability and Development Working Group as a compliance resource.</p>

E: Quality Assessment and Rating (no more than 300 words per cell)

completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

6. Analysis and Learning	Analysis and learning were rated as adequate. Development of the Framework has been strongly informed by the independent PFA review and subsequent consultations with NGOs, and the recognition that a change in approach was needed. However, the benefits of partnership and reasons for selecting this model of the three options proposed by the 2009 review should be more explicit in the Framework. The Framework should better explain the processes and mechanism by which the HPA will be institutionalised over the life of the program. Multi-year block grant funding for emergency response as recommended by the 2009 review is a long-term goal beyond the scope of the initial three-year phase and reference to it should therefore be removed from the Framework.	4	<u>Required action to achieve fully satisfactory rating (5)</u> Amend Framework to: (i) better explain partnership benefits, choice of this model, and process for institutionalisation of HPA; and (ii) delete reference to multi-year block grant funding.
7. Effectiveness	Effectiveness was rated as good. The shared objectives of the partnership are wide-ranging, strong, and based on collaborative action. However, the Framework should explain how HPA is intended to integrate with the international humanitarian response mechanism, i.e. how it will coordinate with INGOs and UN agencies to ensure appropriate, integrated and effective Australian responses. Shared objectives should be rationalised to remove overlap and to prioritise and re-balance respective commitments of AusAID and NGOs, including an appropriate balance of 'process' and 'outcome' commitments. Key commitments should be selected as achievement milestones.	5	<u>Recommended action</u> Amend Framework to: (i) explain integration of HPA within international response mechanisms; (ii) rationalise shared objectives and partner commitments; and (ii) identify selected partnership commitment milestones.
8. Efficiency	Efficiency was rated as adequate. Proposed engagement with NGOs under HPA is well-described. However, the Framework should better articulate the links between the emergency response funding, DRR and capacity building components of HPA. Differentiation between HPA emergency response funding procedures and non-HPA ad hoc humanitarian funding opportunities and procedures is not sufficiently clear.	4	<u>Required action to achieve fully satisfactory rating (5)</u> Amend Framework to better articulate: (i) links between HPA components; and (ii) differentiation between HPA and non-HPA emergency response funding opportunities and procedures.
9. Monitoring and Evaluation	Proposed Monitoring and Evaluation arrangements at the activity and partnership levels were rated as adequate. Utilisation at the individual activity level of NGOs' existing M&E and reporting systems (where rated in the HPA selection process as fit-for-purpose) was endorsed. However, the Framework should acknowledge that HPA M&E arrangements will need to reviewed once planned new agency performance measurement guidelines and a possible new humanitarian M&E framework are in place. It should require M&E data collection to be gender, age and disability-disaggregated and include both qualitative and quantitative data collection and indicators.	4	<u>Required action to achieve fully satisfactory rating (5)</u> Amend Framework to: (i) acknowledge that HPA M&E to be reviewed in context of any new AusAID performance management and humanitarian M&E arrangements; and (ii) specify data disaggregation and indicator requirements.

E: Quality Assessment and Rating (no more than 300 words per cell)

completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

10. Sustainability	HPA sustainability was rated as good in terms of the partnership providing a strong and ongoing framework for improved humanitarian response. However, the Framework should provide more justification as to how the partnership will be beneficial, and how it fits within the context of Australia's broader humanitarian response approach and mechanisms.	5	<u>Recommended action</u> Amend Framework to more clearly identify: (i) the benefits of an ongoing AusAID/NGO humanitarian partnership; and (ii) its place in the broader humanitarian response context.
11. Gender Equality	The approach to gender equality was rated as adequate. However, gender should be upgraded from a cross-cutting issue to a critical strategic issue across the board, to be reflected as follows: (i) selection process to require NGOs to demonstrate (with strong examples) gender analysis capacity in emergency response, DRR and capacity building; (ii) NGOs to include gender action plans in Emergency Response Implementation Plans and DRR/capacity building design/implementation docs; (iii) DRR/capacity building activities should include support for development of counterpart gender-sensitive recruitment practices and staff gender analysis skills; and (iv) gender approach to comply with ACFID gender guidelines and international best practice.	4	Include gender analysis in HPA selection criteria - ref recommendation (i) adjacent. Amend Framework to incorporate agreed programmatic recommendations (ii) to (iv). Incorporate agreed programmatic recommendations (ii) to (iv) in HPA Head Agreements.

*** Definitions of the Rating Scale:**

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6)		Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3)	
6	Very high quality; needs ongoing management & monitoring only	3	Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
5	Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas	2	Poor quality; needs major work to improve
4	Adequate quality; needs some work to improve	1	Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

E: Next Steps completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

Provide information on all steps required to finalise the design based on <i>Required Actions</i> in "C" above, and additional actions identified in the peer review meeting	Who is responsible	Date to be done
1. Changes made to HPA design as indicated above	Mark Wedd/Leisa Gibson	21 August 2010
2. The HPA request for capacity statement will be issued in October. HPA partners will be selected by mid-December and the resulting contract negotiations will be finalised in mid-February	As above and PAS	15 October 2010

F: Other comments or issues completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the APR meeting

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A •
--

F: Approval *completed by ADG or Minister-Counsellor who chaired the peer review meeting*

On the basis of the final agreed Quality Rating assessment (C) and Next Steps (D) above:

- QAE REPORT IS APPROVED**, and authorization given to proceed to:
- FINALISE** the design incorporating actions above, and proceed to implementation
 - or: **REDESIGN** and resubmit for appraisal peer review

NOT APPROVED for the following reason(s):

signed: _____

6/6/10

When complete:

- Copy and paste the approved ratings, narrative assessment and required actions (if any) (table D) into AidWorks
- The original signed report must be placed on a registered file

