MFAT-DFAT HUMANITARIAN MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR THE PACIFIC

DECEMBER 2018

Australian Government
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

NEW ZEALAND
FOREIGN AFFAIRS & TRADE

Cover photo: At Nasinu District School teachers and children sit outside after TC Winston while completing activity plans. Photo credit: Australia's Access to Quality Education Program (AQEP).

Introduction

This Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (MEF) was developed jointly by New Zealand (MFAT) and Australia (DFAT) as part of ongoing donor efforts to improve responses to rapid onset disasters in the Pacific. The purpose of the MEF is to:

- Support DFAT and MFAT decision-making during responses
- Improve the evidence base on the impact of humanitarian response efforts
- Improve the effectiveness of future responses through identification of lessons
- Support better communication of the difference made for affected populations.

The MEF reflects and aligns the humanitarian policies and strategies of New Zealand and Australia through six Strategic Result Statements (SRS) (Table 1). It is designed to link preparedness, response and recovery efforts.

The MEF is scalable and intended to be applied in a manner proportionate to the nature and extent of each response. While MFAT and DFAT will systematically draw on all components of this framework, other humanitarian partners may find that only certain aspects are relevant to their efforts.

1. Strategic Result Statements (SRS)

In addition to reflecting the humanitarian strategies and policies of both countries and the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, the SRS outlined below incorporate World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) and Grand Bargain commitments, and reflect the Sphere Humanitarian Charter, protection principles and quality criteria from the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS).

Strategic Result Statements (SRS)	Reflects…	Links to…
1. Our humanitarian response is appropriate and relevant	Essential OECD-DAC criteria reflects CHS	Checking assumptions and re-planning in real time
2. Our humanitarian response is timely and effective		Routine outputs monitoring/review
3. Our humanitarian response is efficient and well managed		Systems review, value-for-money private sector engagement, innovation
4. Our humanitarian response engages and is accountable to affected communities and vulnerable people	Three levels of engagement reflecting CHS quality criteria and key WHS commitments	Engagement with affected populations (including accountability)
5. Our humanitarian response reinforces national and local leadership and capacity as much as possible and engages international actors where necessary		Engagement with affected government and localisation of humanitarian responses
6. Our humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary		Engagement with other humanitarian actors

SRS 1, 2 and 3 are consistent with OECD-DAC criteria, as well as MFAT and DFAT practice. Cross cutting issues including gender equality and disability are woven into several SRS but most critically 1 and 2. Connectedness, an OECD-DAC criterion, is woven into SRS 1 and 2. SRS 3 expands the standard OECD-DAC treatment of efficiency to include consideration of the management of the response, and operational effectiveness and efficiency.

SRS 4, 5 and 6 relate to the responsibility to engage with and account to affected communities, national governments and other humanitarian actors. SRS 4 combines CHS quality criteria 4 and 5 and includes a focus on engaging the most vulnerable and marginalised. SRS 5 is included to reflect New Zealand and Australian WHS commitments. SRS 6 reflects CHS quality criterion 6.

The SRS and associated evaluative enquiry areas 'drive' all monitoring and evaluation processes - from the onset of a disaster through to the conclusion of the relief and early recovery phase. Over time, the SRS should influence response planning, communications, partnerships and contracting.

2. Evaluative Enquiry Areas

Evaluative questions support each SRS. These reflect MFAT and DFAT's expectations in relation to principles, standards and good practices. The evaluative enquiry areas are to be applied in real time through monitoring visits and quality checks, and at review after completion. Different versions of the statements and questions are included; the real time version is aimed at identifying issues for corrective action, while the review version probes for learning and future application.

Humanitarian protection and assistance provided by New Zealand and Australia should meet The Sphere Handbook Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response. These standards are implicit in the MEF. Meeting the standards constitutes evidence of quality. Therefore, staff should be broadly familiar with all relevant standards, and able to access details as required.

3. High-level indicators

A set of suggested high-level indicators have been developed. The key high-level quantitative indicator that MFAT and DFAT use for aid programme quality reporting focuses on the number of affected people assisted, disaggregated by sex, age and ability. Reporting against this indicator remains mandatory.

Additional indicators quantifying the number of community facilities/critical infrastructure assessed or restored, and the proportion of humanitarian response funding allocated to early recovery and to national and local responders can also be applied as relevant. The indicator set is summarised in the MEF Overview and additional explanations relevant to their application are provided in this document.

At the field level, MFAT and DFAT require routine monitoring data to track the progress of funded activities and provide content for situation reports and public communications.

4. Use of the MEF

The MEF will support operational decision-making and guide performance assessments for MFAT and DFAT funded humanitarian action. The nature and scale of each response will determine which monitoring enquiry areas and indicators are most applicable. Where appropriate, the MEF can be used to guide the design and focus of strategic humanitarian evaluations that DFAT and/or MFAT may commission. The MEF may not be fully operationalised and reported against in every response to rapid onset disasters in the Pacific.

Over time, the MEF is expected to support most humanitarian response planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes funded by Australia and New Zealand, including:

- response planning (design);
- delivery partner proposals and reporting;
- real time monitoring and corrective action;
- after action and completion reviews and evaluations (where appropriate); and
- corporate reporting.

As new agreements are negotiated, DFAT and MFAT may discuss what modifications, if any, could be made to partner reporting arrangements. Changes to reporting will seek to streamline and rationalise donor reporting requirements, while supporting the collection of robust data and improving humanitarian outcomes. This may look different for each delivery partner.

5. MEF development and annual review

In late 2017, the advanced draft MEF evaluative questions were shared with relevant delivery partners, for information and use as appropriate. The MEF was piloted by DFAT and MFAT during the response to Tropical Cyclone Gita in Tonga in February 2018. A subsequent joint MFAT-DFAT review substantiated the value of the framework as a tool for improving the quality and effectiveness of our humanitarian response.

The MEF will continue to be reviewed and updated annually to ensure it remains fit for purpose. These updates will include constructive dialogue with all interested parties. As opportunities arise, MFAT and DFAT will discuss MEF implementation with whole of government partners, Pacific island governments, civil society representatives and international aid actors in the Pacific.

MEF Overview

Strategic Result Statements	Evaluative Enquiry Areas	High-level Indicators
1. Our humanitarian response is appropriate and relevant	1.1. Our plans and funded activities reflect needs and priorities 1.2. Information gaps - sector, geographic or vulnerable groups - and emerging issues are being addressed 1.3. Our planning addresses recovery and strengthens longer-term resilience	a) **Number of affected people provided with assistance**[1] ***(mandatory)*** b) Number of community facilities/critical infrastructure restored *(optional)* c) Percentage of response funding allocated to early recovery and utilised within the response phase *(optional)*
2. Our humanitarian response is timely and effective	2.1. Our humanitarian response is timely 2.2. Response objectives can be realised and outputs are progressing against our Statement of Intent/Objectives as expected, and to satisfactory standards	**a) Number and percentage of responses that are launched within MFAT and DFAT internal mandated timeframes *(mandatory)***
3. Our humanitarian response is efficient and well managed	3.1. Use of whole-of-government response capacity is efficient 3.2. Response procedures and communications are functioning well, including with implementing partners and the public 3.3. Outputs are being delivered efficiently	a) Cost per person assisted *(optional)*
4. Our humanitarian response engages and is accountable to affected communities and vulnerable people	4.1. Appropriate safeguards are in place to minimise harm 4.2. Our humanitarian response is transparent 4.3. Affected populations, including marginalized groups, participate in the decisions that impact them 4.4. Safe, accessible and responsive mechanisms to handle feedback and complaints are functioning	a) Percentage of people affected who report that they are satisfied with the opportunities they have to influence the response *(optional)* b) Percentage of people affected who consider complaints mechanisms accessible, effective, confidential and safe *(optional)*
5. Our humanitarian response reinforces national and local leadership and capacity as much as possible and engages international actors where necessary	5.1. We are reinforcing national response and coordination mechanisms as much as possible 5.2. We are supporting national and local leaders and initiatives where appropriate 5.3. We are engaging and supporting international actors where necessary, including supporting their partnerships with local and national actors	a) Percentage of budget allocated directly or as directly as possible to local and national humanitarian actors *(optional)*
6. Our humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary	6.1 Our response is well coordinated and complementary with other international actors	a) Self-assessed quality of coordination and complementarity with other international actors during response *(optional)*

[1] DFAT: Number of vulnerable women, men, girls and boys provided with life-saving assistance in conflict and crisis situations (results disaggregated by sex, age and ability)

Evaluative Enquiry Areas

Real Time Evaluative Statements and Questions **Purpose: to prompt remedial action (decision-making)**	**At Completion Evaluative Statements and Questions** **Purpose: to rate, and probe for learning to be applied in future**
SRS 1: Our humanitarian response is appropriate and relevant	
1.1 Our plans and funded activities reflect needs and priorities	*1.1 Our response corresponded with needs and priorities*
Whose safety, dignity and rights may be at risk in these circumstances? Do our plans and funded activities correspond with known needs and priorities of affected populations and vulnerable groups? Does this include strategies to protect the safety, dignity and rights of affected people; address vulnerabilities; promote gender equality; and address barriers to inclusion and opportunities for participation for people with disability? Is feedback from monitoring and affected persons received and acted on? Are plans and activities being adapted as needs, priorities, vulnerabilities, risks and opportunities change?	To what extent did our response address known needs and priorities at different points in time? To what extent did our response include strategies to protect the safety, dignity and rights of affected people; promote gender equality; and address barriers to inclusion and opportunities for participation for people with disability? How responsive were we to changing needs, and to capacities, risks, opportunities, and feedback from monitoring and from affected persons? Were existing information sources, including disaggregated data, used to address differentiated needs and vulnerabilities?
1.2 Information gaps - sector, geographic or vulnerable groups - and emerging issues are addressed	*1.2 Information gaps and quality issues were addressed*
Are there critical gaps or weaknesses in the information available about the protection, assistance and recovery needs and priorities of affected populations and vulnerable groups disaggregated by sex, age and ability? What can we do to address gaps and strengthen the information we rely on? Are we making the most of existing information sources to avoid	How adequate for planning and programming purposes was the information available over time about the protection, assistance and recovery needs and priorities of affected populations and different groups? Were the vulnerable and marginalised consulted? If there were gaps in information or quality issues, how did we

Real Time Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to prompt remedial action (decision-making)	At Completion Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to rate, and probe for learning to be applied in future
duplication of effort? Have affected persons been consulted? Are there local/national organisations that can help address gaps or weaknesses, including in response coordination groups, humanitarian clusters, bilateral program partners and NGOs?	address this? How did the gaps impact on the relevance and appropriateness of the response and how did we mitigate? Were local options to fill gaps fully explored?
1.3 Our planning addresses recovery and strengthens longer-term resilience	*1.3 Plans addressed recovery and longer-term resilience*
Is our humanitarian response founded on and aligned with existing development activities? Are relief, recovery and longer-term resilience being planned holistically within MFAT/DFAT, and standalone interventions being limited? What is emerging as important for early recovery? Are we considering resilience at all levels, including individuals, communities and systems? Is this reflected in delivery partner planning?	To what extent was our humanitarian response founded on and aligned with existing development activities? To what extent were we able to plan relief, recovery and development activities holistically within MFAT/DFAT? How appropriate and effective were any preparedness activities we had funded? What enabled and constrained the incorporation of early recovery in the responses of our delivery partners? To what extent have we been able to link our response (relief + early recovery) to recovery, preparedness and development?
SRS 2. Our humanitarian response is timely and effective	
2.1 Our humanitarian response is timely	*2.1 Our humanitarian response was timely*
Are we on track to meet our timeliness target for initial response following a request for assistance? Are we making decisions in a timely manner, and once made, are decisions actioned promptly? Are our activities and the activities of our partners being implemented according to schedule?	Did we activate our emergency preparedness and response procedures in a timely manner (e.g. planning meetings; activating Emergency Coordination Centre/Crisis Centre; deploying Initial Assessment Team/Crisis Response Team)? Did we meet our timeliness target for initial response following a request for assistance?

Real Time Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to prompt remedial action (decision-making)	At Completion Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to rate, and probe for learning to be applied in future
Are we selecting funding mechanisms that facilitate timely dispersal of funding? Are we using pre-positioned supplies and funding? Are we using partners with an existing presence and/or activities in the affected area (including established relationships with local partners)? Does the speed of our response align with national systems and needs in the affected country?	Did we make timely decisions and were they actioned promptly? Did we use pre-positioned supplies and funding and were they activated in a timely manner? Did our policies, processes, procedures and stand-by arrangements facilitate timely response? Were there any avoidable delays? Did we use partners with an existing presence and/or activities in the affected area (including established relationships with local partners)? Did the speed of our response align with national systems and needs in the affected country? To what extent do affected populations and partner governments think that our relief items and activities (and those of our partners) have been delivered or implemented at the right time, according to needs at different phases of the response? Did we receive timely, concise reporting from partners?
2.2 Response objectives can be realised and outputs are progressing against our Statement of Intent/Objectives as expected, and to satisfactory standards	*2.2 Response objectives (as articulated in the Statement of Intent) were realised and outputs were delivered as expected and to satisfactory standards*
Do we appear to be on track to achieve our response objectives? Are our delivery partners meeting reasonable expectations, including timing and coverage, quantity and quality, including risk management? Are delivery partners adhering to appropriate standards (e.g. Sphere) and principles (e.g. Do No Harm)? Are we anticipating potential negative effects, monitoring them, and taking action to prevent them if possible? If not, what are the likely consequences for the affected population and vulnerable groups? How can we address or mitigate relevant risks, constraints and/or shortcomings?	To what extent have we achieved intended results and met appropriate standards (e.g. Sphere) and principles (e.g. Do No Harm? To what extent did we achieve our response objectives? In which respects was our response relatively effective / less effective and what were the primary enablers and constraints? How well did delivery partners perform and what enabled and constrained their performance? Were risks identified and appropriately mitigated? Was any harm minimised? What evidence is there that the Do No Harm principle was applied

Real Time Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to prompt remedial action (decision-making)	At Completion Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to rate, and probe for learning to be applied in future
	(e.g. risk and/or conflict sensitivity analysis; anticipating potential negative effects and taking actions to prevent them)?
SRS 3. Our humanitarian response is efficient and well managed	
3.1 Use of whole-of-government response capacity is efficient	*3.1 Whole-of-government response capacity and use was adequate*
Do we have the human resources (including gender balance and local knowledge), logistical capacity and funding to manage all aspects of our response effectively and efficiently? Are the strengths and resources of whole-of-government partners being considered and is coordination optimal?	How adequately were we resourced in country and in our ECC/HOC to manage all aspects of the response (human resources (including gender balance and local knowledge), logistics, funding)? Which aspects of our whole-of-government cooperation worked well and what could be improved?
3.2 Response procedures and communications are functioning well, including with implementing partners and the public	*3.2 Response procedures and communications functioned well, including with implementing partners and the public*
Are we applying standard operating procedures appropriately? Are we documenting key decisions and delivery of outputs? Could the information flow to and from delivery partners be strengthened? Do response procedures enable us to communicate effectively with the public?	To what extent were protocols and standard operating procedures applied appropriately? Do any require amendment? What are the priorities and opportunities for improving operational effectiveness and efficiency? How effective were we at communicating with the public?
3.3 Outputs are being delivered efficiently	*3.3 Outputs were delivered efficiently*
Are partners managing the implementation of funded activities well, including keeping to agreed output delivery schedules? What measures are delivery partners taking to ensure cost efficiency (in relation to inputs and activities) and cost effectiveness (in relation to results)? Can existing bilateral program partners be used to achieve cost	How well did partners manage the implementation of funded activities including keeping to agreed output delivery schedules? How effective were measures taken to ensure cost efficiency and effectiveness? What more could we have done? Were opportunities taken to involve the private sector? Did delivery partners use new or innovative processes, practices or technology that could be replicated?

Real Time Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to prompt remedial action (decision-making)	At Completion Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to rate, and probe for learning to be applied in future
efficiencies? Are there opportunities to achieve a similar result more efficiently and/or at reduced cost by using new or alternative processes, practices or technologies or by engaging the private sector? Have we considered unconditional and conditional cash transfers, cash/value vouchers, commodity vouchers and cash-for-work[2].	
SRS 4. Our humanitarian response engages and is accountable to affected communities and vulnerable people	
4.1 Appropriate safeguards are in place to minimise harm	*4.1 Appropriate safeguards are in place to minimise harm*
Are appropriate safeguarding policies and procedures (including training) in place and are they operating effectively (e.g. code of conduct, child protection, measures to protect staff and affected populations from sexual harassment, exploitation and abuse)?	Were appropriate safeguards in place to minimise harm? Where complaints or issues arose, were they managed safely, appropriately and effectively?
4.2 Our humanitarian response is transparent	*4.2 Our humanitarian response is transparent*
Are we sharing clear, relevant information about our response with key stakeholders including affected governments and the public in a timely manner? Are we reporting our financial commitments to the United Nations Financial Tracking Services in a timely manner? Do we and our delivery partners have effective means of communicating intentions, rights and entitlements to all persons who are to be offered protection and assistance? Is information accessible to all, including people with disabilities?	Did we share clear, relevant information about our response with key stakeholders including affected governments and the public in a timely manner? Were our funding commitments reported to the United Nations Financial Tracking Services in a timely manner? How effectively did we and our delivery partners communicate intentions, rights and entitlements to all persons who were offered protection and assistance? Was information accessible to all, including people with disabilities?

[2] Refer Cash Transfers: DFAT Humanitarian Strategy Guidance Note

Real Time Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to prompt remedial action (decision-making)	At Completion Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to rate, and probe for learning to be applied in future
4.3 Affected populations, including marginalised groups, participate in the decisions that impact them	*4.3 Affected populations, including marginalised groups, participated in the decisions that impacted them*
Are the views of affected governments, communities, including marginalised groups, sought as a matter of course and used to guide activity planning, design and implementation? Are mechanisms in place to listen to affected populations? How often are people consulted and how? Are there any barriers to including marginalised groups in decision-making processes and are partners addressing them? Is engagement with affected populations helping determine how to build resilience and strengthen preparedness?	To what extent did affected populations, including marginalised groups, participate in and play an active role in decisions that impacted them? Were programmes and activities responsive to the diversity and expressed views of affected populations, including marginalised groups? Were there any barriers to participation in decision-making processes for marginalised groups and if so, how were these overcome? Do affected populations, including marginalised groups feel that their needs, opinions and priorities were adequately considered and addressed? How did engagement with affected populations contribute to building resilience and strengthen preparedness? To what extent were we able to help resource community initiatives?
4.4 Safe, accessible and responsive mechanisms to handle feedback and complaints are functioning	*4.4 Feedback and complaints were managed in a safe, accessible and responsive manner.*
Have our partners established safe, accessible and responsive mechanisms to handle feedback and complaints, designed in consultation with affected populations? Do mechanisms provide for two-way communication so that affected populations are kept updated about progress and decisions taken in response to their feedback?	Were safe and responsive complaints mechanisms established, used, and acted upon? What types of feedback mechanisms were established and which were the most effective and why? To what extent do affected populations, including marginalised groups, feel that their feedback and complaints were received and

Real Time Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to prompt remedial action (decision-making)	At Completion Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to rate, and probe for learning to be applied in future
	responded to adequately, effectively and in a timely manner?
SRS 5. Our humanitarian response reinforces national and local leadership and capacity as much as possible and engages international actors where necessary	
5.1 We are reinforcing national response and coordination mechanisms as much as possible	*5.1 We reinforced national response and coordination mechanisms as much as possible*
Are we communicating our intentions and activities with the partner government, and supporting and complementing partner government disaster response mechanisms as the default coordination arrangement? Are we doing enough to support the inclusion and leadership of national and local responders in coordination mechanisms (including humanitarian clusters)?	How well did we communicate with the partner government? How well did we support and complement the partner government response mechanisms as much as possible and support the inclusion and leadership of national and local responders in coordination mechanisms as appropriate? What more could we have done?
5.2 We are supporting national and local leaders and initiatives where appropriate	*5.2 We supported national and local leadership and initiatives where appropriate*
Are we doing enough to identify and support national and local initiatives and strategies? Are we partnering with national and local responders and providing financing or other means to enhance their delivery systems and capacities? What proportion of our response funding is going to local and national partners directly or indirectly (i.e. through one transaction layer)? Is there a coherent and common intent to strengthen resilience and support 'localisation' through all activities?	To what extent did we identify and support national and local government initiatives and strategies devised by affected communities? What more could we have done? Did we take appropriate opportunities to partner with national and local responders and provide financing or other means to enhance their delivery systems and capacities? What proportion of our response funding went directly or indirectly (i.e. through one transaction layer) to local and national partners? To what extent was there a coherent and common intent to strengthen resilience and 'localisation' through all activities?

Real Time Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to prompt remedial action (decision-making)	At Completion Evaluative Statements and Questions Purpose: to rate, and probe for learning to be applied in future
5.3 We are engaging and supporting international actors where necessary, including supporting their partnerships with local and national actors	*5.3 We engaged and supported international actors where necessary, including their partnerships with local and national actors*
Are we engaging and supporting international actors only where necessary, to complement the national and local response? Are the international actors we engage partnering effectively with local and national actors, by supporting them to build leadership and decision-making independence over time?	Did we engage and support regional and international actors only where necessary to complement the national and local response? Did our international partners effectively partner with relevant local and national actors, supporting them to build leadership and decision-making independence over time?
SRS 6. Our humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary	
6.1 Our response is well coordinated and complementary with other international actors[3]	*6.1 Our response was well coordinated and complementary with other international actors*
Are we sharing information and coordinating our response optimally with other donors and international actors, especially between New Zealand and Australia and within FRANZ and the Pacific Humanitarian Team? Are we and our partners reporting information through coordination mechanisms (e.g. the cluster system)? Are we identifying and using opportunities to influence partners to enhance coordination?	What constrained and enabled us in sharing information and coordinating with other international actors? What could we do differently to improve information sharing and coordination in future? How well were we able to influence partners in relation to coordination? What more could we do in future to influence partners to enhance coordination?

Guidance on suggested high-level indicators

All data is to be disaggregated by sex/age/ability where possible.

Indicator	Guidance and comment

[3] Nationally led coordination is addressed under SRS 5

Indicator	Guidance and comment
SRS 1: Our humanitarian response is appropriate and relevant	
Number of affected people provided with assistance[4].	The indicator relates to coverage and it may be helpful to state the total number affected alongside the number assisted. DFAT is able to share specific technical guidance for calculation of DFAT's indicator.
Number of community facilities/critical infrastructure restored.	For unearmarked funding, requires agreement with the partner government on reporting requirements.
Percentage of response funding allocated to early recovery and utilised within the response phase.	Will require an estimate until sector-wide coding systematically identifies early recovery activities.
SRS 2: Our humanitarian response is timely and effective	
Number and percentage of responses that are launched within MFAT and DFAT's internal mandated timeframes.	For calculation and reporting by DFAT and MFAT staff only.
SRS 3: Our humanitarian response is efficient and well managed	
Cost per person assisted.	Calculate on the basis of total humanitarian budget allocation to the response divided by number of persons assisted. This is a crude indicator. However, it may still allow for simple comparisons between responses. It would be useful to break down cost per vulnerable person by cost categories, and for the main cost drivers to be benchmarked over time. Context will always be important and completion reporting should include observations on how the specific context influenced the main cost drivers.

[4] DFAT's Aggregate Development Result is "number of vulnerable women, men, girls and boys provided with life-saving assistance in conflict and crisis situations (results disaggregated by sex, age and ability)".

Indicator	Guidance and comment
SRS 4: Our humanitarian response engages and is accountable to affected communities and vulnerable people	
% of people affected who report that they are satisfied with the opportunities they have to influence the response % of people affected who consider complaints mechanisms accessible, effective, confidential and safe.	Both require delivery partners to provide this information (through surveys or focus group discussions). The latter requires construction of a composite indicator based on user perceptions of the complaints mechanism.
SRS 5: Our humanitarian response reinforces national and local leadership and capacity as much as possible and engages international actors where necessary	
% of budget allocated directly or as directly as possible to local and national humanitarian actors.	1. Direct funding refers to funding that does not pass through an international intermediary. 2. 'As directly as possible' refers to: • Funding channelled through a pooled fund that is directly accessed by national and local actors • Funding to a single international aid organisation that reaches a local/national actor directly from that one intermediary.
SRS 6: Our humanitarian response is coordinated and complementary	
Self-assessed quality of coordination and complementarity with other international actors during response.	To be assessed during post-event lessons learned exercises. Assessment of coordination with other international actors may include coordination between Australia and New Zealand, and/or coordination issues at a system-level (i.e. whole of response).