

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

Australia provided \$10 million in emergency assistance to support relief efforts in the immediate aftermath of the earthquake through

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies - emergency relief activities	\$1 m
Office of Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) - to support coordination and advocacy activities	\$1 m
World Food Programme - emergency food aid	\$4.5 m
Australian NGOs under the AusAID Periodic Funding Agreements* - emergency assistance in priority sectors of health, water, sanitation, food, coordination and logistics	\$2.5 m
Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), an agency of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) - facilitation of movement of personnel and resources and emergency relief distribution	\$1 m
TOTAL	\$10 m

* Funding to Australian NGOs was provided through:

- Oxfam (\$550,000) to assist up to 300,000 people by providing water and shelter in the areas of Port-au-Prince and Carrefour
- Caritas (\$350,000) to provide food and kitchen kits in the areas of Port au Prince and Leogane
- World Vision (\$250,000) to provide water and sanitation and protection programs in Petionville province
- Plan (\$400,000) to support children's emotional and development needs on Jacmel and the surrounding areas of Le Vallee and Cayes-Jacmel in South Haiti
- CARE (\$550,000) to provide safe drinking water and reduce the risk of water-borne diseases for 70,000 people in Leogane and Carrefour communes, near Port-au-Prince

- Save the Children (\$400,000) to provide education and protection for 4800 children and constructing 8 temporary classrooms in Port-au-Prince, Jacmel, Leogane and Petit Goave

Australia also deployed five air traffic controllers from the Royal Australian Air Force to support the United States' effort to improve the flows of humanitarian aid into the main airport in Port-au-Prince and seven Australian specialists, deployed through RedR Australia to support the United Nations efforts in the disaster.

RECONSTRUCTION SUPPORT

Australia is providing \$14 million to support early recovery and reconstruction in Haiti through

United Nations Development Program (UNDP)'s Cash for Work program	\$2.5 m
Haiti Reconstruction Fund	\$10 m
Support to CARICOM to assist improved coordination and support to Haiti	\$750,000
Trilateral cooperation with Brazil to help revive the agriculture sector <i>NB: This activity is still under discussion between officials</i>	\$750,000
TOTAL	\$14 m



Australian Government
AusAID

Quality at Implementation Report Template

- Document name: **QAI Report Template**, registered # 107
- Use with Instruction: ***How Do I Manage Quality at Implementation Assessment, Review & Reporting?*** registered # 104
- Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management Group
- Contact for assistance: QualityReports@ausaid.gov.au, or Manager, Operations Support and Outreach on +6206 4023
- Current from 7 December 2009 to 31 October 2010

Quality reports drafted in this template should be copied into AidWorks following consultation on the assessment and management response with program team and partners, and any agreed revisions are made. Responses should be no more than 300-words per cell, corresponding with text limitations in AidWorks. Approval of the report by the relevant AusAID Director/Counsellor **must** be recorded in AidWorks (see AidWorks Quick Reference Guide on Quality Reportings)

*Initiative name, dates, value and expenditure information are automatically provided when the report is generated from AidWorks.

Highlight and delete this box and text before using!



Australian Government
AusAID

Quality at Implementation Report for < name of initiative >

Summary

Initiative Name	< initiative name >		
Initiative Number	< initiative number >		
Start date	< start date of initiative >	End date	< end date of initiative >
Value	< \$AUD >	Expenditure to date	< \$AUD >
Report drafted by	< name >	Date of draft	< date of draft report >
Approved by	< name of Counsellor / Director >	Date approved in AidWorks	< date final report is approved in AidWorks >
This QAI assessment is based on the outcome of an independent evaluation: <If "yes", enter quality ratings only, no narrative, and ensure evaluation report is attached in AidWorks.>			< Yes / No >

Description (no more than 300 words per cell)

Description of the Initiative/ Activity (new!)	What is it? < Provide a brief (one-two paragraph) description of the activity. This should provide a clear picture of what the activity is, assuming a reader had no prior knowledge >
Objectives Summary	What are we doing? < Summarise the objectives against which progress is/ achievements are assessed (at criterion 2) >

Australian Aid – Rated Quality Criteria

Criteria	Assessment (no more than 300 words per cell)	Rating (1-6)	Management Response Be as precise as possible: what? how? who (AusAID)? when? (no more than 300 words per cell)
1. Relevance (new!)	Why are we doing this? < Assess the extent to which the activity is aligned, is appropriate and is contributing to higher objectives/outcomes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its relationship to partner priorities/ plans / objectives • its relationship and contribution to Australian country, regional, and/or sector strategies > 	<#>	< Describe related actions <u>AusAID</u> can/will take to maintain or improve the relevance of this activity in the next 12 months >
2. Effectiveness (formerly Achievement of Objectives)	How is it going? Will it work? < Assess the extent to which objectives are likely to be, are being, or have been met. **Where existing objectives seem unclear, unrealistic or inappropriate, as part of review discuss alternative objectives as a basis for meaningful assessment >	<#>	< Describe related actions <u>AusAID</u> can/will take to maintain or improve the effectiveness of this activity in the next 12 months ** Including proposed formal steps to amend objectives if determined necessary by senior program managers. See Guideline<link>>

Criteria	Assessment (no more than 300 words per cell)	Rating (1-4)	Management Response Be as precise as possible: what? how? who (AusAID)? when? (no more than 300 words per cell)
3. Efficiency (formerly Implementation Progress)	<p>Is it working smoothly?</p> <p>< Assess the extent to which inputs are providing value-for-money and are being delivered within stated timeframes.</p> <p>Assess whether inputs in terms of funds, staff and other resources are appropriate for the objectives and delivery mode.</p> <p>Assess the extent to which identified (or new) risks to progress and outcomes are being managed, and with what impacts/consequence. ></p>	<#>	< Describe related actions AusAID can/will take to maintain or improve the efficiency of this activity in the next 12 months >
4. Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>How do we know?</p> <p>< Assess the extent to which there is robust management information for implementation and decision-making as well as evidence of effectiveness. ></p>	<#>	< Describe related actions AusAID can/will take to maintain or improve monitoring and evaluation of this activity in the next 12 months >
5. Sustainability	<p>Will benefits last?</p> <p>< Assess the extent to which the activity and delivery approach is likely to lead to enduring benefits after the Australian contribution has ceased.</p> <p>Assess the extent to which the activity is ensuring no significant negative environmental impacts are likely and complying with the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. ></p>	<#>	< Describe related actions AusAID can/will take to maintain or improve sustainability (including environmental compliance) of this activity in the next 12 months >
6. Gender Equality (new!)	<p>How are we achieving it?</p> <p>< Assess the extent to which the activity integrates gender-sensitive practice in objective setting, implementation, monitoring and assessment of results - Asses the extent to which the activity has advanced and improved gender equality, benefits, decision-making, women's rights, capacity development ></p>	<#>	< Describe related actions AusAID can/will take to maintain or improve implementation for gender equality outcomes throughout this activity in the next 12 months >

Other Key Issues

Criteria	Assessment (no more than 300 words)	Management Response Be as precise as possible: what? how? who (AusAID)? when? (no more than 300 words)
7. Cross-Cutting Issues and Commitments	<p>What else is at stake?</p> <p>< Note specific activities, outputs, outcomes which indicate progress on, or compliance with, agency policies and commitments. Eg, Environment, Paris Declaration/Accra action agenda/Cairns Compact, and, where relevant, HIV/AIDs, Anti-Corruption, Climate Change, Disaster Risk Reduction, Disability ></p>	< Describe related actions AusAID can/will take to maintain or improve quality and effectiveness of relevant cross-cutting policies and themes throughout this activity in the next 12 months >
8. Risk to Highlight	<p>What needs attention?</p> <p>< Taking into account assessments above, and any other relevant information, identify specific risks requiring management attention, if any.</p> <p>For each risk, indicate Red, Amber or Green based on significance = likelihood x impact ></p>	<p>Red / Amber / Green</p> <p>< Describe related actions AusAID is taking, or can take, to manage and mitigate these risks in the next 12 months ></p>
9. Current Issues	<p>Other things to know</p> <p>< Only enter other relevant information requiring team/management attention not identified above. Note: This can be useful for activity handover ></p>	< Describe related actions AusAID can/will take if necessary in the next 12 months >

Key Results (no more than 300 words)

10. Key Results	<p>So what?</p> <p>< After weighing up assessments and relevant information above, what are the most significant results of our efforts that we can justify and communicate. This is what you want to tell or have the Minister/High Commissioner/Ambassador say ></p>
-----------------	---

Considerations for preparing the report

These prompts are not exhaustive, nor do you have to answer each question. They are a guide only and should complement other relevant considerations identified by the program team. For further details on completing this report see the *Guideline Complete a QAI Report*.

Description of the Activity - "What is it?"
Provide a brief, clear description of the activity, and any related sub-activities, assuming a reader had no prior knowledge. This includes clear indication of the approach(es) taken and modality(ies) by which it is being delivered. Doing so will frame the assessment to follow and help a reader to contextualise the progress toward objectives, with implementation, any management responses identified, as well as relative significance of any key results claimed.
Objectives summary – "What are we doing?"
Briefly (in not more than eight lines) summarise the activity objectives against which the activity is assessed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An objective is defined as "a specific statement setting out what an activity is expected to achieve by a given time", and provides the primary basis for judging the success of the activity. the number of objectives should be limited to ensure focus on the priority outcomes to be achieved. For many AusAID activities this information is listed under the "Purpose" section of the activity Design Document or in the monitoring and evaluation framework. If the activity has been subjected to a Quality and Entry reporting process, refer to the QAE report for its summary of objectives.
Relevance – "Why are we doing this?"
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the specific role and intended contribution of Australian aid through this activity (aid objectives) to the Partner Government's priority development outcomes remain clear, relevant and appropriate? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> if not, or if partner priorities or institutional contexts have changed, or are changing, how will this activity fit or adapt? Does the activity target priority needs not addressed by other development partners, and/or how is Australia otherwise seeking to harmonise its assistance? Is the activity contributing as planned to the higher level objectives of the Australian aid program as outlined in relevant country, regional and thematic strategies? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> if not, or if Australian program objectives have changed, or are changing, how will this activity fit or adapt? Does the activity remain relevant to the context/needs of beneficiaries? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> does the proposed approach to addressing the identified development issues (including the modality and financing arrangements) continue to match the context and operational reality, as much as any specific analysis underpinning the design? If working with/through another partner (e.g. UN, WB, PIFS), consider <i>both</i> the relevance of Australian <i>objectives for the partnership</i>, (why we chose to work this way) and the partner's aid objective(s) <i>vis a vis</i> the development context, partner priorities and beneficiaries' needs?
Effectiveness – "How is it going? Will it work?"
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How clear, measurable and achievable are the objectives for this activity (aid objectives) within the stated timeframe? Has anything changed that impacts this? Is the activity achieving the objectives expected at this stage and is it likely to achieve its intended objectives by completion? As a result, what evidence is there, at this stage, of the activity's contribution to higher level objectives/outcomes of the program? Is how we think change will occur being validated by implementation? If not, what changes need to be made to objectives and/or approaches so that the desired change might occur? Are the main risks to achievement of aid objectives identified, monitored and are plans to prevent or mitigate them being acted on? How well are we managing key partnerships which may contribute to achieving objectives? If working through partners (e.g. UN, WB, and PIFS), how are Australia's objective(s) for the partnership progressing (often defined through partnership frameworks)? And how are the partners progressing with their own aid objectives?
Efficiency – "Is it working smoothly?"
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the activity making efficient use of time and resources to achieve activity objectives and outcomes? Do technical solutions and associated implementation arrangements remain high quality, appropriate to the context and good value for money? Has the activity suffered from any delays in implementation, whether against the implementation plan, the budget, or both? If so, why, with what consequence to the objectives, and what is being/was done about it? Is the activity adequately and appropriately resourced to achieve the desired objectives? Are roles and responsibilities of, and communications between, all development partners and all actors involved in activity implementation clear and how well are they working? Where appropriate, are implementation arrangements harmonised with other donors and aligned with partner government systems?

- Has management of the activity been responsive to changing needs and managed risks to achieving objectives?

Monitoring and Evaluation – “How do we know?” (Programs might find the *interim guidance on activity level monitoring and evaluation* helpful when assessing this criterion.)

- Do monitoring and evaluation arrangements provide timely and meaningful information in support of management, accountability and lessons-learning needs?
- Is monitoring and evaluation focused on priority information needs and not overly complex?
- Is it clear what will be assessed, by whom, when and how (including baselines where appropriate and realistic)?
- Is data gender-disaggregated to measure the impact of the activity on men, women, boys and girls?
- Does evidence exist to show that activity objectives are on track to being achieved, and to what extent changes will be sustained? Can this also inform analysis and judgement of contribution to/achievement against higher level objectives of the program?
- Where we are jointly implementing with other partners and/or funders, are there *AusAID specific objectives* for engagement in the activity/partnership, and do monitoring and evaluation arrangements address this?
- Do monitoring and evaluation arrangements use, or contribute to strengthening, local monitoring and evaluation systems and/or capacity? If strengthening the capacity of partner M&E is an *objective of the activity*, is this being tracked and managed accordingly? (Note this would then need to be identified in the Objectives summary and assessed against “Effectiveness”.)
- Given all these considerations, is monitoring and evaluation adequately resourced?

Sustainability – “Will benefits last?” (Programs might find *interim guidance on assessing sustainability* helpful when assessing this criterion and considering related management actions.)

- Is it clear what sustainable benefits/change the activity aims to generate? Is sustainability in fact an aim of, or reasonably achievable by, the activity?
- If it is, are strategies for achieving sustainability explicit? To what extent are they being acted on?
 - are they integral to the activity objectives, and being measured and assessed?
- What confidence is there at this stage that any benefits/changes the activity is generating will endure? Assess in terms of either/both:
 - outcomes – what the activity is aiming to achieve, and what it would take to sustain that
 - processes – how the activity is operating, and what it would take for that to continue
- Are specific constraints to sustainability of the activity identified and being addressed?
 - this should include consideration of financial, human resource and political constraints
- Do beneficiaries and/or partner country stakeholders have sufficient ownership, capacity and resources to maintain the activity outcomes after Australian Government funding has ceased? Has anything changed for the better or worse?
- How well are any emerging environmental, climate and disaster challenges (e.g. extreme weather events, resource degradation, pollution, disasters and climate change related impacts) or opportunities (e.g. for Disaster Risk Reduction or adaptation) being addressed in activity implementation?
- How well is the activity building resilience to cope with changing conditions and future uncertainties?
- How is the activity ensuring no significant negative environmental impacts are likely (including complying with the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act) and how is it pursuing opportunities to enhance the environment?
- How is monitoring and evaluation being used to assess and report on environmental sustainability of the activity?

Gender equality – “How are we achieving it?”

- How well does the activity integrate gender equality into objectives and the consideration of risks and sustainability?
- What progress has been made on addressing/resolving any gender equality issues identified at design? Or identified subsequently?
- Does the activity access gender expertise for implementation?
- What progress has been made on the development of capacity regarding gender equality objectives of: program staff; counterparts; development partners; and/or the broader community?
- How are gender equality considerations and impacts discussed at the policy level and with counterparts at the program level?
- Is the monitoring and evaluation assessing and reporting on progress towards desired gender equality outcomes and impact?
- How well does the activity contribute to advancing gender equality?

Cross-cutting issues – “What else is at stake?”

Discuss whether/how this activity contributes to AusAID’s policy commitments on aid effectiveness (Paris/Accra/Cairns Compact in the Pacific), use of government systems, anti-corruption, as well as cross-cutting thematic issues such as HIV/AIDS, environment and climate change, disability, or other AusAID or Australian Government policy commitments, as relevant.

This section should provide meaningful information, across the country and thematic programs, of plans, monitoring and results which show adherence with and/or progress towards these aid policy commitments. Specific details of relevant outputs, outcomes or activities rather than generalities should be provided, and, where possible, track progress towards defined objectives in these areas. For instance:

- Does the program have an anti-corruption action plan, and/or commitment in the country strategy? How does this activity support this? What internal anti-corruption strategies has this activity adopted, and how are these progressing?

Risk management – “What needs attention?”

This section should identify **only specific risks requiring higher level management attention**, as determined by the assessment and/or other relevant information available. Consideration should especially include reputational risks such as environmental, social, child protection, corruption or political concerns related to the activity.

A simple scale is used Red/Amber/Green to flag the significance of the risk, taken as a combination of its likelihood and consequences. Use the rating to help you communicate with senior management. AusAID actions to manage and mitigate the risk should be clear. This section should not usually cover country-level risks unless they directly influence the ability to achieve activity outcomes.

Key Results – “So what?”

This is the chance to communicate the things that matter most about this activity. Though it should represent the “headlines” it is deliberately reserved as the last word in the process. The preceding reflection and assessment against the quality criteria should help make clear what *difference* the activity is making or has made. This section should tell the story of the results of progress towards aid objectives through implementation of the activity to date. This might duplicate assessment against the “Effectiveness” criterion, but should be pitched at a public audience.

- Be selective, highlighting key achievements which tell a story, rather than long lists.
- Link any outputs (e.g. schools built, curriculum developed) to outcomes (e.g. changes in educational achievement and service delivery), to illustrate the relative significance of progress against objectives.
- Include activity level institutional outcomes, such as changes in behaviours and institutional performance.
- Where relevant, make the link between activity results and higher-level country or thematic strategy performance indicators, as well as partner development plans and priorities.
- Include results which were not planned for, if they demonstrate important achievements. For example replication of activity results into government and other programs can be an important sign of development impact. Also note any negative unplanned effects.
- Even at early stages of implementation, assessment should demonstrate attention to achieving development objectives, not just delivering outputs – at later stages it should indicate whether objectives achieved have produced desired immediate outcomes. In between the context of progress with objectives and any key results will be judged in relation to elapsed time and money spent.