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# Acronyms

ANCP Australian NGO Cooperation Program

AHP Australian Humanitarian Partnership

AHP SU Australian Humanitarian Partnership Support Unit

AS HMB Assistant Secretary, Humanitarian Response, Risk and Recovery Branch, DFAT

CBDRM community-based disaster risk management

CBM CBM Australia is an organisation focused on disability in developing countries

CCA climate change adaptation

DFAT Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Australian Government

DiDRR disability-inclusive disaster risk reduction

DPO disabled people’s organisation

DRR disaster risk reduction

FAS HPD First Assistant Secretary, Humanitarian, NGOs and Partnership Division, DFAT

HRS Humanitarian Preparedness and Response Section, DFAT

HPA Humanitarian Partnership Agreement

INGO international non-government organisation

M&E monitoring and evaluation

NDMO national disaster management office

NGO non-government organisation

PDF Pacific Disability Forum

PPF Partnership and Performance Fund

UN United Nations

UNESCAP United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

WHS World Humanitarian Summit

$ denotes the Australian Dollar

# Glossary

**Activity plans (also known as sub designs)** – outline the activities that AHP NGOs and their partners will deliver. These describe NGO outcomes, program logic, gender and disability analysis, a detailed Year 1 activity implementation plan, and budget and risk management

**AHP NGOs –** AHP lead NGOs and consortia members, based in Australia

**AHP lead NGOs** – the six Australian NGOs contracted by DFAT to deliver the five-year AHP. Some of these NGOs lead a consortium of organisations

**Country Committee** – Disaster READY governance mechanism at the country level

**Country plans** – set out the country context, the particular program outcomes that AHP NGOs are working towards in that country, how they will work together and manage risks

**Disaster READY design –** describes the package of the overarching framework, country plans and activity plans

**Disaster READY overarching framework** – provides the strategic context, rationale, program logic and outcomes, delivery mechanisms, budget, governance, management, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, gender and disability analysis, and risk management (this document)

**Humanitarian capability** – the systems, knowledge, skills and practices that enable effective action to reduce disaster risks, prepare for, respond to, and to recover from disasters

**Localisation** – defined through Australian Red Cross-DFAT Pacific research as “the process of recognising, respecting and strengthening the independence of leadership and decision-making by national actors in humanitarian action, in order to better address the needs of the affected populations”

**National NGOs -** includes local NGOs (national, regional and community-based) and national offices of international NGOs (including national offices of AHP NGOs)

**Pacific Islands** – Pacific states and Timor-Leste

**Steering Committee** – Program governance mechanism

**Shared Services** – a funding mechanism within country plans that supports AHP NGO coordination and improved practice on gender, disability inclusion and child protection through sharing expertise and services

# AHP Disaster Ready OveRarching Framework

Start Date: January 2018 End Date: June 2022

Total proposed funding allocation: $ 42.5m[[1]](#footnote-1)

AHP Disaster READY Investment approved by:  IC Endorsed by AIC:

Quality assurance completed: Simon Ernst (independent reviewer) and peer review

# Executive Summary

Small island developing states are among the most vulnerable countries in the world with respect to natural disasters and climate change. The UN World Risk Index, which measures exposure to natural hazards and the capacity to cope with these events across 171 countries, places small island developing states at the top of its ranking. In addition to their limited capacity to respond to natural disasters, these countries are more frequently hit by extreme weather events than larger countries, and their economic costs are much higher on average (IMF, 2016a). Climate change will only worsen the reach of natural disasters by increasing their intensity and frequency (IPCC, 2014). The UNESCAP 2017 Asia-Pacific Disaster Report found that countries with special needs, in particular small island developing states, were expected to experience average annual losses close to four per cent of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as a result of natural disasters and the worsening impacts of climate change.

Disaster READY is a 4.5 year, $42.5m Australian Government program to help Pacific island communities prepare for and build resilience to disasters. The purpose and focus of the Disaster READY program reflects the priorities of the Australian Government’s 2017 Foreign Policy White Paper, which recognises the critical role played by local governments and partners in advancing a secure, self-reliant and prosperous Indo-Pacific. The White Paper emphasises the importance of investing in local and national capacity to better prepare for and respond to natural disasters.

The program will be implemented by the Australian Humanitarian Partnership (AHP). The AHP is a strategic five-year (2017–2021) partnership between the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and six Australian NGOs and their consortium partners[[2]](#footnote-2). The AHP delivers more effective, innovative and collaborative humanitarian assistance by allowing Australia to use the networks and access of Australian NGOs to respond to natural disasters and protracted crises in our region and beyond. Additionally, the AHP also has a specific focus on strengthening the ability of local communities and organisations in the Pacific and Timor-Leste to prepare for and respond to crises. The AHP is supported by the AHP Support Unit (AHP SU), which provides support for the partnership administration, coordination and secretariat services, monitoring and evaluation, and communications.

The Disaster READY program will focus its resources and efforts in five countries, all of them ranked among the top at-risk countries in the world[[3]](#footnote-3), with Vanuatu ranked as the country with the greatest risk of disaster worldwide. The World Risk Report (2017) also identified Solomon Islands (6), Timor-Leste (10), PNG (11), and Fiji (15) amongst the 15 highest disaster risk countries.

The purpose of Disaster READY is to:

Strengthen local humanitarian capability and preparedness in the Pacific and Timor-Leste so that communities are better able to respond to and recover from rapid- and slow-onset disasters.

The Disaster READY design reflects the commitment of the Australian Government and its NGO partners to work towards the global “localisation” agenda that prioritises local decision-making and responses to building resilience and preparedness for disasters. In the Pacific, localisation has been defined as “*the process of recognising, respecting and strengthening the independence of leadership and decision-making by national actors in humanitarian action, in order to better address the needs of the affected populations*”[[4]](#footnote-4). This process requires a shift to greater engagement and control by national actors – government, local NGOs, faith-based organisations, and the private sector – and a corresponding change in behaviour by international actors and organisations. The Disaster READY program reflects this direction.

The Disaster READY design process has been instrumental in building the right foundations for collaboration and synergies in implementation at the country level[[5]](#footnote-5). The DFAT Humanitarian Response and Recovery Branch and AHP NGOs headquartered in Australia have set the overarching framework and strategic direction, whilst the implementation strategies have been designed at the country level in collaboration with DFAT Post, national governments, local NGOs (including disabled people’s organisations (DPOs) and women’s organisations) and the private sector. DFAT and AHP NGOs are committed to continuing a strengthened approach to country-driven implementation and collaboration, as evidenced through the country plans (Annex 13) and country-level NGO designs, and the governance structure that includes country-level committees. In peace time these strengthened relationships will enhance collaborative responses by AHP NGOs in the event of a disaster.

Disaster READY will support women, people with disabilities, youth and children to have their needs recognised and met through community, sub-national and national mechanisms for disaster preparedness and response. NGOs will engage with communities and sub-national and national disaster management structures to improve coordination and government responsiveness to community needs, and to strengthen the leadership and influence of national actors in the humanitarian system. The program goes some way to addressing the increased vulnerabilities created by climate change.

Five end-of-investment objectives are envisaged by June 2022. These are based on the strengths and capacities of AHP NGOs and country contexts**[[6]](#footnote-6)**:

1. **Communities are better prepared for rapid- and slow-onset disasters:** communities understand disaster and climate risks in their location and have the resources, skills and knowledge to reduce risks and prepare for and respond to disasters. They have mechanisms in place to respond to both slow-onset and rapid-onset disasters, including early warning systems that are accessible to all.
2. **The rights and needs of women, people with disabilities[[7]](#footnote-7), youth and children are being met in disaster preparedness and response at all levels**. Women, people with disabilities, and youth are represented on community, sub-national and national disaster committees. Children are represented on school disaster committees. Humanitarian operating procedures (including those of AHP NGOs) are responsive to the needs of women, people with disabilities, youth and children. All community members, including men and boys, faith and other community leaders, and government staff address the barriers that prevent the rights and needs of women, people with disabilities, youth and children being met.
3. **Government, NGOs, the private sector and communities coordinate more effectively for inclusive disaster preparedness and response.** National and sub-national disaster mechanisms function and respond to community needs during disasters, including through accessible and safe evacuation centres and improved communications for preparedness, early warning, disaster impact and response. Regional approaches to cash transfers and logistics are adapted to and operational in some countries. NGOs work with the private sector on improved communications, logistics and cash transfers.
4. **National NGOs and faith-based organisations have more influence and capacity in the country humanitarian system.** Local NGOs and faith-based organisations are represented in national and sub-national disaster committees. Together with national offices of INGOs, they have improved organisational capacity for disaster preparedness and response as well as increased influence in the country humanitarian system.
5. **AHP NGOs work effectively together and with other relevant stakeholders.** AHP NGOs coordinate with government, the Red Cross, women’s and other NGOs, and donors; they champion and demonstrate inclusive approaches and use good practices in disaster preparedness and risk reduction in their development programming.

The AHP Disaster READY design comprises three levels:

**Overarching framework** – provides the strategic context, rationale, program logic and outcomes, delivery mechanisms, budget, governance, management, monitoring and evaluation arrangements, gender and disability analysis, and risk management (this document).

**Country plans** – set out the country context, the particular program outcomes that AHP NGOs are working towards in that country, how they will work together and share expertise on gender, disability, child protection and child rights, and manage risks.

**Activity plans (sub designs)** – outline the activities that AHP NGOs and their partners will deliver. These detail NGO outcomes, program logic, gender and disability analysis, a detailed Year 1 activity implementation plan, and budget and risk management (see Annex 6 Summary of Activity Plans).

Program management is led by DFAT. DFAT is responsible for funding approvals and final decisions, approval for major shifts in strategy, realignment of funding, changes in geographic focus, and other key decisions which impact on the overall implementation of Disaster READY.

The program takes a flexible, adaptive approach with AHP NGOs and DFAT engaging in regular dialogue, strategic direction setting, and assessment of overall progress and relationships through the Disaster READY Steering Committee. This committee includes a representative from DFAT Humanitarian Response and Preparedness section, each of the six lead NGOs, a disability organisation, and the AHP SU.

At the country level, Disaster READY Country Committees are responsible for coordination between NGOs as well as coordination between NGOs and DFAT Post, government and other stakeholders. Country Committees will review progress against the program outcomes and adapt annual implementation plans to respond to opportunities and challenges. The AHP SU will support both the Disaster READY Steering Committee and the Disaster READY Country Committees.

The program has been structured around an agreed set of outcomes and indicators. These provide a consistent focus across the five countries and between the three levels of the overarching program, country coordination and NGO activities. Analysis against these outcomes and indicators will enable program partners, with assistance from the AHP SU, to tell a collective story about their achievements and lessons. The bulk of the data that will be used to assess the program’s performance will be provided through the NGOs’ M&E systems at the country level. In addition, an annual small-scale evaluation (in line with the Steering Committee’s priorities) will focus on a thematic issue or be used to evaluate the response to a disaster in one of the focus countries. This will allow DFAT and the partners to assess the impact of their preparedness and localisation work. An independent evaluation will be conducted in Year 4 to inform the design of phase two of the program.

Disaster READY will be delivered through two mechanisms: ***Mechanism 1:*** Multi-year funding in the five focus countries from January 2018 to June 2022 ($32.4m). This includes direct funding to the six AHP NGO consortia of $5m each plus Shared Services funding of $2.4m. Stable, multi-year funding to NGOs enables long-term country-based planning and provides a base for innovation. Shared Services funds incentivise NGOs to improve practice on social inclusion issues, to coordinate, and to collectively respond to changes in the country context.
 ***Mechanism 2:*** Performance and Partnerships Fund (PPF) of $8.5m. This fund will be accessed via competitive grants open to the AHP consortia to scale up successful collaborations and innovations, including private sector engagement, to support community disaster preparedness in the Pacific and Timor-Leste. Two rounds of competitive grants will be opened in 2019 and 2020. There is the potential to expand the program to other Pacific countries through the second round of the PPF.

# Innovations in disaster ready





# Analysis and Strategic Context

Small island developing states are among the most vulnerable countries in the world with respect to natural disasters and climate change. The UN World Risk Index, which measures exposure to natural hazards and the capacity to cope with these events across 171 countries, places small island developing states at the top of its ranking. In addition to their limited capacity to respond to natural disasters, these countries are more frequently hit by extreme weather events than larger countries, and the economic costs of these events are much higher on average (IMF, 2016a). Climate change will only worsen the reach of natural disasters by increasing their intensity and frequency (IPCC, 2014).[[8]](#footnote-8)

Recent disaster events in the Pacific region have highlighted the high risk of natural hazards in this region and the impacts of these hazards on people and infrastructure.

* In February 2016, category five Tropical Cyclone Winston struck Fiji. A total of 30,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, leaving approximately 131,000 people in need of immediate shelter assistance. In addition, 229 schools were severely damaged or destroyed.
* In March 2015, category five Tropical Cyclone Pam hit Vanuatu. It inflicted damage and losses of about 60 per cent of GDP, affecting more than 188,000 inhabitants (more than 70 per cent of the population).
* The 2015–16 El Niño resulted in severe droughts in many countries in the Pacific and in Timor-Leste, with significant impacts on health and livelihoods.

The World Risk Register (2017)[[9]](#footnote-9) identified Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, PNG, Timor-Leste and Fiji amongst the 15 countries at highest disaster risk. The UNESCAP 2017 Asia-Pacific Disaster Report[[10]](#footnote-10) found that countries with special needs, in particular small island developing states, were expected to experience average annual losses close to four per cent of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as a result of natural disasters and the worsening impacts of climate change.

Climate change exacerbates the magnitude and impacts of natural hazards. Pacific Island countries are highly exposed to cyclones, droughts, landslides and floods, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes and tsunamis. Looking ahead, climate change predictions include an increase in extreme hot days and warm nights, extreme rainfall events, intensity of tropical cyclones in the South Pacific, sea level rise and ocean acidification[[11]](#footnote-11).

Lesser-developed states and economies are more vulnerable to disaster impacts. Since 1980, low-income countries have accounted for nine per cent of the disaster events but 48 per cent of the fatalities[[12]](#footnote-12).

Similarly, the poor and marginalised within these states are more vulnerable to the long-term negative impacts from natural disasters.

“Disasters affect the poor and vulnerable disproportionately, especially women, children, the elderly, and those recovering from the impact of conflicts. Women are more likely than men to die from disasters when their socioeconomic status is low”[[13]](#footnote-13).

Women, people with disabilities, children and the elderly have fewer assets and lower mobility as well as less opportunity to mitigate or reduce disaster risks. The injury rate for people with disabilities in Vanuatu during Cyclone Pam was 2.45 times higher than for people without disabilities[[14]](#footnote-14). In the Pacific, women are more likely to be killed by disasters compared to men and are more vulnerable to sexual and gender-based violence. Post disaster, the burden on women and girls increases disproportionately as they spend more time looking for clean water, firewood and food. Women and people with disabilities are marginalised from leadership and decision-making processes, including mechanisms to prepare for and respond to disasters.

Reducing disaster risk is critical to reducing the impact of disasters and climate change. The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030) represents international consensus on the value of disaster risk reduction (DRR). The four priorities for action are: 1) understanding disaster risk; 2) managing disaster risk and strengthening risk governance; 3) investing in risk reduction; and 4) enhancing preparedness. These priorities are referenced in the Sustainable Development Goals, which explicitly link poverty with people’s vulnerability to climate and natural disasters (Goal 1, Target 1.5) and recognise the importance of disaster- and climate-safe cities and settlements (Goal 11, Target 11.5), the value of hazard mapping and early warning systems (Goal 13, Target 13.5), and the importance of gender equality (Goal 5)[[15]](#footnote-15).

The Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific, adopted by Pacific countries in 2016, provides a multi-stakeholder platform for integrated action on disaster management and climate change. The Framework advocates an inclusive approach to planning and decision-making, recognising that decision-making and preparation are likely to be more effective when they include those most vulnerable. At national levels, resilience-orientated approaches to preparedness are at various stages of development and implementation. Most efforts at national level are not matched at the implementation level sub-nationally due to resource constraints, relatively weak capacity, and poor linkages between national and local levels of governance.

At community and family level, traditional approaches to dealing with natural hazards have developed due to remoteness and the absence of state or other service delivery. Communities are first responders; women play critical roles as primary caregivers and informal leaders during disasters while men occupy formal leadership positions. Churches and other faith-based organisations shape community beliefs about why disasters happen and the value (or otherwise) of preparedness. In addition, churches own and manage critical community assets such as schools, church buildings and storage facilities, and therefore provide a foundation to build resilience and preparedness. Communities that understand hazards, mitigate risks and prepare for disasters are more able to effectively respond to and recover from disasters[[16]](#footnote-16). In the Pacific and Timor-Leste, NGOs have been instrumental in supporting communities to reduce risks and prepare for disasters in inclusive ways[[17]](#footnote-17). Faith-based organisations have rallied frontline volunteer responders during disasters and they, together with local NGOs, are demanding a greater role in country humanitarian systems.

These regional, national and local responses are set against a global humanitarian backdrop that has shifted towards “localisation”: placing greater value on local responses to building resilience and preparedness for disasters. The 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) reinforced the critical importance of local, inclusive and context-specific approaches to humanitarian challenges, shifting the power from international actors (including INGOs, donors and the UN) to local ownership of humanitarian resources and decision-making.

In the Pacific, localisation has been defined as “*the process of recognising, respecting and strengthening the independence of leadership and decision-making by national actors in humanitarian action, in order to better address the needs of the affected populations*”[[18]](#footnote-18). This process requires a shift to greater engagement and control by national actors – government, local NGOs, faith-based organisations, and the private sector – and a corresponding change in behaviour by international actors and organisations. At one end of the spectrum, localisation can be interpreted as a form of decentralisation, e.g. from INGO headquarters to country offices often staffed and managed by local staff implementing both development and humanitarian activities. At the other end of the spectrum, it is a more radical transformation where strategic, operational and financial decisions are made by national actors, including national NGOs and faith-based organisations[[19]](#footnote-19). Localisation efforts in the Pacific and Timor-Leste span this spectrum, and localisation indicators are built into this Disaster READY design.

AHP NGOs have demonstrated their commitment to the localisation agenda, including through this design process. The Disaster READY design process has laid the foundation for ongoing collaboration between NGOs at the country level, strengthening their ability to set the direction and coordinate with DFAT Posts, and with national and local governments. DFAT and AHP NGOs headquartered in Australia have set the overarching framework and strategic direction, whilst the implementation strategies have been designed at the country level, in collaboration with DFAT Posts, national governments, and local NGOs (including DPOs). DFAT and AHP NGOs are committed to continuing a strengthened approach to country-driven implementation and collaboration, as evidenced through the country plans and NGO country-level activity plans (annexed to this overarching framework) and a governance structure that includes Country Committees.

## Development Problem and Issue Analysis

Natural disasters reverse development gains through loss of life and trauma as well as through loss of housing, schools, hospitals, roads and other infrastructure. Disasters can cause significant dislocation of populations, contribute to conflict and entrench poverty. Climate change is increasing the frequency and intensity of disasters such as cyclones, floods and droughts. In the Pacific and Timor-Leste, the range and frequency of natural hazards, combined with weak systems for disaster preparedness, risk mitigation and response, undermine development gains. For example, Cyclone Winston affected the livelihoods of more than 60 per cent of Fiji’s total population, destroyed or damaged 30,000 homes and 495 schools, and caused damage estimated at US$1.3bn ($1.7bn)[[20]](#footnote-20). The protracted El Niño-related drought in 2015–16 has had long-term impacts in Timor-Leste. Crop failures, livestock deaths, water scarcity and food insecurity affected 120,000 people, and one year on, research shows that 67 per cent of drought-affected households continue to implement negative coping measures such as reducing meal portion sizes and using household savings[[21]](#footnote-21).

Investments in DRR can result in less damage and loss when a disaster strikes, reduce the cost and improve the timeliness of a response, and accelerate recovery[[22]](#footnote-22). Despite the evidence and global policy commitments to DRR, such as the Sendai and Hyogo Frameworks, attention and resources of the humanitarian system tend to be prioritised towards short-term, life-saving responses to rapid-onset disasters rather than towards DRR. There are also other challenges confronting a ‘building resilience’ approach:

* disaster management agencies in the Pacific and Timor-Leste are siloed from other government departments and have relatively low status and funding;
* there is limited use of information about disaster and climate risks which undermines the ability to plan effectively;
* there is a lack of accessible and contextualised early warning systems;
* humanitarian mechanisms are not well-connected with communities, local civil society organisations and churches; and
* there is a disconnect between national policies, systems and resources and the operational reality at sub-national government and community levels.

The experience of women, children, and people with disabilities is particularly stark; supply-driven humanitarian responses often fail to meet their specific needs, e.g. safety from violence or physically accessible shelter.

Disaster READY addresses these development challenges by supporting communities to understand slow- and rapid-onset disaster risks, to prepare for these risks, and to reduce the risks where possible. The program will support women, people with disabilities, youth and children to have their needs recognised and met through community, sub-national and national mechanisms for disaster preparedness and response. NGOs will engage with communities and sub-national and national disaster management structures to improve coordination and government responsiveness to community needs as well as to strengthen the leadership and influence of national actors in the humanitarian system. The program goes some way to addressing the increased vulnerabilities created by climate change. For example, in Timor-Leste the program will address increasing water scarcity, which in 2015/16 contributed to the El Niño-related drought.

## Evidence Base and Lessons

The Disaster READY design is evidence-based. Source evidence has included major country-specific disaster reports, regional and global disaster reports, and evaluations from a wide range of disaster responses, DRR programs, and climate change adaptation (CCA) programs in the Pacific and Timor-Leste over the past 10 years[[23]](#footnote-23). The methodology included mapping of current DRR, climate and resilience programs to identify potential points of intersection with Disaster READY, e.g. with regional climate change programs and the UNDP Pacific Resilience Program[[24]](#footnote-24). These lessons have informed the country plans and NGO activity plans. Eight key lessons were drawn from the evidence. These were tested and endorsed with a wide range of country stakeholders involved in the Disaster READY design.

The key eight lessons, and how they have informed this program design, are summarised in the table below. Country plans include more detailed discussion of evidence and lessons in each focus country.

Table 1: Eight Key Lessons from evidence

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lesson | How this is applied in the design |
| 1. Be context relevant
* Ensure programs are relevant to country development strategies and priorities
 | Primary focus during the design has been to facilitate country stakeholders (including NGOs, national disaster management offices (NDMOs), DFAT Post, etc.) to develop realistic outcomes, indicators and management arrangements for the program that are based on community consultation and needs. |
| 1. Simplify
* NGO project objectives and outcomes were too numerous and complex. There was a need to simplify designs and have a more focused approach

  | A core set of outcomes and indicators that apply across the program has been identified following country consultations. NGOs have identified which of these are relevant for their work that they will monitor and report on.NGO designs have been reviewed by technical specialists and peer reviewed by other NGOs to ensure their work is realistic and focused. |
| 1. Start right
* Rigorous project design is essential to guide management, implementation and monitoring
* Building on existing NGO networks and partnerships has enabled NGO projects to be effective and provide value for money
* Project design, M&E and reporting systems should include clear statements of objectives, showing how these will be achieved, with measurable indicators
 | Allowing six months for the program design (and at least four months for NGO designs) and providing technical specialists to support the NGOs (in the areas of gender, disability, and M&E, plus child protection-focused sessions during in-country design workshops) has helped to ensure rigorous designs. NGO designs build on existing relationships with local partners in-country. |
| 1. Communicate and engage with government and others to enable program success
* Community development work is small-scale and local. Engagement with government provides mechanisms for scaling out successful approaches to other communities. The private sector also offers potential for supporting scaling out
* Developing advocacy skills with communities and partners enables connections between communities and government
 | Supporting improved engagement between communities and government is one of the objectives of the program. Government (e.g. NDMOs) has been consulted at several key points during the designs. NGOs in each country have committed to use and/or develop common tools for CBDRM with government.Responsiveness and engagement with government disaster management priorities and structures. |
| 1. Dream big
* Programs made up of small standalone activities that do not connect or build on each other reduce the ability to reach desired higher-level outcomes
 | The program proactively supports and incentivises coordination between NGOs at country level (e.g. through funding a country coordinator role, funding joint work on social inclusion, and requiring a joint annual review and planning forum).DFAT Posts have been actively engaged in the design and will continue this engagement through implementation. This will facilitate linkages to broader policy agendas and help bridge the divide between humanitarian and development programming.  |
| 1. Don’t rush
* Longer program timeframes are needed to establish firm relationships with government and other partners, and to influence local development planning
 | The program has a budget for each NGO consortium for 4.5 years of implementation. Such long-term and stable support to NGOs is a significant innovation in humanitarian programming. |
| 1. Use hazard and risk information in clever ways
* Combining local knowledge with new science improves the likelihood of acceptability and leads to improved effectiveness and efficiency. Finding effective ways to translate complex technical information into forms that make sense locally is essential to supporting community awareness and adaptation. NGO programs play an important role in brokering knowledge across the technical divide.
 | The program is exploring ways to access climate science through linking NGOs with DFAT’s upcoming Australia Pacific Climate Change Action Program (expected to start in late 2018).Community-based disaster risk planning by NGOs will integrate climate and disaster risks.NGOs will work with national meteorological services and local communities to improve the way in which early warnings are communicated and received. |
| 1. Inclusiveness must be front of mind
* Some programs address gender in a practical and fulfilling way while many address gender equalities in a tokenistic manner only
* Gender-responsive DRR had positive impacts on community-level preparation, response and recovery resulting from Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu
* Supporting the involvement of people with disabilities requires more work and attention; in the past, their involvement has been largely restricted to activities that facilitated disabled access and not about genuine involvement in all aspects of a program
* Child-centred approaches to vulnerability assessments, adaptation planning, and local action provide unique and essential inputs to overall community resilience
 | Gender equality and disability inclusion have been addressed from the inception of the design with guidance papers and technical support for NGO designs from gender and disability humanitarian specialists; gender, disability and child protection sessions during all design workshops; active involvement of DPOs in the design process and program governance mechanisms; and participation of women’s and LGBTQI organisations in design workshops. Shared services at country level focuses on gender equality, disability inclusion and child protection, drawing on NGO technical expertise; progress in these areas will be reviewed annually.  |

## Rationale for Australian DFAT Engagement

Alongside Pacific Island governments and communities, Australia is a first responder to disasters in the Pacific and Timor-Leste. Australia has a clear interest in supporting neighbouring countries to build their own humanitarian capability. The Australian Government’s 2017 Foreign Policy White Paper recognises the critical role played by local governments and partners in advancing a secure, self-reliant and prosperous Indo-Pacific. The White Paper emphasises the importance of investing in local and national capacity to better prepare for and respond to natural disasters. In particular, it recognises the value of local partners, who have a comprehensive understanding of local contexts and can often reach vulnerable groups that are otherwise difficult to access.

One of Australia’s key aid investment priorities articulated in the Australian Aid policy (2014)[[25]](#footnote-25) is to build resilience through humanitarian assistance, disaster risk reduction and social protection. Reducing risk and building resilience to future disasters is a priority not only to save lives but also for sustainable economic growth[[26]](#footnote-26). DFAT’s Humanitarian Strategy (2016)[[27]](#footnote-27) articulates four objectives for Australia’s humanitarian investments: supporting reform and innovation to strengthen humanitarian action; reducing disaster risk; supporting preparedness and response capabilities in the Indo-Pacific; and enabling early recovery efforts. Australia has a portfolio of humanitarian investments through the UN and Pacific regional organisations and through national governments in the focus countries as articulated in the DFAT Pacific Humanitarian Strategy[[28]](#footnote-28).

Disaster READY responds to each of the four objectives of the DFAT Humanitarian Strategy and has a specific focus on the thematic priorities of the policy: gender equality and women’s empowerment; disability inclusiveness; child protection; and robust monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning. The focus of Disaster READY is at the community level, recognising the strength, depth and reach of AHP NGOs in the Pacific and Timor-Leste built over many years, including through the Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) and other programs. The selection of AHP NGOs to the broader partnership reflects experience and technical specialisation across all aspects of the disaster management cycle. This includes disaster risk reduction and preparedness, disaster response and recovery. Disaster READY provides a clear and coherent funding window to the selected NGOs and their consortium partners to deliver holistic disaster management outcomes in the Pacific and Timor-Leste.

Disaster READY is in line with the WHS Grand Bargain commitment to increase collaborative humanitarian multi-year planning and funding as well as the shift in the Sendai Framework to longer-term development investments in DRR. Through this investment, Australia meets its commitments under the Sendai Framework to provide adequate and sustainable support to developing countries to increase the number of local DRR strategies and to improve people’s access to early warning systems, and disaster risk information and assessments.

Australia is committed to localisation. Working through NGOs is a key strategy to achieving this. Disaster READY is the prime vehicle for DFAT to support communities, local NGOs and faith-based organisations, national offices of INGOs, and national and local disaster management agencies to improve their ability to influence and lead disaster response[[29]](#footnote-29). Disaster READY is the only DFAT regional program focusing on humanitarian preparedness and localisation at community level, outside of some commitments made by NGOs through their ANCP activities.

DFAT’s Humanitarian Partnership Agreement[[30]](#footnote-30) (HPA) program (2011–2016) supported NGOs to work on DRR through short-term (annual) funding. A number of standalone activities were delivered across the world. Many of these were successful but not scaled up or linked to broader systematic change in disaster risk management or development programs. Disaster READY builds on the achievements of the HPA and addresses the constraints. Disaster READY has increased the timeframe for delivery to four and a half years, has doubled the funding available, and has identified countries in the Pacific and Timor-Leste to enable a more context-driven and systematic approach to achieve change.

The delivery approach for Disaster READY – with a large number of preselected AHP NGO consortia – does give rise to a continued risk of fragmentation and duplication[[31]](#footnote-31). The program takes a geographic and thematic focus to concentrate resources and support well-coordinated, systematic interventions. This will also be a central consideration for the annual review and assessment by the NGOs in each country and by the Steering Committee.

NGO interventions in the five focus countries are designed to complement rather than duplicate bilateral and regional efforts, and Disaster READY seeks to leverage and support other resilience programming, including DFAT climate change investments.

## Geographic Focus

Disaster READY will focus its resources and effort on five countries which have high strategic interest to DFAT, high disaster risk ratings, and existing strong presence and engagement of AHP NGOs. According to the World Risk Report[[32]](#footnote-32), the five Disaster READY countries are among the top 15 countries worldwide that are most at risk to disasters. **Vanuatu** was ranked the world’s most at-risk country, **Solomon Islands** (6), **Timor-Leste** (10), **PNG** (11) and **Fiji** (15). Underpinning the approach is a foundation of:

* DFAT Post engagement in the ongoing direction and implementation;
* continuing NGO coordination and collaboration at national levels; and
* continued buy-in and engagement by local partners in the program.

These (and other criteria) will be assessed annually at country level and across the overall program, and resources may be shifted to higher-performance countries based on this assessment (see Monitoring and Evaluation section).

The focus on five countries notwithstanding, demand and need for investment in DRR is high right across the Pacific. The program has therefore built in a degree of resourcing to allow investments in other Pacific countries through a competitive grants window, the Disaster READY PPF (round two), and in a potential phase two of AHP (2022 onwards).

## Thematic Focus

The Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP) details the disaster cycle faced by member countries. It identifies a broad range of possible interventions from prevention through to response and reconstruction, and demonstrates how disaster and climate change actions can be integrated. The FRDP potential interventions at each stage of the cycle have informed this design and are summarised below[[33]](#footnote-33) in Figure 1, which shows the spectrum of interventions from both disaster and climate change perspectives.

***Figure 1 FRDP disaster risk management and climate change adaptation cycles***



There is a wide range of potential investments to prevent disasters, to limit their impact, and to prepare for disasters. Disaster prevention often requires large-scale investments beyond the scope of a single NGO program. However, through the AHP, NGO efforts can be made more effective and have a greater impact through joint efforts. Disaster READY prioritises collaborative efforts for disaster preparedness and recognises that in practice, community-level “preparedness” and “limiting impacts” often overlap, and NGOs can therefore gain efficiencies for development outcomes. For example, in communities at risk of drought, the installation of roof water collection systems can be considered both a preparedness measure and a measure that limits impacts or risks. It can also have broader development impacts for health and sanitation.

The focus on preparedness is informed by recognition that CCA and resilience building are addressed through a range of development investments including CCA programs (DFAT and Green Climate Fund); bilateral programs on agriculture, markets system development, and water and sanitation; local strengthening of health and education services at the frontline; a range of infrastructure programs that use appropriate technologies for the risk profile; and initiatives through the Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) and its commitment to resilience building in the Pacific. The design of Disaster READY locates coordination and decision-making at the country level, ensuring that country context and relationships drive the program. This will make it easier for AHP NGOs to align with bilateral and other programs at the country level.

## Innovation and Private Sector Engagement

Disaster READY brings innovations in the coordinated NGO delivery mechanism to deliver effective and efficient preparedness programs. Long-term humanitarian funding provides a basis for building a performance culture between NGOs, with annual reviews at country level to assess progress against country plan objectives and progress on social inclusion issues. Country plans, Country Committees and Shared Services support AHP NGOs to coordinate and collaborate, maximising opportunities for impact and scale beyond the limited reach that small-scale activities usually bring. Dedicated Shared Services funding has been built into the program to incentivise learning and continuous improvement by NGOs on humanitarian action and gender equality, disability inclusion and child protection. This includes dedicated support for DPO participation in country-level activities and decision-making. NGOs will be facilitated by the AHP SU to collectively assess and respond to changing contexts and priorities in focus countries each year. In addition, the AHP SU will facilitate a regional learning event to promote sharing of lessons and good practice across countries.

The multi-year core funding provided to the NGOs from the start of the design process has provided space for NGOs to collaborate and share technical skills, knowledge and relationships. This would not have been possible under a competitive annual funding round. This builds on the experience of several highly successful DFAT programs such as the Australian Africa Community Engagement Scheme (AACES) which demonstrated that reducing competition is vital to allow the space for coordination, learning and innovation.

Disaster READY also recognises that a complementary competitive process can incentivise performance. The PPF provides incentives for strong performance, collaboration and innovative approaches to community disaster preparedness and risk reduction. Funding rounds will open after Disaster READY implementation has started, and NGOs will be expected to show evidence of strong performance and collaboration through multi-year funding.

For more information on innovation refer to the innovation infographic in the Executive Summary.

The private sector is an important partner during humanitarian response. AHP NGOs will build relationships with the private sector, particularly those that present opportunities to strengthen value chains and build resilience in market systems. NGOs have deepened their partnerships with the private sector through the design phase, and specific investments include:

* market assessments for cash transfer schemes in Fiji and Vanuatu (Save the Children and Oxfam);
* use of mobile phone companies for communications about preparedness and disaster information (all NGOs in Timor-Leste);
* regional logistics training developed with input from Toll Logistics, and private sector staff targeted for logistics training (Save the Children);
* business continuity planning to support communities in the Solomon Islands (World Vision);
* supply chain innovations with local design and manufacture of housing and other disaster response materials (Habitat for Humanity and Field Ready); and
* improving the supply chain for pre-positioned supplies with local and Australian business church members (CAN DO Fiji).

Competitive grants through the PPF will offer opportunities to scale up successful NGO private sector engagement.

# Investment Description

## Logic and Expected Outcomes

The purpose and objectives of Disaster READY have been developed through extensive consultation over a five-month period with DFAT Humanitarian Response, Risk and Recovery Branch, DFAT Posts, AHP NGOs and their local partners, and stakeholders in each of the five countries (e.g. NDMOs and other government agencies, UN agencies, Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific agencies, DPOs and the Red Cross) (see Annex 3 Design Process).

### Purpose Statement

The overarching purpose of AHP Disaster READY[[34]](#footnote-34) is to:

**Strengthen local humanitarian capability and preparedness in the Pacific and Timor-Leste so that communities are better able to respond to and recover from rapid- and slow-onset disasters.**

Humanitarian capability refers to the systems, knowledge, skills and practices that enable effective action to reduce disaster risks, and to prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters. By focusing on communities, the purpose notes the critical role they play in managing disasters – in terms of preparing themselves for disaster, and as vital first (and sometimes the only) responders. The focus reflects the established relationships and experience of NGOs in working with communities in the Pacific and Timor-Leste and recognises the importance of localisation (shifting power in the humanitarian system to local actors). The purpose statement recognises the impact of rapid-onset disasters such as cyclones, earthquakes, floods, landslides and tsunami as well as slow-onset disasters related to climate changes such as drought. Moreover, it recognises the need for recovery processes that help to reduce future risk.

### Objectives

Five objectives (or end-of-investment outcomes) articulate how the purpose will be achieved. These are:

1. Communities are better prepared for rapid- and slow-onset disasters
2. The rights and needs of women, people with disabilities, youth and children are being met in disaster preparedness and response at all levels
3. Government, NGOs, the private sector and communities coordinate more effectively for inclusive disaster preparedness and response
4. National NGOs[[35]](#footnote-35) and faith-based organisations have more influence and capacity in the country humanitarian system
5. AHP NGOs work effectively together and with other relevant stakeholders

The first objective focuses on the ability of communities to understand disaster and climate risks, to reduce risks and have preparedness plans in place to respond to disasters as well as early warning systems that are accessible to all. The second objective highlights the importance of addressing the needs and rights of marginalised people, including women, people with disabilities, youth and children in humanitarian preparedness and response. The third objective identifies the ways in which coordination between government, NGOs, the private sector and communities is necessary to ensure that disaster preparedness and response is inclusive and effective. The fourth objective sets out an agenda for localisation by increasing the influence and capacity of national NGOs and faith-based organisations in the country humanitarian system. The fifth objective directs AHP NGOs to coordinate and build on each other’s strengths to address social inclusion at country level as well as to bridge the divide between development and humanitarian programming. This objective recognises that AHP partners and other international actors need to be locally sensitive when deployed to support response efforts.

The purpose and objectives are common across all five countries.

A simple program logic outlining the relationship between the purpose and objectives is presented in Figure 2 below. It illustrates the connections between the objectives: Objective 2, relating to social inclusion, sits across and supports Objective 1 (community preparedness), Objective 3 (coordination between government and other stakeholders), and Objective 4 (national NGOs and faith-based organisations having greater influence). Similarly, Objective 5 (coordination within and between NGOs) also supports progress in the other four objectives.

*Figure 2: Program Logic for Disaster READY*

 

### Outcomes

A series of outcomes have been identified for each objective. These are discussed further below.

**Objective 1: Communities are better prepared for rapid- and slow-onset disasters**

This objective focuses on communities understanding disaster and climate risks, taking steps to reduce these risks, and planning to respond to disasters when they strike. AHP NGOs have a critical role in accessing and translating climate and disaster science to help communities understand the risks in their locality, to develop plans to reduce risks and prepare for disasters, and to action those plans including through seeking support from sub-national government systems.

AHP NGOs will work with meteorological services and NDMOs to improve early warnings so that all community members can take appropriate action before a disaster. Warnings need to be accessible to women and men, people with disabilities, and children and youth; all should be able to act on those warnings. In the focus countries, community-based disaster and climate risk planning is a recognised element of the government disaster management system; however, coverage, consistency of approaches, inclusion and sustainability all require attention.

The relatively modest resources at country level through Disaster READY will enable NGOs to contribute towards an increase in the coverage of community-based disaster and climate risk reduction, preparedness and planning. Identifying successful approaches that are inclusive and sustainable and sharing this evidence will be a focus for annual reviews and the regional learning event.

The outcomes sought through this objective are outlined below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Objective | Outcomes  |
| 1. Communities are better prepared for rapid- and slow-onset disasters
 | * 1. Communities understand likely hazards and risks and have knowledge, skills and resources to manage these
	2. Community disaster mechanisms*[[36]](#footnote-36)* are prepared for and are responding to rapid- and slow-onset disasters
	3. Communities understand, and seek support from sub-national*[[37]](#footnote-37)* government planning and budget processes and other funding sources to prepare for and respond to disasters
	4. Women, men, people with disabilities, and children demand, access, understand and act on early warning information for rapid- and slow-onset disasters
 |

 **Objective 2: The rights and needs of women, people with disabilities, youth and children are being met in disaster preparedness and response at all levels**
Disasters do not impact all people in the same way. Existing social exclusion and marginalisation are exacerbated during disasters. Women, people with disabilities, children, youth and other marginalised people (such as LGBTQI people and the elderly) have less access to resources and decision-making; they are more likely to experience harm and exploitation during disasters.

For disaster preparedness and response to meet the needs and rights of marginalised people, disaster management structures, practices, procedures, policies, and laws from community level to national level need to change. Representation of marginalised people in decision-making structures is one aspect of change. All community members, including men, boys, faith leaders and other community leaders also need to address the barriers of exclusion. In order to support these changes, AHP NGOs are required to build their own capability to support inclusion in both their external work and their internal operations. This will be further supported through the Shared Services mechanism.

The outcomes sought through this objective are outlined below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Outcomes**  |
| 1. **The rights and needs of women, people with disabilities, youth and children are being met in disaster preparedness and response at all levels**
 | * 1. Increased representation and capacity of women, people with disabilities, youth and children[[38]](#footnote-38) in disaster committees[[39]](#footnote-39) and planning processes, particularly at community and sub-national levels
	2. Humanitarian operating practices, procedures, policies, laws and tools from community to national level incorporate and are responsive to rights and needs of women, people with disabilities, youth and children
	3. All community members including men and boys, faith leaders and other community leaders and government staff address the barriers that prevent women, people with disabilities, youth and children from having their rights and needs met in disaster preparedness and response
	4. AHP NGOs apply more inclusive approaches in their internal and external preparedness and response planning
 |

 **Objective 3: Government, NGOs, the private sector and communities coordinate more effectively for inclusive disaster preparedness and response**
Effective coordination between government, NGOs, the private sector and communities is essential for ensuring that disaster responses address the needs of affected people. Those needs have to be rapidly assessed and communicated to disaster response command centres for appropriate and coordinated responses that engage all available resources from government, NGOs, the private sector, and communities themselves. Disaster preparedness includes establishing and ensuring functioning systems for coordination that recognise and incorporate the strengths and resources of local actors. In each of the focus countries, governments have mandated disaster committees or clusters at national and sub-national levels. National offices of INGOs play an important role in supporting these government-led committees, including as active co-chairs of national clusters or committees.

This work will be supported and deepened through Disaster READY, particularly at the sub-national level, and with greater representation of local NGOs and faith-based organisations. Critical areas for coordination include ensuring that evacuation centres are safe and inclusive; improved communications; improved logistics to increase efficiency and reach during a response; and adapting and operationalising systems for cash transfers in some countries. AHP NGOs will engage in these areas with a focus on supporting community engagement and supporting systems that are inclusive of women, people with disabilities, children and youth.

The outcomes sought through this objective are outlined below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Outcomes** |
| 1. **Government, NGOs, the private sector and communities coordinate more effectively for inclusive disaster preparedness and response**
 | * 1. National and sub-national *[[40]](#footnote-40)* disaster committees are functioning
	2. Sub-national governments are better able to respond to community needs during rapid- and slow-onset disasters
	3. Evacuation centres including schools, churches and other community facilities are safe and accessible for women, people with disabilities and children
	4. Improved two-way communications between communities and government for preparedness, early warnings, disaster impact and response
	5. Cash transfer and logistics preparedness processes developed through regional platforms are adapted to and operational in some countries
 |

 **Objective 4: National NGOs and faith-based organisations have more influence and capacity in the country humanitarian system**
National offices of INGOs, local NGOs, and faith-based organisations such as churches are frontline responders during disasters. They often have deep understanding of the communities with whom they work. In the focus countries, these organisations are development-oriented; given the many recent disasters, however, they have become increasingly engaged in humanitarian response. They can be sidelined by government and international actors during a major disaster response.

AHP NGOs will support local NGOs, faith-based organisations, and national offices of INGOs to build their organisational capacity for disaster response and preparedness in order for them to take a more active, informed role both before and during disasters. This objective recognises that localisation in the focus countries is both about decentralisation by AHP NGOs to country offices and, in some cases, more radical transformation, e.g. where strategic, operational and financial decisions are made indisputably by local NGOs and faith-based organisations. These elements of localisation will increase the prospect that national NGOs will be recognised as key partners of government during a disaster response and increase the likelihood that responses will meet the needs of affected people.

The outcomes sought through this objective are outlined below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Outcomes** |
| 1. **National NGOs and faith-based organisations have more influence and capacity in the country humanitarian system**
 | * 1. Local NGOs and faith-based organisations are better represented in national and sub-national disaster coordination mechanisms
	2. National NGOs and faith based organisations have improved organisational capacity for disaster preparedness and response, including policies, processes, equipment and distribution systems
	3. National NGOs have greater influence with respect to INGO headquarters and the country humanitarian system
 |

 **Objective 5: AHP NGOs work effectively together and with other relevant stakeholders**
Close coordination is expected between AHP NGOs and other stakeholders at country level to build relationships, to develop consistent approaches to community preparedness, and to learn from each other’s strengths and experiences. This coordination is essential to meet the ambition that Disaster READY go beyond a series of small but worthy NGO DRR activities to affect more systemic change in focus countries. The objective also sets the ambition that AHP NGOs take good practice from humanitarian work into their development programming.

The outcomes sought through this objective are outlined below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Outcomes** |
| 1. AHP NGOs work effectively together and with other relevant stakeholders
 | * 1. AHP NGOs are well coordinated and engaging with government, Red Cross, women’s and other NGOs, and donors
	2. AHP NGOs are using shared services to champion inclusive approaches and demonstrate and share impact
	3. AHP NGOs are using good practices from humanitarian programs to mainstream disaster preparedness and risk reduction into other work
 |

See also Annex 1 Objective, Outcome, Indicators Table; and Annex 6 Summary of Activities in each country.

## Delivery Mechanisms and Resources

AHP Disaster READY will be delivered through two mechanisms:

1. ***Mechanism 1:*** Multi-year funding in the five focus countries from January 2018 to June 2022. This includes direct funding to six AHP NGO consortia of $5m each (total of $30m over 4.5 years) plus shared services funding of $2.4m (over 4.5 years).
2. ***Mechanism 2:*** Performance and Partnerships Fund (PPF) of $8.5m This fund will be accessed via competitive grants open to the AHP consortia to scale up successful, collaborative approaches to community disaster preparedness in the Pacific and Timor-Leste. Two rounds of competitive grants will be opened in 2019 and 2020.

A program budget with Mechanisms 1 and 2 and management costs is at Annex 7. A program timeline is at Annex 8.

Mechanism 1 Multi-year AHP NGO funds

Multi-year funding ($5m per AHP NGO consortium, $30m total) is expected to be spread across four and a half years. Annual allocations will be determined each year by the AHP leads/consortia, in consultation with DFAT. AHP consortia were required to develop activity plans that build on existing relationships, target resources to achieve impact and maximise coordination at country level, as articulated in country plans (see Annex 3 Design Guidelines). Through the design process, AHP consortia decided which countries they would work in and which consortia and local partners they would work with (see Annex 2 for details). There is an overall funding limit of $5m to PNG to ensure resources are not too heavily weighted to this larger country. There is also a limit of 10 per cent for regional activities, which are defined as activities which are delivered to countries or people from outside the five focus countries or primarily engage with regional institutions (such as the Pacific Disability Forum (PDF) or the Pacific Shelter Cluster). Where AHP NGOs are developing regional policies, standards or training, their activity plans show how these will be translated into practice in one or more of the five countries.

Each AHP NGO consortium has undertaken a participatory design process in each country. Activity plans set out a detailed situational, gender and disability analysis; the design logic and outcomes; the M&E approach; and an annual implementation plan and budget. In Vanuatu and Timor-Leste, AHP NGOs have existing strong, collaborative working relationships; they worked together to conduct shared analysis and to produce a joint program logic and M&E framework. In the other countries, AHP NGOs are at earlier stages of coordination and opted to pursue individual activity plans.

Flexibility is built into the program through the annual review, learning, and planning process. Each year NGOs will submit annual implementation plans for each activity, following the annual review forum. NGOs are expected to revise funding allocations based on activity performance and contribution to country plan outcomes. Annual implementation plans will be reviewed and approved by DFAT HRS and Posts. DFAT will also determine the amount of funding and whether all activities are continued in each of the five countries based on performance. This will include an assessment of NGO results achieved and whether these are sufficient given the stage of project implementation, the level of engagement with and from DFAT Post, and coordination between AHP NGOs.

Budget estimates by country for Shared Services are at Annex 7. This information will be updated each year in the country plans.  **Country plans** have been developed for each of the five focus countries. These plans identify which AHP NGOs will work in the country and their local partners; funding allocations; and the objectives, outcomes and indicators which will be collectively addressed in that country. Country plans articulate how AHP NGOs will coordinate and undertake collaborative work, including sharing services and building expertise on gender, disability, child protection and, in some cases, child rights. AHP NGOs worked together during the design process and will continue to operate as a country governance committee during implementation (see Governance and Management arrangements below). Country plans identify how Country Committees will engage with DFAT Posts, government disaster management mechanisms, the Red Cross, women’s and other NGOs, and donor programs.

The AHP SU will support the Country Committee to annually review progress against the country plan outcomes, monitor risks and set priorities for the coming year (see Governance and Monitoring and Evaluation sections below). DFAT and the AHP SU will aim to engage the Steering Committees and Country Committees with the APCCAP climate science specialists and an all-hazard DRR specialist as part of the annual planning cycle.

**Mechanism 1 Shared Services**

Shared services funds ($2.4m total) incentivise NGOs to improve practice on social inclusion issues, to coordinate, and to collectively respond to changes in the country context. Different AHP NGOs have different strengths in social inclusion. Shared services recognises these strengths, with different NGOs leading improved practices with other AHP NGOs in the country. For example, in a number of countries, CARE will lead on improving practices across all partners on gender equality. In all countries, shared services will also be used to support meaningful engagement by the relevant DPO in AHP decision-making and activities. The shared services fund also provides $30,000/year for an NGO to take the lead in coordinating Country Committee members and driving processes to share information, build consistency, and identify opportunities for joint work, including M&E. Shared services priorities are identified annually and managed through the Country Committees under the leadership of the coordinating NGO (this position can be rotated after 12 months).

Base funding of $250,000 (total for the 4.5 years) is allocated to each of the five countries (total $1.25m over 4.5 years). The remaining $1.15m will be allocated annually, based on the funding level through Mechanism 1 multi-year funding (See Annex 7 for Shared Services budget). Details of shared services are included in country plans. **Timing**

A detailed timeline is at Annex 8. Below are the key dates for annual review, planning and approvals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| September / October 2018 | Annual country review and planning forum |
| 31 October 2018 | AHP NGO Annual Activity Reports dueCountry Committee Shared Services Reports due AHP NGO Annual Activity Implementation Plans dueCountry Committee Shared Services Proposals due |
| November 2018 | DFAT HRS and Posts review plans. DFAT HRS approves plans and budgets.Country plans updated by AHP SU in consultation with Country Committees |
| December 2018 | Contracting for 2019 |

Mechanism 2 the Performance and Partnerships Fund

The Performance and Partnerships Fund (PPF) aims to support the scale-up of good practice, innovation, and collaboration between NGOs. The PPF will have a total budget of $8.5m over two rounds in 2019 and 2020.

The objectives of the PPF are to:

1. Encourage AHP NGOs and their local partners to scale up successful approaches to disaster preparedness, risk reduction and localisation, including reinforcing and building on country-based coordination and collaboration.
2. Ensure a rigorous evidence base on the effectiveness of the approaches and disseminate evidence of the lessons and benefits of these approaches widely.
3. Facilitate collaboration, learning and improvement across the AHP NGO consortia.
4. Respond to emerging priorities for the AHP partnership in disaster preparedness and risk reduction in the Pacific and Timor-Leste.

**Funding amounts, rounds and eligibility**

A total of $8.5m will be granted through two rounds of funding in the first quarter of 2019 and 2020. To support the scale-up of successful approaches, all of round one funding and at least 50 per cent of funding for round 2 will be for the focus countries. Round 2 will provide an opportunity for successful programs to have a small trial in new countries where Disaster READY may look to extend in the second phase (2022+).

Grants will be awarded for a maximum of up to two and half years in Round 1 and two years and five months in Round 2. Proposals can be for multiple countries or a single country. Proposals must be submitted through the AHP NGO consortia leads for contracting purposes. Opportunities for joint work with the Red Cross Emerging Priorities Fund could also be explored. **PPF Selection Criteria**

Detailed selection criteria will be developed for each round in consultation with the Steering Committee. Likely criteria include:

* Contribution to the Disaster READY purpose and objectives
* Evidence of successful past performance for scale-up
* Emerging DFAT priorities
* Potential to generate evidence or learning
* Potential to have influence and impact at scale

Selection and assessment criteria will favour partnerships between AHP NGOs, and/or the Red Cross or private sector organisations.

In developing the selection criteria DFAT will consider whether a funding for proposals is appropriate, in consultation with the Steering Committee.

In order to provide a rigorous and independent evaluation of the success or potential of an approach, NGOs will be required to partner with a research institution to be eligible for the Fund. At the very least, the research partner should oversight the evaluation methodology, analysis and reporting.

The NGOs must include a communication strategy in their proposal, outlining how they will maximise the influence and uptake of the approach into broader policy and practice areas.

Final selection criteria, the application process, and funding available in each round will be determined by the DFAT Humanitarian Preparedness and Response Section and other sections within the Humanitarian, NGOs and Partnerships Division; the AHP SU will also provide support.

**Timing**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| October 2018 | Annual country reviews – sharing of results from the first nine months of implementation and relevant bridge fund activities. |
| December 2018 | AHP NGOs and DFAT identify priorities for the PPF through the Disaster READY Steering Committee. |
| January 2019 | DFAT issues selection criteria, application forms, and timetable for submission and selection  |
| March 2019 | **Round 1:** Grants announced, funding from April 2019 to September 2021 (report due as part of the NGO annual report by the end of October).  |
| October 2019 | Annual country reviews. Reporting on PPF Round 1 grant implementation to be included in annual country reviews |
| December 2019 | AHP NGOs and DFAT jointly identify priorities for the PPF through the Disaster READY Steering Committee. |
| January 2020 | DFAT issues selection criteria, application forms, and timetable for submission and selection  |
| March 2020 | **Round 2:** Grants announced, funding from April 2020 to June 2022.  |

 **Selection committee**

Selection will be undertaken by a committee chaired by the Director of Humanitarian Preparedness and Response Section, one or more independent experts[[41]](#footnote-41), and other DFAT humanitarian and Pacific experts. Feedback will also be requested from social inclusion, protection and poverty, and social transfers experts. Selection will be based on an assessment of written proposals, including budgets. A summary of selected proposals will be made available to all AHP NGOs.

# Governance and Management Arrangements

## Governance

AHP Disaster READY is an initiative of the DFAT Humanitarian, NGOs and Partnerships Division (HPD) in partnership with six AHP NGO leads. It is supported by the AHP SU. All final funding decisions, including annual tranches and PPF grants, will be approved by DFAT[[42]](#footnote-42). These decisions will be informed by a robust country annual review and planning process as well as the views of Steering Committee members. DFAT will also hold final approval for major shifts in program strategy, realignment of funding, changes in geographic focus, or other key decisions which impact on the overall implementation of Disaster READY.

In line with the collaborative intent of Disaster READY, strategic direction setting and assessment of overall progress and relationships between AHP NGOs and DFAT at the program level will be managed through the Disaster READY Steering Committee. At the country level, Disaster READY Country Committees (formed as working groups during the design) are responsible for coordination between NGOs and between the NGOs and DFAT Post, government and other stakeholders. Country Committees are also responsible for assessing progress against the country plans and setting shared service priorities. The AHP SU will support both the Disaster READY Steering Committee and the Disaster READY Country Committees.

*Figure 3: Disaster READY Governance Arrangements*

 

 **Disaster READY Steering Committee**

The **Steering Committee** is responsible for strategic direction setting and assessment of overall progress and relationships between AHP NGOs and DFAT at the program level. The Steering Committee should take the views of Country Committees into account. Committee meetings will be held in Melbourne or Canberra, with teleconference facilities for participants in other locations. Face-to-face meetings with all representatives will be aligned with the regional forum[[43]](#footnote-43).

***Membership***

* Director of the DFAT Humanitarian Response and Partnerships Section (Chair)
* One representative from each of the six AHP lead NGOs
* One position shared between CBM and the Pacific Disability Forum[[44]](#footnote-44)
* One representative from the AHP SU
* The Country Committee coordinator can attend as an observer

The Committee will aim to achieve gender balance.

***Functions***

1. Review and endorse country results and activity plans against overall program outcomes and objectives.
2. Make recommendations on program strategy issues and emerging priorities, including coordination and learning with regional disaster and climate programs such as APCCAP.
3. Identify priorities for thematic evaluations and communications materials, taking the views of Country Committees into account.
4. Identify challenges or issues requiring management responses.
5. Review and endorse the selection criteria for each round of the PPF, taking the views of Country Committees into account.
6. Review and endorse the terms of reference for the independent evaluation of the program in Year 4, taking the views of Country Committees into account.

***Meetings***

Steering Committee meetings will be held quarterly in Year 1 (at the same time as AHP quarterly meetings) and six-monthly thereafter. Meetings will be based in Australia. The AHP SU will be responsible for calling meetings, preparing the agenda and minutes, and supporting the Committee Chair as required. Meeting minutes will be shared with Country Committees.

**Disaster READY Country Committees**

AHP NGOs implementing in each country and a representative from the relevant DPO form the membership of Country Committees (see Annex 12 for details). Decisions will be by consensus or by vote where consensus cannot be reached. Committees will aim for gender balance and representation by nationals (see Annex 12 for data).

Funding to enable coordination ($30,000 annually) is included as part of the Shared Services budget to provide a level of cost recovery for a Committee Coordinator who will be nominated by an AHP NGO on a rotating basis. It is recognised that the Country Committee Coordinator role requires a level of leadership as the position maintains representational functions on behalf of the AHP NGOs in each country. The Coordinator’s role includes government and DFAT engagement. Given this, the coordinating AHP NGO has been encouraged to nominate senior staff, such as a country or program director. The coordinating NGO is accountable to the other AHP NGOs represented on the Country Committee.

Shared Services supports improved practice on gender equality, disability inclusion and child protection in humanitarian preparedness and response. In each country NGOs have been nominated by the Country Committee to lead on gender, disability or child protection based on their recognised expertise in the area. Shared Services funding supports the lead NGO to deliver a program of joint learning and practice improvement across Country Committee members. This program will be assessed and plans will be updated during the annual review.

Where a dispute cannot be resolved by the Country Committee, the issue should be escalated by the coordinating NGO to the AHP SU and then to the DFAT representative on the Steering Committee.

Other stakeholders can be invited to attend committee meetings as non-voting representatives. Key stakeholders include DFAT Post, the NDMO or other relevant government ministries, national Red Cross, and women’s and other NGOs or UN agencies.

***Functions***

The **purpose** of the Country Committee is to improve disaster preparedness by:

1. increasing the reach, geographic coverage, and effectiveness of the NGOs’ work;
2. supporting consistency, collaboration and coordination;
3. preventing duplication;
4. increasing efficiency by pooling resources and expertise; and
5. enabling greater influence on the humanitarian system.

The **functions** of the Country Committee:

* Ensure coordinated and streamlined engagement between the AHP NGOs and stakeholders in-country (e.g. DFAT, NDMO, women’s and other relevant departments, Red Cross, DPOs, women’s and other NGOs, and donors)
* Annually review progress against the country plan with key stakeholders and revise the country plan where necessary (with assistance from the AHP SU). This includes:
	+ assessing progress against country plan outcomes
	+ assessing progress on social inclusion through shared services and agreeing on a forward plan for shared services
	+ reviewing changes in the operating environment and risks, and updating the risk register
* Coordinate annual implementation plans and identify and respond to opportunities for coordinating and collaboration
* Support coordination and communication with the DFAT Posts
* Make recommendations to the Steering Committee on strategy issues, emerging priorities, evaluations, communications, and PPF selection criteria, and identify challenges requiring management responses

Country Committee meetings will be held quarterly. The AHP SU will maintain monthly contact with the Country Committees through the Committee Coordinator.

It should be noted that the Country Committee is intended as a governance mechanism for the Disaster READY program only. It is not intended to play a role during an AHP rapid response activation, which will continue to operate as a competitive funding process under the AHP Standard Operating Procedures. However, it is intended that closer coordination and collaboration between partners through the Disaster READY program will assist with more collaborative efforts during rapid response activations.

**AHP NGOs**

AHP lead NGOs are the contract leads for their consortia. They are responsible for:

* having a representative at Steering Committee meetings and representing the views of their country-based teams and consortium members;
* communicating in a timely way with their country and consortium members about the strategic directions, recommendations and decisions of the Steering Committee;
* engaging in the annual program review and planning processes and sharing lessons learnt across their countries of operation;
* managing annual activity reporting and planning (as per contracts); and
* providing photos and other material for communications products.

**DFAT Humanitarian Response, Risk and Recovery Branch**

The Director of the Humanitarian Response and Partnerships Section (HRS) is the chair of the Steering Committee. The Humanitarian Response, Risk and Recovery Branch is responsible for:

* ensuring that the strategic direction of the Disaster READY program aligns with DFAT Humanitarian policy priorities;
* linking Disaster READY with relevant humanitarian staff and initiatives in Canberra and at Posts;
* overseeing the work of the AHP SU and providing financial approvals (such as annual tranches) for Disaster READY;
* communicating with Posts about Disaster READY and representing Post views in the Steering Committee;
* having oversight and providing timely feedback on program performance;
* reviewing NGO annual reports and approving activity plans;
* providing approval for any key changes in program strategy and operations as Disaster READY progresses;
* determining final selection, application process, and funding available in each round of the PPF
* forming Assessment Committees for the review of proposals under the PPF;
* participating in the regional forums and possibly the annual reviews at country level;
* participating in program evaluations (as required);
* managing internal communications and media products (including government press releases; Twitter feeds and other social media; government reports and assessments); and
* commissioning the independent evaluation of the program in Year 4.

**DFAT Posts**

DFAT Posts are a key partner and stakeholder for the Country Committees. DFAT Posts provide advice and guidance to the Country Committee and to DFAT Humanitarian, NGOs and Partnership Division about the implementation and continued relevance of the country plan and activity plans to bilateral priorities.

Engagement by the Post is necessary to ensure that AHP is well linked to other bilateral and regional investments, particularly in DRR and climate change resilience.

The role of the DFAT Post is to:

* + maintain regular communication with the Country Committees, including through attendance at committee meetings on invitation;
	+ participate in the annual review and planning workshops – likely to be in mid-October;
	+ review AHP NGO annual reports and activity plans;
	+ ensure AHP NGO plans are aligned with DFAT bilateral priorities;
	+ ensure AHP is well linked to current or new bilateral and regional work; and
	+ identify and support public diplomacy opportunities.

## Management and support

Support and management of the Disaster READY program is a function of the AHP SU. The AHP SU team will support DFAT’s Humanitarian Response and Preparedness Section (HRS) by providing program management oversight, M&E, communications inputs, and grant and operational management. This will free up the DFAT HRS to play a strategic role by continuing to work with AHP partners on the localisation agenda, promoting collaborative disaster risk management efforts at the country level by ensuring links with other key DFAT aid investments, and promoting strong engagement of DFAT Posts and national government counterparts.

AHP SU support will be provided through the established AHP SU team. This will be supplemented with technical, administrative and logistics support to ensure that the Disaster READY program and the AHP implementing partners have the support required to achieve quality outcomes. This will enable a strong program focus on localisation, gender and disability inclusion, robust NGO collaboration, evidence-based decision-making, and communications and public diplomacy.

Below are the role descriptions of the AHP SU in Disaster READY and the additional technical, administrative and logistic support funded through the program and managed by the AHP SU.

**AHP SU Staff Roles**

AHP SU roles in Disaster READY are as follows:

**Partnership Director**

* Provide oversight of the program, including its governance arrangements
* Lead on the Secretariat function for the Steering Committee
* Manage and engage in annual country reviews and the regional learning and review event
* Provide support to the Country Committees through monthly teleconferences
* Facilitate interactions between DFAT HRS and Posts and AHP NGOs to support partnership outcomes
* Maintain management oversight of all AHP SU support functions to the Disaster READY program, including operational and grants inputs, monitoring, evaluation and learning support, and the development of communications and media products

**Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Manager**

* Support and manage review and development of country-level MEL systems to ensure that results from the focus countries feed into program-level outcomes
* Support and manage annual review processes at the country level, including in-country visits, and assist with the development of annual plans
* Support and manage the regional learning event
* Support the development of criteria for the PPF
* Design and manage annual thematic evaluations and final evaluations

**Operations and Grants Manager**

* Conduct all contracting arrangements between DFAT (Service Orders) and AHP NGOs (Grant Orders)
* Manage the internal contracting of advisers associated with the ongoing management and support of Disaster READY
* Manage budgets
* Provide inputs for communication and support issues resolution with Country Committees
* Support the review and reporting, communications outputs, and evaluations associated with the program

**Communications and Media Manager**

* Lead on program communications in consultation with AHP NGOs and DFAT
* Identify stories that promote Disaster READY to the general public and demonstrate aid effectiveness in the Pacific and Timor-Leste
* Work closely with the MEL Manager to draw country-specific communications products from the M&E data
* Update website
* Manage the development of thematic reports
* Provide infographics and social media products in coordination with DFAT and AHP NGOs
* Manage in-country media visits

## Additional support services

**Annual country review and planning forum management**

Annual country review and planning forums support localisation by shifting decision-making to the country level. The AHP SU will support Country Committees by facilitating two-day forums in each AHP focus country so as to build a culture of joint learning and continuous improvement. The AHP SU will support the Country Committees to engage with other key stakeholders, including DFAT Posts, key government officials, and broader disaster management and social inclusion actors. The forums are an efficient way for DFAT, partner governments, and other humanitarian stakeholders to engage with, assess and contribute to the program. They also enable full participation by people with disabilities, women and local NGOs. The events will be facilitated by a strategic facilitator with AHP SU staff providing M&E, logistics and communications support; the AHP Partnership Director will provide strategic support.  **Strategic facilitator**

The Disaster READY program requires adviser support due to the number of partners involved at country, regional and Australia levels. The strategic facilitator inputs will enable a focused approach to the Disaster READY program and maintain AHP SU support to the broader AHP program. The strategic facilitator will shape the content and facilitate the annual review and planning forums as well as the regional learning event. Six days input per country annually (30 days input in total) has been budgeted for workshop preparation, facilitation and travel. Additional days have been budgeted for reporting, engaging with the Steering Committee and Country Committee meetings, input to the PPF selection criteria and application process, and review of end-of-year reports and activity proposals. **Gender and disability specialists**

Social inclusion is a key focus area for the Disaster READY program. It is also a key priority for DFAT, particularly gender and disability inclusion. The APH SU contracted gender and disability inclusion specialists to support the design process and to provide valuable inputs to the AHP NGOs.

The Disaster READY design incorporates on-going inputs to support implementation. The budget includes 12 days for each adviser annually to review and provide input into annual activity reports and plans and shared services reports and plans. The advisers will support the NGOs to identify the extent to which country plan inclusion outcomes are being achieved. **PPF selection process and technical specialist**

The Disaster READY design commits AHP NGOs to a robust selection process for competitive grants under the PPF. The AHP SU will manage consultations with Country Committees and the Steering Committee on selection criteria for the PPF. The final selection criteria, application process, and funding available in each round will be determined by the DFAT Humanitarian Preparedness and Response Section, with the AHP SU managing administration of the application and assessment process. The AHP SU will provide an independent technical specialist for the selection panel which will be chaired by DFAT. **Regional learning event management**

Annual reviews will be supplemented with a learning event in year two to be held in the Pacific region. This event will be facilitated by the AHP SU. It will provide cross-learning opportunities for the program so that countries can learn from each other’s experiences. The events will be facilitated by a strategic facilitator with AHP SU staff providing M&E, logistics and/or communications support, and the AHP Partnership Director providing strategic support. AHP NGOs are expected to fund their participation in the event (including a representative from each country, and a representative from the ANGO) through Mechanism 1 core multi-year funds.

DFAT expects to undertake an independent evaluation in Year 4 to assess impact and inform the potential design of the second phase of the program. DFAT may consider an additional regional learning forum as part of a design process. This is not currently funded in the program.  **M&E and communications**

In Year 1 the AHP SU MEL Manager will travel to each Disaster READY country to ensure a clear and consistent approach is used to define the common indicators and associated methodologies. This will help to enable the analysis of country plan outcomes that can be synthesised for program-wide reporting. This foundation will be built on through the annual review and planning process.

Two small-scale thematic evaluations will be held over the life of the program focusing on key themes of Disaster READY, such as disability inclusion, gender equality, localisation, and/or NGO coordination. In addition, two post-disaster evaluations will be held to assess the extent to which the preparedness efforts contributed to the response. The evaluations will be small-scale: two involving some travel to the field, and two being limited to desk assessments. The M&E Manager will help to coordinate these evaluations, and will also provide support to the independent evaluation in year 4 as required.

These evaluations will inform the communications strategy for the program, providing the source material that brings the ability to tell a story about the results achieved. An annual media/journalist visit will be supported. At least one journalist will be brought to the field in each country in order for them to see the impact of AHP programs and to file stories that can be rolled out annually. The AHP SU will manage these visits and include briefings with DFAT in Canberra, and travel to selected program sites in consultation with DFAT Posts.  **Administration Surge**

The program will increase the workload, including program administrative oversight, of the AHP SU Operations and Grants Manager. An additional two days per month has been budgeted to cater for increased administrative support that will be required to assist in providing back-office functions such as travel logistics, acquittal processes, event organising (country and regional events), and secretariat support.

# Monitoring, Evaluation and Communication

This section describes the M&E system for Disaster READY and how the results will be disseminated.

Monitoring and evaluation of program performance and changes in the context will be critical to enable the program to understand and demonstrate where there have been successes and to adapt or move away from areas that are underperforming.

There are several purposes for the Disaster READY M&E system. These are to support:

1. **Learning and improvement** by DFAT and AHP NGOs and partners within each country
2. **Accountability** requirements to DFAT, communities and other stakeholders in the Pacific about the use of program resources and the achievement of outcomes
3. **Program management** **and decision-making** by DFAT and the Steering Committee (e.g. to review and approve annual NGO plans, to determine whether particular activities are continued in each country if results are not being achieved)
4. **Strategic communications** by the NGOs and DFATbyproviding evidence to influence decision-makers to progress reform across the Pacific and in global forums as well as to support public diplomacy efforts

## Principles Guiding the M&E System

A number of principles will guide the implementation of the M&E system. These include the commitment to:

1. having a primary focus on supporting the use of the information collected;
2. building on and strengthening local M&E capacity where possible;
3. addressing gender, disability, youth and children and other inclusion variables in all M&E activities;
4. involving program personnel, participants and stakeholders in ‘sense-making’ so that there is ownership of data and a greater likelihood that the data can be used to influence change;
5. valuing both qualitative and quantitative data and using a variety of methods to capture the complexity of implementation and results;
6. supporting the flow of information in multiple directions so that participants and management stakeholders receive feedback about the program;
7. complying with the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability[[45]](#footnote-45) and other international standards for ethics, evaluation methods, and results measurement, including the DFAT Monitoring and Evaluation Standards (2017)[[46]](#footnote-46); and
8. ensuring that the complexity and scale of the M&E is in line with the level of financial and human resources available to implement the M&E system.

## Overarching Evaluation Questions

The following high-level evaluation questions guide the M&E system (see Table 2). These are aligned to the quality criteria in the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability (CHS), the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria, and DFAT’s Aid Quality Check (AQC) report. The alignment between the CHS quality criteria and the sub-questions is included in the footnote[[47]](#footnote-47).

The evaluation questions provide the framework for the NGOs’ annual review and reporting, the annual review by Country Committees, and an independent evaluation in Year 4. An annual small-scale evaluation will also provide data to inform the assessment against the evaluation questions relating to effectiveness and inclusion. The particular methods that will provide information for each of the sub-questions are outlined in Table 4 and described in the text below.

Table 2 Evaluation Questions for Disaster READY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Question** | **Evaluation sub-questions** |
| EFFECTIVENESS |
| 1. Are we achieving the outcomes we expected at this point in time?
 | * 1. To what extent has local humanitarian capability in the Pacific and Timor-Leste been strengthened so that communities are better able to manage and respond to rapid- and slow-onset disasters? (E.g. what progress has been made towards the program objectives and outcomes?)
 |
| INCLUSION |
| 1. Have Disaster READY processes and outcomes been inclusive?[[48]](#footnote-48)
 | * 1. How equitable has the participation of women and people with disabilities been in program activities (e.g. in the Country Committees and in NGO activities)?
	2. What benefits or changes have women and girls experienced from the program?
	3. What benefits or changes have people with disabilities experienced from the program?
	4. To what extent are children and youth involved in and benefiting from the program?
	5. Are the necessary policy, systems and processes in place to protect children?[[49]](#footnote-49)
 |
| EFFICIENCY |
| 1. Is Disaster READY making appropriate use of Australia’s and our partners’ time and resources to achieve outcomes?
 | * 1. What evidence is there that the program is making appropriate use of time and resources to achieve outcomes?
	2. Do predicted budgets compare well to actual expenditure?
	3. What has been the value-add of the ANGO headquarters and the SU?
	4. Has the coordination between NGOs in-country been worth the effort (greater reach, impact, reduced burden on other stakeholders, duplication avoided, etc.)?
	5. Have shared services been worth the effort?
 |
| RELEVANCE |
| 1. Is this still the right thing to do?
 | * 1. Have changes to the economic, social or political context affected the relevance of the program?
	2. Are the program’s activities and approach the most appropriate way to achieve its outcomes?
	3. To what extent has DFAT Post been engaged in the program (e.g. Post awareness of and support for Disaster READY)
	4. Are the program results, engagement with and from Post, and NGO coordination sufficient to continue funding the activities in each country?
 |
| SUSTAINABILITY |
| 1. Will the benefits of Disaster READY last?
 | * 1. To what extent is the program using local systems and processes and strengthening the capacity of local institutions?
	2. Are climate change and disaster risks associated with the program identified and effectively managed?
	3. What evidence is there that benefits are being sustained?
 |

**Defining effectiveness and inclusion in more detail – Core Outcomes and Indicators**

As noted earlier, Disaster READY has been designed around a core set of outcomes and indicators. This common framework will enable shared analysis, learning, and communication across partners in each country and for the program as a whole (see Annex 1). The outcomes and indicators will provide information on effectiveness and inclusion in particular.

The indicators are primarily quantitative to facilitate analysis and reporting. The NGOs are also expected to provide additional quantitative and qualitative data on the results of their activities. These will also be analysed on an annual basis by the AHP SU to identify trends, themes or cases of note.

## Levels of Enquiry

There are three levels of enquiry and analysis for Disaster READY*.* These include:

1. Overarching program
2. Country plan
3. NGO activity plan (sub design)

Each of these levels of enquiry are explained in more detail below.

## Program Level

**Lead responsibility**

Assessment of the progress and results of Disaster READY is the responsibility of the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will meet quarterly in 2018 and six-monthly in following years.

The AHP SU will assist the Steering Committee in this function by coordinating the M&E and reporting for the overarching Disaster READY program. On an annual basis, the AHP SU will collate the results against the core outcomes at a country and program level and assess progress towards Disaster READY objectives. This will inform DFAT’s assessment of NGOs and the program’s performance (see Quality Assurance below for more on DFAT’s assessment). It will also enable program partners to tell a collective story about the results achieved.

Each year, the AHP SU will review and update this M&E framework as required. As part of this review, the AHP SU will facilitate stakeholders to review and update the theory of change if necessary.

**Where the data will come from**

The **NGOs’ M&E** will provide the bulk of the information used to assess and report on the progress against Disaster READY objectives. On an annual basis, the NGOs will, individually and collectively as a Country Committee, review and report on progress (including results from shared services, the NGO multi-year funds, and any activities implemented under the PPF).

The AHP SU will also facilitate **a regional learning forum** in 2019. This will involve a representative from each NGO consortium in each of the five countries, DFAT and the Pacific Disability Forum. The purpose of the forum is to review progress towards the program objectives and to identify successes, areas for improvement, and opportunities for coordination. NGOs are expected to send one representative from each of their countries of implementation and the ANGO; the cost of this will be funded from their project budget. Venue hire, catering, the workshop facilitator, and travel for the PDF representative will be funded from the AHP SU management budget.

An annual **small-scale evaluation** will be conducted. This evaluation could be on a thematic topic (e.g. disability inclusion or gender equality) or it could be used opportunistically to evaluate the response to a moderate or significant disaster in one of the five priority countries to assess the impact of the preparedness work. Country Committees in a country which has experienced a disaster will also be encouraged to reflect on the extent to which their preparedness work had contributed to a more inclusive and effective response as well as what improvements may be needed. The focus and terms of reference for the annual evaluation would be identified by the Steering Committee. The evaluations will be funded from the AHP SU management budget. The budget for these evaluations is modest: two evaluations will be desk-based, while the other two will have a small budget for some field assessment.

On an annual basis, the **Steering Committee will review the effectiveness of the management approaches**,including engagement by DFAT Posts, efficiency, and the value-add of the Steering Committee, Country Committees and the SU.

Periodic **monitoring** of program implementation will also be undertaken by either DFAT HRS or DFAT Post. Monitoring by DFAT HRS will be combined with other visits to the priority countries to ensure efficient use of resources. A simple monitoring tool will be developed by the AHP SU to guide the focus of data collection.

In Year 4 of the program (2021), DFAT will commission an **independent evaluation** of the overarching Disaster READY program. This assessment will inform the design of phase two of the program (2022–2027). The Terms of Reference will be developed and the evaluation team members will be selected in consultation with the Steering Committee. An independent evaluator will lead the review[[50]](#footnote-50). Using the evaluation questions as the framework, the evaluation will assess whether the progress towards the objectives was adequate, the value of the program design, and the effectiveness of the program’s management by DFAT, the Steering Committee and the AHP SU. To ensure consistency and complementarity, the Team Leader will also be contracted prior to the evaluation to review the NGO evaluation designs which they will be required to conduct in Year 4 of the program[[51]](#footnote-51). **Data storage and analysis**

The AHP SU will develop a suitable platform where data can be stored and readily accessible to DFAT and NGO partners. This will likely be a simple web-based system to which NGOs will upload their results on an annual basis. This system will be developed by July 2018 and piloted prior to its use in October 2018 (at which time the NGOs will provide their annual reports). **Reporting**

The AHP SU will provide an annual consolidated report to DFAT (and other stakeholders) to inform DFAT’s annual quality check process. This will be structured against the key evaluation questions. The annual report will be compiled in February. It will be informed by the NGOs’ annual review of progress against their designs (provided in October and updated in mid-February). A range of additional communication products will be produced, as discussed under the communications section in the design.

## Country Level

**Lead responsibility**

Country-level M&E will be led by the coordinating lead NGO for each Country Committee with assistance from the AHP SU. **Where the data will come from**

The bulk of the data on the program’s performance will be collected by the NGOs through their M&E systems. The NGOs in the Country Committees will review this performance information and assess the outcomes achieved through shared services on an annual basis. In some countries, committees could use funding from Shared Services to conduct additional monitoring or research also. **What will occur at country level?**

The Country Committees (involving the NGOs, DFAT and DPOs) will jointly review the progress against Disaster READY outcomes on an annual basis. The Country Committees will assess whether progress has been as expected and is adequate, and will determine lessons for sharing and areas for improvement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What | **Country Review, Learning and Planning Forum** |
| When | September/October, annually (two days) |
| What  | * NGOs present highlights and lessons
* Collective review of successes and areas for improvement against the country outcomes and indicators
* Review results of shared services (e.g. review NGO progress to improve consideration of gender, disability, and child protection[[52]](#footnote-52))
* Plan the following year’s shared services submission
* Review country-level risks
* Identify opportunities for improved coordination
 |
| Who | All country partners, DPO, DFAT Post + AHP SU (+ ANGOs where appropriate)The Country Committee could involve other stakeholders for part of the workshop (e.g. NDMO, Office of Women’s Affairs or others as relevant) |

**Reporting and communications**

On an annual basis, the AHP SU will work with the lead NGO in each country to write an annual report. This report will synthesise the NGOs’ annual reports to provide a collective story of the program’s progress in relation to the outcomes in the country plan. The report will also summarise the outcomes of the shared services funding (the lead coordinator will provide a brief report on the activities and results of shared services on 31 October, together with a proposal for the following year’s funding). This report will be shared with DFAT, the DPO, NDMO and other local stakeholders. The AHP SU will also assist the Country Committee to identify and develop additional communication products to showcase and share the lessons and achievements of the program in-country and more widely as appropriate. **DFAT review of shared services**

On an annual basis, Country Committees will provide a proposal for the following year’s social inclusion work to be funded through shared services. The DFAT Humanitarian Preparedness and Response Section will review and provide feedback on these proposals (considering the report on progress provided by the lead coordinator described above) and seek feedback from DFAT Posts and relevant thematic areas as required.

## NGO Sub Program

As noted earlier, the NGOs' M&E will provide the bulk of the information used to assess and report on the progress against Disaster READY objectives.

All NGOs have been required to align their designs to Disaster READY objectives and outcomes[[53]](#footnote-53) and to identify which of the common Disaster READY indicators they will monitor and report on. The NGOs will also monitor other quantitative and qualitative indicators as needed to assess their results against Disaster READY outcomes.

The NGOs will review and report on progress (including results from shared services, the NGO multi-year funds, and any activities implemented under the PPF) on an annual basis. They will do so individually and collectively as a Country Committee. Based on this analysis, the NGOs will develop their activity proposals for the following year.

As described further in the section on Quality Assurance below, DFAT will review the NGOs’ annual reports to assess their performance and to inform the approval of the NGOs’ proposals for the following year.

The NGOs are also required to conduct an evaluation in Year 4 of the program (2021). The results of this assessment will inform an independent evaluation of Disaster READY which will be commissioned by DFAT (see the section on program-level M&E above). NGOs will be encouraged to use their evaluation as an opportunity to facilitate a systematic internal review with their partners. However, it is recommended that the NGOs also involve at least one independent consultant to help meet accountability requirements and to bring a fresh perspective to their work. To ensure consistency, the NGO evaluation designs will be reviewed by the Team Leader chosen to conduct the DFAT independent evaluation. The NGOs should also consider conducting joint evaluations in each country to support shared learning and efficiency. **A localised approach – strengthening partners’ M&E**

AHP NGOs have been encouraged to primarily use their local partners' existing systems for information management; however, they need to ensure that these systems meet a series of quality requirements that were outlined in the design guidelines[[54]](#footnote-54). In summary, these requirements include:

* assessing not just the quality of activities but also the positive and negative outcomes that resulted;
* assessing different levels of involvement and positive (and negative) outcomes for women and men, youth, children and people with disabilities;
* using a mix of methods and gathering information from a range of sources; and
* collecting baseline information for a small selection of outcomes and maintaining flexibility within the M&E approach to accommodate the likely changes in project design.

NGOs were also required to identify the existing strengths and weaknesses in their partners' M&E systems and identify how this capacity would be built through the project. Five per cent of the total AHP NGO budget was required to be spent in-country to support and strengthen local partners’ M&E.

## Quality Assurance

There will be several quality assurance mechanisms used within Disaster READY. These include:

1. **Review of the NGOs’ M&E systems** – this will be facilitated by the AHP SU in Year 1. The purpose of the review is to ensure the quality of data collected in relation to Disaster READY core outcomes and indicators. The review will examine the quality of the baselines collected by the NGOs, the data collection and analysis processes, and other requirements noted in the design guidelines (e.g. involvement of marginalised groups in sense-making processes). The review will be facilitated by the AHP SU M&E Manager and provide an opportunity for NGOs to peer review and learn from each other’s M&E approaches.
2. **Annual review of NGO progress reports and proposals, and Country Committee social inclusion proposals:**
	* **DFAT review of NGO annual progress reports and proposals** – DFAT will review the NGOs’ annual reports to assess their performance, to monitor against risks and safeguards, and to inform the approval of the NGOs’ proposals for the following year. DFAT will also assess whether there were sufficient results, engagement from and with Post, and coordination between the NGOs to continue funding the activities in each country. The DFAT Humanitarian Preparedness and Response Section will coordinate this review on an annual basis. Feedback will also be sought from Pacific Posts, Pacific Sections and relevant thematic areas. Once agreed, the proposals will be submitted to the FAS HPD or AS HMB (as outlined in the governance arrangements) for approval.
	* **DFAT review of shared services (social inclusion) proposals** – Concurrently, the DFAT Humanitarian Preparedness and Response Section will also review the social inclusion proposals from the Country Committees. Feedback will be sought from Pacific Posts and relevant thematic areas as required.
	* **NGO peer review – NGOs will also peer review each other’s progress reports** and proposed activity plans at the country review in September/October each year and at the regional learning event.
3. **Independent review** – as noted earlier, DFAT will commission an independent review of the program during Year 4. The review will assess the program against the key evaluation questions. The NGOs will be required to allocate time to participate in the review. The evaluation team will be funded from a separate DFAT budget.

## Timeline for M&E and reporting milestones

A summary of the major milestones relating to M&E are outlined in Table 3 below. Key planning milestones are included in italics.

Table M&E and reporting milestones

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **M&E and reporting milestone** | **Date** |
| Country Review, Learning and Planning Forums (2 days)Year 1 includes review of NGOs’ M&E systems (+1 day) | Sep / Oct |
| NGOs submit annual reports (incl. bridge funding) (Year 1 = Jan/Feb – 30 Sept) Country Lead Coordinator submits brief shared services report*Proposals for NGO multi-year funds due**Shared services proposals due* | 31 Oct *31 Oct* |
| NGOs provide brief quantitative update on additional highlight results to inform DFAT’s Annual Quality Check (e.g. 2 pages max) | Mid-Feb |
| AHP SU compiles country annual reports and overarching program report | End of Feb |

Additional milestones in Year 1 only include:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Country Committees define indicators – with SU assistance  | By 30 March |
| NGOs submit updated M&E plan to the SU | 30 April |

Additional milestones also include the regional learning forum to be held in 2019.

## Data sources for each evaluation sub-question

A summary of the data sources for each evaluation sub-question is included in Table 4.

Table 4 Data sources for each evaluation sub-question

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation sub-questions** | **Data sources** |
| EFFECTIVENESS - Are we achieving the outcomes we expected at this point in time? |
| * 1. To what extent has local humanitarian capability in the Pacific and Timor-Leste been strengthened so that communities are better able to manage and respond to rapid- and slow-onset disasters? (E.g. what progress has been made towards program objectives and outcomes?)
 | NGO annual reportAnnual evaluationsIndependent evaluation |
| INCLUSION - Have Disaster READY processes and outcomes been inclusive? |
| * 1. How equitable has the participation of women and people with disabilities been in program activities?
 | NGO annual reportsAnnual evaluationsIndependent evaluation |
| * 1. To what extent is the program making a difference to gender equality and empowering women and girls?
 |
| * 1. Are people with disabilities benefiting equally from the program?
 |
| * 1. Are the necessary policy, systems and processes in place to protect children?
 | NGO annual reportsShared services report |
| EFFICIENCY - Is Disaster READY making appropriate use of Australia’s and our partners’ time and resources to achieve outcomes? |
| * 1. What evidence is there that the program is making appropriate use of time and resources to achieve outcomes?
 | NGO annual reportsAnnual review by Steering CommitteeIndependent evaluation |
| * 1. Do predicted budgets compare well to actual expenditure?
 | DFAT/AHP SU assessment |
| * 1. What has been the value-add of the ANGO headquarters and the AHP SU?
 | NGO annual reportsIndependent evaluation |
| * 1. Has the coordination between NGOs in-country been worth the effort?
 | Country Committee annual reportsIndependent evaluation |
| * 1. Have shared services been worth the effort?
 | Country Committee annual reportsIndependent evaluation |
| RELEVANCE - Is this still the right thing to do? |
| * 1. Have changes to the economic, social or political context affected the relevance of the program?
 | NGO annual reports |
| * 1. Are the program’s activities and approach the most appropriate way to achieve its outcomes?
 | NGO annual reports |
| * 1. To what extent has DFAT Post been engaged in the program (e.g. Post awareness of and support for Disaster READY)?
 | Steering Committee (DFAT and ANGOs informed by Post and Country Committees) |
| * 1. Are the program results, engagement with and from Post, and NGO coordination sufficient to continue funding the activities in each country?
 | DFAT assessment of NGO annual reports and feedback from Post |
| SUSTAINABILITY - Will the benefits of Disaster READY last? |
| * 1. To what extent is the program using local systems and processes and strengthening the capacity of local institutions?
 | NGO annual reportsPossibly annual evaluation |
| * 1. Are climate change and disaster risks associated with the program identified and effectively managed?
 | NGO annual reportsIndependent evaluation |
| * 1. What evidence is there that benefits are being sustained?
 | NGO annual reportsIndependent evaluation |

# Communications

Communications in Disaster READY will be based on evidence of what is working and innovative in the program. A key objective is to promote the success of the Disaster READY program and to demonstrate Australia’s commitments to humanitarian system reform and the implementation of the WHS Grand Bargain to a broad range of audiences. Advocating the success of the approach to other donors has the potential to leverage additional resources. Communications will help to promote Australia’s role in and commitment to the Pacific region, including in the areas of sustainable development and gender equality.

The AHP SU will lead on program communications in consultation with the Steering Committee.

The AHP SU will produce both country-specific and overall program stories about trends, successes, innovative elements, or surprising results. These will be drawn from data generated from the common indicators, annual reviews, and case studies.

An individual communications plan will be prepared for each story with communications outputs (reports, press releases, infographics, video, media site visits with journalists, case studies, etc.), relevant audiences (DFAT, Australian public, in-country public, humanitarian community in Australia and globally, other governments), and the best placed communications channels to reach these audiences. The communications plan will form the basis of consultation and approval by DFAT and the relevant AHP NGO before proceeding to production.

The AHP SU will identify stories likely to be interesting to a broader audience. AHP NGOs will also generate media or communications about their own work under Disaster READY. Nevertheless, they have been asked to share these ideas with the AHP SU beforehand. As much as possible, the program aims to identify the bigger themes and messages so as to convey a collective story of change at the country level, rather than focusing on particular projects or specific NGOs. Each NGO activity plan identifies opportunities for communications related to M&E of activities.

# Sustainability

Disaster READY includes several approaches to ensure that the benefits of the program will last.

* **Localisation**: Disaster READY is a key tool for achieving Australia’s commitment to localisation in humanitarian action in the Pacific and Timor-Leste. The definition of localisation in the Pacific emphasises the independence of leadership and decision-making by national actors in humanitarian action[[55]](#footnote-55). AHP NGOs will support national NGOs and faith-based organisations, and in particular women, people with disabilities and youth, to increase their representation, confidence and influence in humanitarian coordination mechanisms at national and sub-national levels. The program builds the capacity of existing community governance and leadership structures (such as churches) which will continue after Disaster READY is finished. Capacity support to national NGOs and faith-based organisations will enable these organisations to independently deliver disaster response to communities in coordination with government and international organisations. The program’s M&E system will track any increase in the influence of national offices of INGOs, local NGOs and faith-based organisations, and women, people with disabilities and youth in humanitarian preparedness.
* **Supporting government:** Disaster READY is strongly connected to government systems for disaster management. Country plans recognise and respond to national disaster policy priorities. AHP NGOs work closely with provincial and national government systems for disaster response and preparedness. This includes building their understanding of social inclusion issues and supporting the development of tools and implementation of practices (such as rapid assessment surveys) that form part of the government disaster system. AHP NGOs will use practice and evidence generated by the program to inform and improve DRR policy which will be sustained beyond the AHP. Disaster READY Country Committees provide an important platform for AHP NGOs to develop shared messages to influence governments and donors.
* **Accurate risk assessment:** Community-based disaster risk management (CBDRM) starts with an assessment of risks – both disaster and climate change-related risks. NGOs are working with government to develop standard approaches to CBDRM in each country which incorporate disaster and climate risks. The intention is that NGO activity plans will be reviewed by climate specialists to assess incorporation of disaster and climate risks. During implementation, Disaster READY will link with regional programs addressing climate change to ensure programming is informed by the latest data available. The upcoming Australia Pacific Climate Change Action Program will provide at least an annual briefing on the climate science available to inform programming and to identify any opportunities for tailoring of data to relevant time or location scales. The program will also aim to engage with all-hazard DRR specialists (through DFAT) in the annual planning process.
* The M&E system will track the continued understanding of risks (including climate change-related risks) and use of disaster preparedness practices after community-based planning and training is completed.
* **Sustainability will be tested:** program partners will test the sustainability of community-based disaster response planning and coordination with government through simulations. When disasters do occur, AHP (through Disaster READY and activations) will assess how localisation in preparedness translates into action to address the needs of affected populations during a response.

# Gender Equality

### Background gender analysis

Despite action and commitment by government and civil society, there is slow progress towards achieving gender equality in the Pacific and Timor-Leste. Gender inequality remains pervasive across the Pacific, in particular in the critical domains of leadership and decision-making, access to and control of resources, and gender-based violence[[56]](#footnote-56).

Disaster impacts are not gender neutral. In the Pacific, women are more likely to be killed by disasters compared to men and are more susceptible to sexual and gender-based violence. The physical burden on women and girls increases disproportionately after a disaster as they spend more time looking for clean water, firewood and food, as well as keeping the family safe and healthy. Their usual protection mechanisms can be affected as their home and community are disrupted. The increased burden of work can result in girls missing school and children being left unaccompanied for long periods of time, which presents additional protection risks. The psychosocial burden of women increases as well. Women and girls living with disability are even more at risk: their social isolation, exclusion and dependency increase the extent of abuse they are subjected to and limit the actions they can take. Finally, women in the Pacific and Timor-Leste are marginalised from leadership and decision-making processes governing their lives, including disaster management mechanisms. These mechanisms in turn fail to acknowledge and respond to their needs.

### How the program will progress gender equality and the empowerment of women

Disaster READY is committed to recognising and responding to the differences in how women and men prepare for and are affected by disasters. This can ensure that the basic rights of women and girls are met as well as help to make disaster risk reductions more effective. Paying close attention to gender differences and promoting women’s and girls’ active engagement and leadership in disaster preparedness and risk reduction helps to bring different perspectives, capacities and resources to the task. The program recognises the additional challenges facing women and girls with disabilities, including barriers to participation and leadership and risks of physical, sexual and other forms of violence.

Program objectives, outcomes and indicators are disaggregated by gender, disability and age. NGOs are required to address, at the very least, the representation of women in disaster committees and the inclusion of girls’ and women’s needs in community disaster plans. Country plans and NGO activity plans include country and activity-specific gender analysis which draws on a range of existing sources, as well as research and programming that responds to country-based priorities and opportunities for action.

Through the design process there was some recognition that LGBTQI people also experience greater harm during disasters. Initial research presented at design workshops in Fiji demonstrated how transgender people were unable to access evacuation centres, food, water and other supplies during Cyclone Winston. The Fiji country plan includes outcomes and indicators on LGBTQI inclusion. In other focus countries, this level of commitment could not be achieved through the design process but may develop through cross-country learning as the program rolls out. Annual country reviews will be an opportunity to raise this issue and seek commitment to action in annual implementation plans.

Specific gender analysis in country plans and in activity plans provides the basis for action that is meaningful in each country context. Gender humanitarian expertise was provided to AHP NGOs through:

* a background guidance paper which provided a detailed analysis of opportunities in gender-responsive DRR and included examples from around the Pacific;
* a practical session at the initial design workshop presented by CARE gender specialists from Australia and Vanuatu as well as an additional session on gender equality presented by CARE at each of the five country workshops; and
* gender humanitarian technical expertise provided to support each NGO’s design process and a comprehensive review of each activity plan in relation to gender equality.

Collectively, this has aimed to ensure that all activity plans go beyond counting the number of women participating in the program to a more transformative approach. This includes challenging gender norms and engaging men and boys to address barriers to gender equality, supporting women’s leadership and access to resources, preventing violence, and ensuring that women’s needs are embedded in humanitarian tools, systems and practice. Shared services provides a platform for NGOs to learn and improve their approach to gender equality. Progress in this area will be monitored annually by Country Committees and the AHP SU. The annual review will also be an opportunity to reflect on and incorporate country-specific learning and evidence from AHP NGOs as well as research from government and other sources.

# Disability inclusion

### Background analysis

Disability-inclusive DRR (DiDRR) is an emerging field of work[[57]](#footnote-57). Since the 1990s there has been international recognition that socially disadvantaged people suffer the most from natural disasters. Recognition of the risks faced by people with disabilities and the importance of proactive consultation with people with disabilities is a more recent commitment. Translating that commitment into practice has lagged globally and in the Pacific and Timor-Leste. In 2016 the Australian Government endorsed the Charter for Disability Inclusion in Humanitarian Action and committed to practical action to implement the Charter[[58]](#footnote-58).The Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific also provides impetus for practical action with its emphasis on an all-stakeholder approach to DRR and CCA.

### How the program will progress disability inclusion

Disaster READY will build strong practice on disability inclusion in disaster preparedness and collect data to understand how this action translates into disaster responses that are inclusive of people with disabilities. Program indicators are disaggregated by disability, gender and age.

A primer on DiDRR was prepared for the design process (at Annex 10). A key principle is to take a risk-based approach: hazard and risk assessments are the starting point for community-based disaster preparedness, and risk assessments need to include those most at risk. Furthermore, it is critical that DiDRR is seen as everyone’s business rather than being siloed or treated as an add-on.

Disaster READY promotes the participation of people with disabilities and their representatives in planning, implementation and monitoring. The design process actively included the perspectives of people with disabilities in each country design workshop. DPOs are represented in Country Committees and the Steering Committee. Annual country and program-wide progress and future year priorities are determined by these committees. As DPOs are largely voluntary or underfunded organisations, shared services funding includes support for DPOs to actively participate in Disaster READY. Three AHP NGO consortia include CBM and will support the Pacific Disability Forum (PDF) through CBM. These consortia will draw on technical advice from CBM in implementing activity plans and support the Pacific Disability Forum (PDF) through a regional approach implemented by CBM. The regional approach being taken is for PDF is to build its own technical capacity and tools to implement the Pacific Disability Inclusive Preparedness for Response Strategy. This strategy includes capacity development of national DPOs who will work with AHP country stakeholders. Unlike gender, there are few, if any, AHP NGOs with dedicated disability inclusion staff at country level and the demand on DPOs can be high. As it will take time for DPO capacity to build, AHP NGOs will also draw on technical support through CBM or other sources, while acknowledging that DPOs are recognised representatives of people with disabilities and need to be actively engaged and supported.

AHP NGOs are committed to improving their practice in DiDRR and all activity plans address disability inclusion. AHP NGOs were able to access DiDRR expertise to help develop their activity plans, and all activity plans are being formally reviewed by a disability specialist.

Shared services will support NGOs to improve their practice in relation to disability inclusion. At each annual country review, AHP NGOs (with assistance from the AHP SU) will assess progress against disability inclusion outcomes and engage in a process of continuous improvement.

# Risk Management Plan

Assessment, management and reporting of program risks will be consistent with DFAT’s risk assessment framework. Overall program risks and treatments (see Annex 11 Risk Register) will be managed in the first instance by the AHP SU and will be escalated to DFAT and the Steering Committee where necessary. The AHP SU will review high-level risk and changes in the risk profile quarterly. The Steering Committee will review the risk register annually following country reviews. The AHP SU will escalate risks to DFAT and/or the Steering Committee as required. Program risks have been identified through the design process, including analysis of high-level risks identified in country plans. DFAT will undertake annual Partner Performance Assessments and an AQC for this investment.

AHP NGOs were selected to implement AHP (including Disaster READY) through a competitive grants process. All AHP NGOs have undergone DFAT’s rigorous due diligence assessment and are accredited Australian NGO Cooperation Program agencies. They are required to comply with DFAT policies including Child Protection and Fraud policies, and these requirements extend to their implementing partners. These “generic” risks and management plans are set out in the AHP design document risk register[[59]](#footnote-59), and repeated in the risk register at Annex 11.

There are two key program risks: fragmentation and lack of efficiency associated with the large number of AHP NGOs; and that support for communities and inclusion in preparedness is not translated into disaster response. The design and delivery mechanism are tailored to respond to these risks through geographic and thematic foci, and support for country coordination and a delivery approach that focuses on assessing progress towards outcomes and adapting the program in response.

The program focuses on five countries rather than the whole Pacific region so that resources can be concentrated and coordination built between NGOs. The program also has a thematic focus on disaster preparedness rather than the whole disaster cycle. Engagement by DFAT Posts and partner governments through country planning and review reduces the risk of duplication. Annual country reviews also facilitate a strategic approach by which partners collectively assess progress against program outcomes, challenges and changes in the context, and determine how to adapt to these. When disasters do occur during the program period, partners will assess the extent to which program activities have influenced disaster responses, and there is opportunity to conduct evaluations of the program through a response (see Monitoring and Evaluation section). These learning opportunities will be used to adapt programming and provide evidence for DFAT and AHP NGO policy advocacy so that responses are more inclusive and responsive to community needs.

Risks at country level are included in country plans (using a standard template) and will be monitored and managed by Country Committees who will meet quarterly. The risk register will be updated during annual country reviews with the support of AHP SU. Risks associated with AHP NGO activity plans are included in activity plans (and use a standard template) and are managed by individual AHP NGOs.

#  Safeguards

AHP NGOs have full accreditation under DFAT’s Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP).  ANCP accreditation is a rigorous assessment which examines NGOs' governance, program management capacity, partner management and risk management, including capacity around, and compliance with, the main safeguard issues. AHP NGOs were also subject to a competitive procurement process that required compliance with DFAT’s child protection standards and environmental safeguard systems; they will also assess their broader protection capabilities in relation to gender equality and disability inclusion.

During implementation, checks of compliance with DFAT's child protection and environmental protection policies and of the presence of appropriate safeguards will be carried out as part of monitoring, evaluation and learning activities. These checks will cover both funded ANGO partners and their local implementing partners.

NGOs will work at community level and in schools to improve disaster preparedness. The program will ensure child protection policies are operationalized for humanitarian preparedness and response work as part of national INGO, local NGO and faith-based organisations systems. AHP NGOs must also comply with Sphere Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Emergencies[[60]](#footnote-60). Through shared services, an NGO with child rights expertise will lead the learning and improvement process with other AHP NGOs in each country. NGO progress will be assessed through annual reviews. Some NGOs will undertake specific activities to address children’s rights and needs, for example, through disaster planning and education in schools.

Environmental protection and resettlement risks have not been identified in the program. As there is flexibility in the program there is potential for environmental risks to emerge. The emergence of environmental risks will be monitored when annual activity implementation plans are reviewed and activities will be required to comply with DFAT’s Environmental Protection Policy.

# Annexes

|  |
| --- |
| Annex 1 Program Objectives Outcomes and IndicatorsAnnex 2 AHP Lead NGOs, Consortia, Country partnersAnnex 3 Design ProcessAnnex 4 Design GuidelinesAnnex 5 Evaluations and Reports Reviewed for LessonsAnnex 6 Summary of Activity plans (Sub Designs)Annex 7 Program Budget and YEAR 1 Budget EstimatesAnnex 8 Program TimelineAnnex 9 Gender BriefAnnex 10 Disability-Inclusive DRR PrimerAnnex 11 Program Risk RegisterAnnex 12 Country Committee Members by Gender and Nationality Annex 13 Country Plans  |

1. The proposed funding excludes $3m bridge funding provided to AHP NGOs in 2017 to undertake DRR activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Disaster READY has been designed as a five-year investment, and subject to performance and redesign there is potential for a further five-year phase. There will be a firm review point to inform DFAT’s decision on a second phase. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. World Risk Register 2017: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/WRR\_2017\_E2.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. This definition is used in the Australian Red Cross-DFAT Pacific localisation research, November 2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Annex 3 Design Process for details [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See Annex 1 for common Program Objectives, Outcomes and Indicators [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The term “people with disabilities” is used with recognition that this is not a homogenous group, and that gender, age, type of disability and other socioeconomic factors shape individual experience and capacity [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Building resilience to disasters: an application to small developing states, IMF Working Paper, Oct 2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. World Risk Register 2017: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/WRR\_2017\_E2.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Leave No One Behind: Disaster Resilience for Sustainable Development, Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2017, UNESCAP http://www.unescap.org/publications/asia-pacific-disaster-report-2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management (FRDP) 2017–2030 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The World Bank, The Sendai Report: Managing Disaster Risks for a Resilient Future, 2012, p.4. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. http://dfat.gov.au/aid/topics/investment-priorities/building-resilience/drr/Pages/disaster-risk-reduction-and-resilience.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. CBM-Nossal Institute Partnership for Disability Inclusive Development, Disability Inclusion in Disaster Risk Reduction (2017) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. UNISDR “Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” (2015) http://www.unisdr.org/files/46052\_disasterriskreductioninthe2030agend.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. See, for example, CARE International “Does Gender Responsive Disaster Risk Reduction Make A Difference” (2017), World Humanitarian Summit Regional Consultation for the Pacific, Final Report, 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Griffin, 2016: [Independent Evaluation of the Community-based Climate Change Adaptation Grants Program – main evaluation report](http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/community-based-climate-change-action-grants-independent-review-2016.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Australian Red Cross-DFAT localisation research 2017 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. S. Patel, Going the Extra Mile (2017), Start Fund Bangladesh https://startnetwork.org/resource/going-extra-mile-bangladesh-localisation-review [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Fiji Post Disaster Needs Assessment (May 2016), Government of Fiji [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Emergency Plan of Action Final Report: Timor-Leste Drought (2017) IFRC [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Long-term studies have established that investment in DRR has reduced response and recovery costs. See, for example, Hassan A., Islam A., Chakravorty N., Al Hossain B.M.T. (2013) Disaster Risk Reduction Investment and Reduction of Response Cost in Bangladesh. In: Shaw R., Mallick F., Islam A. (eds), Disaster Risk Reduction Approaches in Bangladesh. Disaster Risk Reduction (Methods, Approaches and Practices). Springer, Tokyo [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. List of evaluations and reports reviewed is at Annex 5 [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Country plans map intersecting programs and highlight key programs and organisations that Disaster READY partners will co-ordinate with. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. DFAT, Promoting Prosperity, Reducing Poverty, Enhancing Stability (2014) http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/australian-aid-development-policy.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. DFAT, Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience, http://dfat.gov.au/aid/topics/investment-priorities/building-resilience/drr/Pages/disaster-risk-reduction-and-resilience.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. DFAT Humanitarian Strategy (May 2016), http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Pages/humanitarian-strategy.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. DFAT Pacific Humanitarian Strategy (Draft 2017) [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Complementary DFAT investments include: Australian Red Cross partnership supporting national Red Cross societies; and Australia Assists, delivered by RedR, to deploy short-term and long-term technical specialists to governments, the UN and regional organisations. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. The DFAT Humanitarian Partnership Agreement was the precursor to the AHP. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. As also noted in the AHP Investment Design, May 2016 Annex 8 Risk Register; see risks 1 and 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. World Risk Register 2017: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/WRR\_2017\_E2.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific, Pacific Community (SPC), Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) and University of the South Pacific (USP), 2016, pg35 [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. NB: This was revised from the original purpose statement in the AHP design document: “Local humanitarian capability in the Pacific is strengthened to anticipate, prepare for, respond to and reduce risks from natural hazards; and Pacific communities are more resilient to the impacts of natural hazards.” [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. “National NGOs” includes local NGOs (national, regional and community-based), and national offices of international NGOs (including national offices of AHP NGOs). [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. E.g. PNG: Ward Development Committees; Vanuatu: Community Disaster and Climate Change Committees [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. E.g. Vanuatu ‘provincial and area’. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Fiji will also include LGBTQI in this and the following two indicators (2.2 and 2.3). [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. In PNG these are ward and provincial level planning processes, rather than a specific disaster committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Each country has a specific disaster management structure including committees and these are specified in country plans E.g. in Vanuatu, this is the provincial government. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Independent experts will be required to be neutral from organisations such as the HAG, the Red Cross and RedR. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Depending on delegation required, this will be either the First Assistant Secretary, Humanitarian, NGOs and Partnership Division or the Assistant Secretary, Humanitarian Response, Risk and Recovery Branch. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. A strategic dialogue session will be scheduled after Steering Committee meetings to promote mutual learning and coordination between AHP, Australia Assists (delivered by RedR) and the Australian Red Cross. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. AHP lead NGOs have established expertise in gender equality, child protection and child rights which they bring to the Steering Committee. However, they have less expertise with disability inclusion in DRR, hence the decision to include a disability representative in the Steering Committee to ensure that disability inclusion is central to strategic program discussions. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Including adherence to technical standards such as The Sphere Handbook and the Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Also including the OECD DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation 2010. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. The alignment between the CHS criteria and the sub-questions includes: Criteria 1 (sub-question 1.1, 1.2), Criteria 2 (2.1), Criteria 3 (2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 5.1), Criteria 6 (4.4), Criteria 9 (4.1, 4.3). [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. This section includes sub-questions relating to gender equality and disability from the AQC and child protection from the HAQC. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Drawn from the HAQC template (2017). [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. As noted earlier, the team leader will also review the evaluation methodologies of the NGOs’ Year 4 evaluations to ensure complementarity and coordination of approaches and information. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. A key lesson from AusAID’s Australian Partnerships with African Communities Program (APAC) program was to have a close connection between the design and assessment standards in the NGOs’ evaluations and any DFAT-commissioned independent evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. NB: This could be a facilitated one-on-one review with each agency prior to the shared country review event. In Year 1, the focus would be on gender and disability; future such reviews could include child protection also. The SU MEL Manager and the Disability Inclusion technical advisor are developing a rubric by which to assess disability inclusion. This early draft will be discussed and further developed with the NGOs and then used on an annual basis as a guided self-assessment by the NGOs. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. NB: these were developed through extensive consultation in each of the five countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. See Annex 4 Design Guidelines. [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Informed by the definition of localisation developed through the ARC’s research in the Pacific, October 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. CARE Australia, “Gender and Disaster Risk Reduction in the Pacific”, Gender Considerations Brief, AHP 2017. This section summarises the key points from the full brief which is at Annex 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
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