Australia
HRI 2009 Ranking: 10th

Australia moved up one position in the HRI ranking this year, from 11th to 10th. Overall, Australia’s scores in qualitative (survey) indicators fell in comparison to its peers, but it was still among the donors rated above the overall average. Improvements in several of the quantitative indicators were enough to climb one position. It performed best this year on Pillars 4 (Protection and International Law) and 5 (Learning and accountability), in which it ranked 5th and 6th respectively. It received its lowest ranking in Pillar 1 (Responding to needs) and Pillar 3 (Working with humanitarian partners), coming in at 12th and 13th respectively. In terms of generosity and burden sharing, Australia ranks 10th in comparison to its peers, based on volume of humanitarian assistance in proportion to GNI.

Compared with its peers, Australia ranked well in HRI indicators around the timeliness of funding to sudden onset disasters, equitable distribution of funding in accordance to needs and commitment to good practice. Australia also ranked above average in indicators around protection, accountability towards affected populations, implementation of refugee law and coordination. Australia’s lowest rankings by indicator were around the provision of long-term funding, where it ranked 20th among the donors, equitable distribution of funding to different crisis countries and funding to NGOs.

In terms of performance by crisis, Australia overall scored slightly above the overall donor average in all crises studied, with slightly above average survey scores in Sri Lanka, Timor Leste and Myanmar, but below average in DRC and the occupied Palestinian Territories.

HRI 2009 results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest scores</th>
<th>Score*</th>
<th>Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responding to needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of funding to sudden onset disasters</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable distribution of funding against level of crisis and vulnerability</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable distribution of funding in accordance to needs in the crisis</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning and accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of good practice and quality standards</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting requirements for humanitarian actors</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lowest scores</th>
<th>Score*</th>
<th>Rank**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responding to needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable distribution of funding to different crisis countries</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of funding to complex emergencies</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working with humanitarian partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding to NGOs</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer-term funding arrangements</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning and accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of recommendations from evaluations</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on HRI ten-point scale
** Ranking in comparison to peers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRI Indicator</th>
<th>Australia Rank</th>
<th>Australia Score</th>
<th>DAC Average</th>
<th>Max DAC</th>
<th>Min DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Saving lives and maintaining human dignity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Neutrality and impartiality</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Non-discrimination</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Independence from non-humanitarian objectives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Needs-based responses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Assessing needs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Funding decisions based on needs assessments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Support not affected by other crises</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Beneficiary involvement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Donor capacity for informed decision-making</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Timeliness of funding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Equitable distribution of funding to different crisis countries</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Funding to forgotten emergencies and those with low media coverage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Timeliness of funding to complex emergencies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Timeliness of funding to sudden onset disasters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Generosity and burden sharing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Equitable distribution of funding in accordance to needs in the crisis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Equitable distribution of funding against level of crisis and vulnerability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pillar 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillar Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Mainstreaming risk reduction and prevention into the response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Crisis prevention and preparedness measures</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Strengthening local community capacity for disaster and crisis preparedness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Supporting the transition between relief, early recovery and development</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Building local capacity to work with humanitarian actors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Funding local capacity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pillar 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillar Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 Adapting to changing needs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Reliability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Coordination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Advocacy for local and government authorities to carry out their responsibilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Support local and government authorities’ coordination capacity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Respect for the roles of the different components of the humanitarian sector</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>8.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Conditionality that does not comprise humanitarian action</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Flexibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Longer-term funding arrangements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Strengthening humanitarian response capacity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Funding UN coordination mechanisms and common services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Funding to NGOs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Funding to CERF and other quick disbursement mechanisms</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Un-earmarked funding</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Funding UN Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Funding IFRC and ICRC Appeals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pillar 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillar Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42 Protection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Advocacy for the respect for human rights</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Advocacy for the respect for and implementation of IHL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Support needs of refugees</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Supporting needs of internally displaced persons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Facilitating safe humanitarian access</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Respect for international humanitarian law</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Respect for human rights law</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Implementation of refugee law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pillar 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillar Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51 Accountability towards affected populations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Transparency of funding and decision-making processes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Evaluations of partners’ programmes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Support for monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Use of recommendations from evaluations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Promotion of good practice and quality standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Monitoring adherence to quality standards</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 Reporting requirements for humanitarian actors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Participation and support for accountability initiatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Conducting evaluations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pillar 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillar Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61 Reporting requirements for humanitarian actors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Participation and support for accountability initiatives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 Conducting evaluations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Australia: ten main strengths

- Timeliness of funding to sudden onset disasters
- Equitable distribution of funding against level of crisis and vulnerability
- Promotion of good practice and quality standards
- Equitable distribution of funding in accordance to needs in the crisis
- Building local capacity to work with humanitarian actors
- Implementation of refugee law
- Accountability towards affected populations
- Reporting requirements for humanitarian actors
- Funding decisions based on needs assessments
- Coordination

Note: This graph compares the ten highest scored indicators for Australia compared to the highest and lowest scores in the DAC group.
Australia scores by pillar

Responding to needs  Prevention, risk reduction and recovery  Working with humanitarian partners  Protection and International Law  Learning and accountability

Highest donor score  Australia  Lowest donor score  Average

Note: This graph compares the average scores by pillar for Australia compared to the highest and lowest scores by pillar in the DAC group.
Australia: Comparison of survey scores in selected crises


Note: This graph shows the HRI 2009 survey scores for Australia compared to the overall DAC average. Data is from 32 survey responses (of a total of 63) from organisations that received funding from Australia (only crises with a minimum of 8 responses are included). Data is not disaggregated in order to protect the confidentiality of respondents.
Note: This graph compares HRI 2009 average survey responses by pillar of UN agencies versus non-UN agencies (includes INGOs, local NGOs and Red Cross Red Crescent) compared against overall DAC averages. Data is based on a total of 61 responses in 11 crises (28 UN agencies, and 33 non-UN organisations).