



THE HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE INDEX 2011

QUALITATIVE INDICATORS' CONSTRUCTION

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. SELECTED QUESTIONNAIRES	2
3. WEIGHTING	3
4. HRI 2011 QUALITATIVE INDICATOR SCORES	4
5. HRI 2010 QUALITATIVE INDICATORS SUMMARY	7
6. MISSING VALUES	9
ANNEX I. HRI FIELD QUESTIONNAIRE	10



1. INTRODUCTION

The present document briefly describes the technical details of the construction of the 20 qualitative indicators of the Humanitarian Response Index (HRI) 2011, evenly grouped into 5 different pillars of donor performance. All of the indicators are based on the answers from the HRI field questionnaire (See annex I), which was used this year by the mission teams in 9 different humanitarian crises around the world: Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, Kenya, the occupied Palestinian Territories, Pakistan, Somalia and Sudan.

Based on the collected scores for each question of the questionnaire, a qualitative indicator was built. In some cases, however, scores from different questions were consolidated into one single indicator, such as the indicator *Independence of aid*, based on questions 2 and 3 on independence of aid and aid free from restrictions, and the indicator *Beneficiary involvement*, based on questions 8, 9 and 10 revolving around the beneficiary involvement on design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation respectively. The indicator on gender sensitive approach was based on question number 6 of the questionnaire, but was not included in the HRI and was analysed separately instead.

2. SELECTED QUESTIONNAIRES

The qualitative indicators' construction is based on the results of 877 questionnaires from 19 assessed donors. The minimum number of questionnaires per donor has been raised from 8 to 15 this year, therefore a second round of phone interviews with additional field respondents took place in July. The donors for which the fewest amount of questionnaires were collected are Finland (16), Belgium (17) and Luxembourg (17). More than 20 questionnaires were collected to assess each of remaining donors. The European Commission and United States had a relatively much higher number of questionnaires: 159 and 142 respectively.

For the qualitative indicators' construction this year, questionnaires have been carefully selected:

- For the European Commission's assessment, given scores are taken into account only if they are for ECHO or the Commission only (i. e. questionnaires for which the donor agency was "Europaid" or not explicitly mentioned, have been deleted).
- For Spain and Italy, decentralized aid (from regional governments) has been excluded.
- For the United States, the Department of Labor and the Association for Rural Development have been excluded.



TABLE 1. NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES BY DONOR

Donors	Number of questionnaires	Donors	Number of questionnaires
AUSTRALIA	21	JAPAN	32
BELGIUM	17	LUXEMBOURG	17
CANADA	65	NETHERLANDS	31
DENMARK	28	NORWAY	41
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	159	SPAIN	45
FINLAND	16	SWEDEN	59
FRANCE	32	SWITZERLAND	27
GERMANY	41	UNITED KINGDOM	64
IRELAND	18	UNITED STATES	142
ITALY	22		
Total			877

3. WEIGHTING

As it was the case last year, the application of a multiple correlation analysis has determined the existence of an impact of the respondent's nationality on the given scores.

Individuals' scores have then been weighted so that each region of origin represents a particular share in a donor's sample, as described in the table below.

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF EACH ASSESSED DONOR'S SAMPLE BY ORIGIN OF RESPONDENTS

REGION or GROUP OF COUNTRIES of origin of respondents	% in each assessed donor's sample
OECD DAC DONORS - EUROPEAN COUNTRIES	55
OECD DAC DONORS - NON EUROPEAN COUNTRIES	20
SOUTHEASTASIA	8
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA	15
OTHER	2
TOTAL	100



4. HRI 2011 QUALITATIVE INDICATOR SCORES

Tables in the following pages contain qualitative indicator scores for the 19 assessed donors. For each indicator, scores are marked with a green arrow and are labeled “good” only when they are more than 3/4 standard deviations above the average score. Scores with a yellow arrow indicate “mid-range”, because they fall within the average 3/4 standard deviations score. Scores are marked with a red arrow when there is room for improvement and fall more than 3/4 standard deviations below the average score.

TABLE 3. LEGEND

Good		Score > Average+3/4*Std Dev
Mid-range		Average-3/4*Std Dev < Score < Average+3/4*Std Dev
Could improve		Score < Average-3/4*Std Dev

TABLE 4. QUALITATIVE INDICATOR SCORES BY DONOR -PILLAR 1

DONORS	PILLAR 1			
	Neutrality and impartiality	Independence of aid	Adapting to changing needs	Timely funding to partners
Australia	7.53	7.69	4.74	7.16
Belgium	8.56	8.24	6.16	6.55
Canada	7.65	6.55	6.27	7.47
Denmark	9.10	8.12	6.12	7.19
EC	8.11	7.12	7.83	6.85
Finland	8.22	8.24	4.76	7.29
France	7.66	6.37	6.26	6.50
Germany	7.24	6.43	6.14	6.48
Ireland	8.58	8.42	5.81	8.02
Italy	7.04	6.00	6.42	5.80
Japan	8.42	7.47	6.97	6.18
Luxembourg	8.58	8.38	4.80	7.50
Netherlands	8.06	7.31	6.96	7.23
Norway	8.92	8.23	6.70	7.18
Spain	8.60	7.71	6.17	6.20
Sweden	8.98	8.22	6.63	7.60
Switzerland	8.76	8.16	6.56	7.93
UK	7.47	6.13	6.47	6.31
US	7.19	6.00	7.48	7.44



TABLE 5. QUALITATIVE INDICATOR SCORES BY DONOR -PILLARS 2 AND 3

DONORS	PILLAR 2				PILLAR 3			
	Strengthening local capacity	Beneficiary participation	Linking relief to rehabilitation and development	Prevention and risk reduction	Flexibility of funding	Strengthening organisational capacity	Supporting coordination	Donor capacity and expertise
Australia	➡ 6.13	⬇ 3.78	⬇ 4.76	➡ 4.20	➡ 7.34	➡ 5.27	➡ 6.23	➡ 6.37
Belgium	➡ 5.26	➡ 4.49	➡ 5.43	➡ 4.16	➡ 7.08	➡ 4.36	⬇ 5.69	➡ 6.62
Canada	⬆ 6.65	⬆ 5.57	➡ 5.71	➡ 4.86	➡ 6.23	⬇ 3.83	➡ 6.35	➡ 6.94
Denmark	➡ 5.77	⬆ 5.34	⬆ 6.77	⬆ 5.31	⬆ 8.37	➡ 5.14	⬆ 7.11	⬆ 7.18
EC	➡ 6.12	⬆ 5.90	➡ 5.35	⬆ 5.61	⬆ 5.97	➡ 4.63	⬆ 7.91	⬆ 7.95
Finland	⬆ 4.68	⬆ 4.17	⬆ 6.53	⬆ 2.99	⬆ 7.73	➡ 4.82	➡ 6.42	➡ 5.70
France	⬆ 6.83	⬆ 5.61	➡ 6.02	⬆ 3.87	⬆ 5.97	⬆ 3.53	➡ 6.10	➡ 6.35
Germany	➡ 5.74	➡ 4.44	⬆ 5.11	➡ 4.91	⬆ 5.58	⬆ 3.84	➡ 5.84	⬆ 5.13
Ireland	⬆ 4.04	➡ 5.00	➡ 5.90	⬆ 5.76	⬆ 8.79	⬆ 6.33	⬆ 4.66	⬆ 3.81
Italy	➡ 5.80	➡ 4.96	➡ 5.83	⬆ 3.57	⬆ 5.71	➡ 4.63	➡ 6.85	➡ 6.03
Japan	⬆ 5.18	⬆ 4.06	➡ 5.97	⬆ 5.18	➡ 6.27	➡ 4.83	➡ 5.78	➡ 6.20
Luxembourg	⬆ 4.52	⬆ 3.07	⬆ 5.22	⬆ 3.31	➡ 7.34	⬆ 3.90	⬆ 4.60	⬆ 4.11
Netherlands	⬆ 6.95	⬆ 5.62	⬆ 6.11	⬆ 5.17	➡ 7.45	⬆ 5.43	➡ 6.74	➡ 6.42
Norway	⬆ 6.38	➡ 4.83	➡ 5.98	➡ 4.50	⬆ 7.84	⬆ 5.52	⬆ 7.11	➡ 6.62
Spain	➡ 5.18	➡ 4.94	➡ 5.68	➡ 4.38	➡ 6.50	➡ 4.40	➡ 6.09	⬆ 5.33
Sweden	⬆ 6.55	➡ 5.11	➡ 5.90	➡ 4.89	⬆ 7.76	⬆ 5.53	➡ 6.38	➡ 6.38
Switzerland	➡ 6.21	➡ 4.48	➡ 5.55	⬆ 3.58	⬆ 7.67	⬆ 5.30	➡ 6.23	⬆ 7.56
UK	➡ 5.65	➡ 4.73	⬆ 5.05	➡ 4.73	⬆ 5.68	➡ 4.36	⬆ 7.02	➡ 6.98
US	➡ 6.15	➡ 5.10	➡ 5.40	➡ 4.75	➡ 6.41	➡ 4.28	➡ 6.74	⬆ 7.18



TABLE 6. QUALITATIVE INDICATOR SCORES BY DONOR -PILLARS 4 AND 5

DONORS	PILLAR 4				PILLAR 5			
	Advocacy towards local authorities	Funding protection of civilians	Advocacy for protection of civilians	Facilitating safe access	Accountability towards beneficiaries	Implementing evaluation recommendations	Appropriate reporting requirements	Donor transparency
Australia	↓ 4.00	↑ 8.08	↓ 4.74	↓ 4.20	↓ 3.74	↓ 3.23	→ 6.75	→ 5.94
Belgium	→ 5.45	→ 6.31	→ 5.57	↑ 6.19	↓ 2.87	→ 4.50	↑ 8.35	↓ 5.63
Canada	→ 5.78	→ 6.62	→ 5.86	→ 5.36	→ 3.99	↑ 5.26	→ 7.39	→ 6.20
Denmark	→ 6.04	↑ 7.68	→ 6.15	→ 4.94	↑ 5.92	↑ 4.92	→ 7.01	↑ 7.05
EC	↑ 6.60	→ 6.69	→ 5.93	↑ 6.55	↑ 5.01	↑ 5.81	↓ 6.60	→ 6.52
Finland	↑ 6.55	↑ 7.65	↑ 6.58	↓ 4.27	↑ 5.62	→ 4.11	↑ 7.92	→ 6.25
France	→ 6.05	→ 6.88	↑ 6.23	↑ 6.15	↓ 3.60	→ 4.80	↓ 6.64	↓ 5.42
Germany	↓ 4.39	↓ 5.01	↓ 4.32	↓ 4.10	→ 4.39	→ 3.87	→ 6.74	↓ 5.33
Ireland	↓ 3.13	↓ 6.12	↓ 3.30	→ 4.94	↓ 3.70	↓ 3.06	→ 7.14	↓ 5.42
Italy	→ 5.31	↓ 6.15	→ 5.78	↓ 4.11	→ 4.26	→ 4.23	↓ 6.64	↓ 5.39
Japan	→ 5.72	→ 6.90	→ 5.39	→ 4.75	↓ 3.52	→ 4.23	→ 7.34	→ 6.37
Luxembourg	↓ 3.55	→ 7.05	→ 5.63	↓ 3.57	→ 4.03	↓ 3.41	→ 7.45	→ 5.99
Netherlands	→ 5.91	→ 6.54	↑ 6.80	→ 5.60	↑ 5.02	→ 4.49	→ 7.22	↑ 6.86
Norway	→ 6.29	→ 7.11	↑ 6.67	→ 5.45	→ 4.77	→ 4.22	↑ 7.86	↑ 7.11
Spain	→ 5.24	→ 6.85	→ 5.21	→ 4.79	→ 3.88	↓ 3.40	↓ 6.38	→ 5.73
Sweden	→ 6.06	→ 7.05	→ 5.77	→ 5.28	→ 4.63	→ 4.42	→ 6.82	↑ 7.39
Switzerland	↑ 7.13	→ 7.18	→ 5.30	→ 5.10	→ 4.35	→ 3.87	→ 7.49	↑ 6.85
UK	→ 6.07	→ 6.53	↓ 4.75	→ 5.56	→ 4.53	↑ 4.86	↓ 6.32	→ 6.18
US	↑ 6.48	→ 6.67	→ 5.77	↑ 5.93	→ 4.47	→ 4.75	↓ 6.56	↓ 5.65



5. HRI 2010 QUALITATIVE INDICATORS SUMMARY

TABLE 7. QUALITATIVE INDICATOR SCORES SUMMARY -PILLARS 1 AND 2

	PILLAR 1				PILLAR 2			
	Neutrality and impartiality	Independence of aid	Adapting to changing needs	Timely funding to partners	Strengthening local capacity	Beneficiary participation	Linking relief to rehabilitation and development	Prevention and risk reduction
Average score	8.14	7.41	6.28	6.99	5.78	4.80	5.70	4.51
Median	8.22	7.69	6.27	7.18	5.80	4.94	5.71	4.73
Standard deviation	0.65	0.89	0.83	0.63	0.80	0.71	0.50	0.78
Minimum score	7.04	6.00	4.74	5.80	4.04	3.07	4.76	2.99
Maximum score	9.10	8.42	7.83	8.02	6.95	5.90	6.77	5.76

TABLE 8. QUALITATIVE INDICATOR SCORES SUMMARY -PILLARS 3 AND 4

	PILLAR 3				PILLAR 4			
	Flexibility of funding	Strengthening organisational capacity	Supporting coordination	Donor capacity and expertise	Advocacy towards local authorities	Funding protection of civilians	Advocacy for protection of civilians	Facilitating safe access
Average score	6.93	4.73	6.31	6.25	5.57	6.79	5.57	5.10
Median	7.08	4.63	6.35	6.38	5.91	6.85	5.77	5.10
Standard deviation	0.97	0.73	0.81	1.07	1.08	0.67	0.86	0.81
Minimum score	5.58	3.53	4.60	3.81	3.13	5.01	3.30	3.57
Maximum score	8.79	6.33	7.91	7.95	7.13	8.08	6.80	6.55



TABLE 9. QUALITATIVE INDICATOR SCORES SUMMARY -PILLAR 5

	PILLAR 5			
	Accountability towards beneficiaries	Implementing evaluation recommendations	Appropriate reporting requirements	Donor transparency
Average score	4.33	4.29	7.08	6.17
Median	4.35	4.23	7.01	6.18
Standard deviation	0.74	0.71	0.56	0.65
Minimum score	2.87	3.06	6.32	5.33
Maximum score	5.92	5.81	8.35	7.39

Particularly well scored indicators for OECD/DAC: Neutrality and impartiality and Independence of aid, all in Pillar 1; all of those who scored above 7 are marked in green.

Particularly poorly scored indicators for OECD/DAC donors: Beneficiary participation, Prevention, preparedness and risk reduction, Strengthening organisational capacity, Accountability towards affected populations and Implementing evaluation recommendations (all scored of those who below 5 are marked in red)

Indicator Linking relief to development (LRRD), presents an especially low standard deviation: 0.5. This translates into a wide consensus on the fact that LRRD is not given the necessary priority by donor governments.



6. MISSING VALUES

Questions in the HRI field questionnaire that present a particularly high percentage of missing values are number 18, 19 and 20 on protection (funding and advocacy) and access, for which about a fifth of the responses are missing. Donor scores in these questions must therefore be interpreted with care.

TABLE 10. MISSING VALUES BY QUESTION

Question	Name	Missing Values (%)
1	Neutrality and impartiality	1.8%
2	Independence of aid	2.6%
3	Aid free from restrictions	0.3%
4	Adapting to changing needs	2.2%
5	Timely funding to organisations	3.6%
6	Gender sensitive approach	5.8%
7	Strengthening local capacity	5.6%
8	Beneficiary involvement in design	4.7%
9	Beneficiary involvement in implementation	4.9%
10	Beneficiary involvement in M&E	4.8%
11	LRRD (linking relief to development)	6.7%
12	Prevention, preparedness and risk reduction	6.8%
13	Flexibility of funding	6.2%
14	Strengthening organisational capacity	7.1%
15	Supporting coordination	4.3%
16	Donor capacity and expertise	5.5%
17	Advocacy towards local authorities	10.1%
18	Funding protection of civilians	25.5%
19	Advocacy for protection of civilians	22.9%
20	Facilitating safe access and security	18.9%
21	Accountability towards affected populations	4.2%
22	Implementing evaluation recommendations	9.5%
23	Appropriate reporting requirements	1.4%
24	Donor transparency	7.3%



ANNEX I. HRI FIELD QUESTIONNAIRE

THE HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE INDEX 2011

Survey questionnaire

Are you familiar with the Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative?

1	2	3	4	5	DK/NA
<i>Not at all</i>		<i>Somewhat</i>		<i>Completely</i>	

Are you familiar with the Humanitarian Response Index?

1	2	3	4	5	DK/NA
<i>Not at all</i>		<i>Somewhat</i>		<i>Completely</i>	

On a scale of 1 – 5, please answer the following questions on the performance of each of the donors that provided funding for your humanitarian programming in 2010.

1	2	3	4	5	DK/NA
<i>Not at all</i>		<i>Somewhat</i>		<i>Completely</i>	

IMPORTANT: For questions number 6, 7, 8, 9, 10,12 and 21 the answer scale is defined as:

1. *It's not a requirement and not given any importance by the donor*
2. *It's not a requirement by the donor, but they like to see it if we include it*
3. *It's a requirement but not given much importance by the donor*
4. *It's an important requirement for the donor*
5. *It's an important requirement and the donor verifies to make sure we do*

Pillar one: Responding to needs

1. Has your donor's humanitarian assistance been neutral and impartial?
2. Is your donor's humanitarian assistance independent from other political, economic or military interests?
3. Is your donor's assistance free from any conditions that would negatively affect your ability to deliver aid?
4. Does your donor verify that you adapt your programmes to meet changing needs?
5. Does your donor provide funding on time, when it is needed?
6. *Does your donor require you to incorporate gender sensitive approaches in your programmes? (check scale)*

Pillar two: Local capacity, prevention, risk reduction, and LRRD

7. *Does your donor require you to strengthen local capacity as part of your programmes? (community, local institutions, etc.)*
8. *Does your donor require beneficiary participation:*
 8. *in design?*
 9. *in implementation?*
 10. *in monitoring and evaluation?*
11. Does your donor support you to integrate recovery and developmental activities in your programmes, when appropriate?



12. Does your donor require you to incorporate conflict and disaster prevention, preparedness and risk reduction in your programmes?

Pillar three: Working with humanitarian partners?

- 13. Does your donor provide you with flexible funding arrangements?
- 14. Does your donor’s support include strengthening your own organisational capacity in areas like preparedness, response and contingency planning?
- 15. Does your donor support coordination among all actors?
- 16. Does your donor have sufficient capacity and expertise (either at field or headquarters level) to make appropriate decisions?

Pillar four: Protection and international laws

- 17. Does your donor advocate for governments and local authorities to fulfill their responsibilities in the response to the humanitarian needs?
- 18. Does your donor facilitate protection of civilians:
 - 11. In terms of funding?
 - 12. In terms of advocacy?
- 20. Does your donor facilitate safe humanitarian access and security of humanitarian workers?

Pillar five: Learning and accountability

- 21. Does your donor require you to integrate accountability towards affected populations in your programmes?
- 22. Does your donor work with you to implement recommendations from evaluations?
- 23. Are your donor’s reporting requirements appropriate?
- 24. How transparent is your donor about its funding and decision-making?

25. Taking into consideration your responses to these questions, what final score would you give for each of your donors? (Please rate them on a scale of 1 to 5)

A. Could you provide specific examples of good and poor donor practice?

Age	Country of origin of the organization
Sex	Type of organization
Country of nationality	Years of experience in the humanitarian or development field
Position	Years of experience working in this crisis
Organisation	
Sector(s) of activity	

Thank you!