

Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design for Pacific Media Assistance Scheme (PACMAS)

A: AidWorks details

Initiative Name:	Pacific Media Assistance Scheme (PACMAS)		
AidWorks ID:	INH353	Total Amount:	\$830,000 over 2 years (will increase)
Start Date:	February 2008	End Date:	Phase 1 end 30 June 2009

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details

Initial ratings prepared by:	Greg Ellis, Design Adviser, DPAG
Meeting date:	Wednesday 12 December 2007
Chair:	Catherine Walker, A/g DDG Global Programs Division
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arthi Patel, Vanuatu Program Manager - Wendy Highett, Manager Corporate Governance, ABC - Evelyn Loh, PACMAS Activity Manager
Independent Appraiser:	- Greg Ellis, Design Adviser DPAG
Other peer review participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Judith Robinson, ADG Pacific (Minister Counsellor, Pacific Regional designate) - Kaye Schofield, Design Team Leader - Geoff Heriot, Chief of Corporate Planning and Governance, ABC - Dominic Friguglietti, Manager, International Projects, ABC (by phone) - Andrew Craig, Pacific Regional Section, DFAT - Nicholas Carpentier, Pacific Regional Section, DFAT - Jay Caldwell, Pacific Open Source Unit, ONA - Zoe Mander-Jones, Director Partnerships Policy Section - Jim Catchlove, Design and Procurement Advisory Group - Jillian Ray, Solomon Islands program, AusAID - Michael Bergmann, Building Demand for Better Governance Unit - Sarah MacCana, Building Demand for Better Governance Unit

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators			
<i>completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser</i>			
Criteria	Rating (1-6) *	Explanation	Actions to improve
1. Clear objectives	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall an elegant design with a strengths based approach - Given the reliance on partners, need to acknowledge the time and energy required to build meaningful relationships - Partner buy-in is mixed and requires quick attention: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o UNDP has expressed interest o PINA are keen partners so they can support their operations o ABC is keen to be involved o SPC informal discussions are positive o NZAID – unsure – no discussions yet - More consultations will add body to the design and could make the Y2 outcomes clearer - Financial independence for media outlets (C6) is too ambitious and there are too many elements that Australia cannot control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporate the building of relationships with implementing partners as a discrete objective and commence with this ASAP. - Revise C6 to be more achievable (develop a range of models of financial independence, not gain independence)
2. Monitoring and Evaluation	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The M&E arrangements might be too advanced for a program of this size and amount - Significant work is flagged for a performance adviser on the program: additional funds are needed to ensure that enough of this person's time can be bought onto the program so the Activity Manager is not expected to undertake additional responsibilities in this area - In the lead up to the new NPP, M&E results will need to be leveraged to ensure more funding. - If management is done in-house, it will increase the proportion used for AusAID management, over the 20% recommended by ODE. There are good reasons for in-house management (e.g. benefits for relationships, value in bringing all pockets of the media sector together), but they need to be spelt out - More consideration is need on how partnerships are monitored and evaluated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reassess the number of Indicators and the means of verification to match the scale of the design - Seek additional funds for the Performance Adviser - Suggest a baseline for Phase one to ensure we can measure whatever gains we have for P2 - Design needs to reflect better the benefits of in-house management - Look to partnerships unit for M&E structure to capture partnerships & why they exist

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators*completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser*

3. Sustainability	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emphasis on working through existing institutions is essential for sustainability, but unsure how much capacity implementing partners have - The whole of sector approach is aimed towards sustainability - This design's potential should be viewed within a longer timeframe: immediate goals are preparing foundations for a more sustained design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess the existing capacity of implementing partners and then review outcomes accordingly
-------------------	---	---	--

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators

completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser

4. Implementation & Risk Management	4	<p>Activity Manager position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our capacity to identify and recruit the right person for the job will have significant impact on the program's success - <i>Qualities:</i> Manager not a technical specialist, but will need to understand the language and issues of media, be good at strategic analysis, be able to build relationship and manage programs - <i>Location:</i> symbolism of the location is important, but also has implications for cost and on how attractive the position is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Having them in an AusAID regional hub is ideal (e.g. like PLP), especially if they have a lot of media expertise but not as much AusAID / program management understanding o The location of the position can change in the future - <i>Support:</i> the position has a lot of responsibilities, it will need to be adequately supported (admin, technical skills, higher level engagement) <p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only have allocation for 2 years: confirmation of additional funds needed as early as possible for Phase 2. - Could source funds from other areas within the budget measure and look into cost sharing with different areas of Pac branch - To improve chances of additional funds, also need to show early gains. Getting program runs on the board quickly might also assist in leveraging other programs for funds <p>Implementation Guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Require more direction in the design about what order the components will be phased in so it isn't too ambitious - Governance arrangement: a committee of all partners will provide additional guidance - Require communications strategies with stakeholders to examine how this will interact with bilateral programs. - Implementing partners have been selected due to unique strengths and areas of expertise. Partners to be supported during implementation to extend this expertise regionally. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Write a position description for the Activity Manager, including clear information about what support will be available - Assess what additional funding is available - Priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o must do components 1 & 2 to deal with legacy issues o explore the potential of delegating to NZAID - C7 seems a simple and effective way to facilitate demand for good governance and engagement with civil society o C 4&5 are strategies that lead to deeper relationships between partners, carried out by a trusted partner. C4 a higher priority than 5 o C4 – missing a quick win: 18 months could be too hard to maintain traction without some kind of achievement o C6 a larger issue to bite off, so a lower priority in Phase 1 - Regional program to be implemented using a "nodes of excellence" model rather than a "centre-periphery" model.
-------------------------------------	---	---	--

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators*completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser*

5. Analysis and lessons	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The significant upfront investment in analysis and lessons is clear and has paid dividends - Can develop the relationship between bilateral and regional programs 	<p>Share lessons learned on clear benefits of robust analysis with other AusAID designs.</p> <p>Building links between regional and bilateral programs should be a responsibility of the activity manager</p>
-------------------------	---	--	---

*** Definitions of the Rating Scale:**

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6)		Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3)	
6	Very high quality; needs ongoing management & monitoring only	3	Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
5	Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas	2	Poor quality; needs major work to improve
4	Adequate quality; needs some work to improve	1	Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

D: Next Steps *completed by Activity Manager*

Provide information on all steps required to finalise the design based on <i>Required Actions</i> in "C" above, and additional actions identified in the peer review meeting	Who is responsible	Date to be done
1. Incorporate the building of relationships with implementing partners as a discrete objective.	Design Team	25 Jan 08
2. Revise C6 to be more achievable (develop a range of models of financial independence, not gain independence)	Design Team	25 Jan 08
3. Reassess the number of Indicators and the means of verification to match the scale of the design	Design Team	25 Jan 08
4. Revise the design to better reflect the advantages of managing the activity in-house	Design Team	25 Jan 08
5. Reflect partnerships in the Monitoring and Evaluation framework	Design Team & Activity Manager	25 Jan 08
6. Assess the capacity of potential implementing partners and review the outcomes accordingly	Activity Manager	Ongoing
7. Develop a position description for the Activity Manager	Design Team & Activity Manager	25 Jan 08
8. Source additional funding for the program from the Budget Measure	Activity Manager	Ongoing
9. Source additional funding for the program from Pacific Branch	ADG Pacific	Ongoing
10. Phase components for implementation	Design Team	25 Jan 08

E: Other comments or issues *completed by Activity Manager*

- The Review meeting agreed that this program must deal with two legacy issues from the PMCF:
 - AusAID invested in the Certificate and Diploma courses very late in PMCF and our credibility and investment is under threat if we don't take steps to make it more sustainable. This makes component 1 a very high priority.
 - Pacific has had a negative customer experience with AusAID (eg with PINA). A lot has been promised, but not much delivered. This approach needs to change, even though it may be risky. This makes component 2 a very high priority.
- Given this history, however, PACMAS also needs to differentiate itself from PMCF and needs to signal that this program is more than vocational education – Components 1 & 2 are necessary, but it will be necessary to get runs on the board with C7 (quite small and done easily) and C4 & 5 – strategies that lead to more relationship building. It was agreed that in order to avoid repeating mistakes of the past, PACMAS needs to be implemented well and robustly, or not at all.

F: Approval *completed by ADG or Minister-Counsellor who chaired the peer review meeting*

On the basis of the final agreed Quality Rating assessment (C) and Next Steps (D) above:

- QAE REPORT IS APPROVED**, and authorization given to proceed to:
- FINALISE** the design incorporating actions above, and proceed to implementation
- or: **REDESIGN** and resubmit for appraisal peer review

- NOT APPROVED** for the following reason(s):
- _____
- _____
- _____

Alistair Sherwin, (A/g
Catherine Walker)

signed:



10/4/08

When complete:

- Copy and paste the details from Part C of this final approved Quality at Entry report into Aidworks, to be used for management reporting
- The original signed report must be placed on a registered file