

**Quality at Entry Report for
Australia-Africa Partnerships Facility
Consolidated Views of Appraisers from Peer Review, 31 October 2009**

Quality Rating Assessment against indicators			
Quality	Rating (1-6) *	Comments to support rating	Required Actions (if needed) ‡
1. Clear objectives	4	Overall the appraisers were satisfied that the objectives were clear given the dual nature of the Facility in development and foreign policy areas.	Simplify objectives to two – development benefits and Australian profile.
2. Monitoring and Evaluation	4	Overall the appraisers were satisfied that monitoring and evaluation was adequately addressed. It would be important to monitor both development impact and relationship building in a balanced way. The primary responsibility for developing the monitoring and evaluation framework has been placed on the managing contractor. The overriding principals presented are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Partner country ownership of performance; ▪ Focus on activity level performance, not program-wide performance; ▪ Acceptance that this is an inherently risky program, with resources spread thinly in countries where Australia has a limited track record and little or no physical presence. 	Clarify how the Program Support Group will work.
3. Sustainability	4	Overall the appraisers noted that sustainability of development activities was challenging but that the design addressed these adequately. Short term nature of activities will limit development impacts however strong scoping and partner government ownership should help to overcome some constraints of short term inputs. Follow up plans for substantial activities and funding for staggered and ongoing support should also increase sustainability. Developing an understanding of partner government processes is critical to ownership and ultimately the success of Australia's engagement in Africa. Looking for donor complementarity (rather than competition) will also help to ensure alignment with other activities and hopefully increasing the sustainability.	Note that Australia, as a small donor, is looking to compliment rather than compete with existing programs of other larger donors.

Quality Rating Assessment against indicators			
4. Implementation & Risk Management	4	<p>Implementation and governance arrangements appear sound. As a mechanism the design document sets out simple but rigorous processes for managing the flow of proposals, quality assurance and engagement with key whole of government partners such as DFAT and Austrade. However, given the uncertainty over the environment that will be operated in, flexibility and adaptability need to be accepted. The design has articulated this well.</p> <p>AusAID will need to work closely with the managing contractor during mobilisation and implementation to ensure risks are addressed by adequate processes and smooth relationships. Working in so many countries with limited financial, logistical and human resources will need significant management attention if the Facility is to deliver effectively on the existing high expectations. AusAID will also need to work effectively with other Australian Government partners including DFAT, Austrade, AFP and other State/Territory Government agencies. AusAID will also need to get the balance right between its strategic and management involvement in the Facility.</p>	<p>Include core principles such as are in the Market Development Facility. Prioritize the sectors with major focus on extractives, agriculture and public policy.</p>
5. Analysis and lessons	5	<p>Appraisers agreed that this was well addressed in the design document. There is limited analysis of the specific countries that the Facility will be operating in but there is some good analysis on the Continent level and Australia's previous engagement in Africa. Given that what has been designed states it is only a mechanism, the analysis is adequate. Over time more analysis will occur in the Facility and this should be captured as lessons for future activities, both inside and outside the Facility.</p> <p>AusAID has undertaken a number of other Facilities around the world and a comprehensive analysis of lessons has been undertaken to feed into the implementation strategies of this design. Additionally AusAID has recently mobilised an activity in the Seychelles and this has been used as a knowledge basis.</p>	<p>Include a lesson on the importance of gender integration to development effectiveness.</p>

*** Rating:** Provide ratings for each of the quality principles using the questions on the next page to assist you, and the following rating scale:

Satisfactory rating (4, 5 and 6)

- 6 Very high quality; needs ongoing management & monitoring only
- 5 Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas
- 4 Adequate quality; needs some work to improve

Less than satisfactory rating (1, 2 and 3)

- 3 Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
- 2 Poor quality; needs major work to improve
- 1 Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

‡ Required actions (if needed): These boxes should be used wherever the rating is less than 5, to identify actions needed to raise the rating to the next level, and to fully satisfactory (5). The text can note recommended or ongoing actions.

D: Next Steps <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting</i>		
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. Two objectives	Tracey Austwick	12 Nov 09
2. Clarify Program Monitoring Group	Tracey Austwick	12 Nov 09
3. Emphasize complementarity	Tracey Austwick	12 Nov 09

D: Next Steps <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting</i>		
4. Include core principles	Tracey Austwick	12 Nov 09
5. Include lessons on gender integration	Tracey Austwick	12 Nov 09

E: Other comments or issues <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the APR meeting</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post are providing final clearance of design. All changes identified here and in the peer review minutes have been actioned.

F: Approval <i>completed by ADG or Minister-Counsellor who chaired the peer review meeting</i>		
<p>On the basis of the final agreed Quality Rating assessment (C) and Next Steps (D) above:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> QAE REPORT IS APPROVED, and authorization given to proceed to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"> <input type="radio"/> FINALISE the design incorporating actions above, and proceed to implementation <i>or:</i> <input type="radio"/> REDESIGN and resubmit for appraisal peer review </p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPROVED for the following reason(s):</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>		
Suzanne Dageseven (on behalf of ADG AHPB)	signed:	

When complete:

- Copy and paste the approved ratings, explanation and actions (table C) into AidWorks
- The original signed report must be placed on a registered file