

**Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design for  
PARTNERSHIP FRAMEWORK BETWEEN AUSAID AND VISION 2020 AUSTRALIA  
GLOBAL CONSORTIUM**

**A: AidWorks details** *completed by Activity Manager*

<b>Initiative Name:</b>	<b>ABI: PARTNERSHIP FRAMEWORK BETWEEN AUSAID AND VISION 2020 AUSTRALIA GLOBAL CONSORTIUM</b>		
<b>AidWorks ID:</b>	INI093/08B284	<b>Total Amount:</b>	<b>UP TO AUD15 MILLION</b>
<b>Start Date:</b>	31 October 2009	<b>End Date:</b>	31 December 2011

**B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details** *completed by Activity Manager*

<b>Initial ratings prepared by:</b>	Anne Rigby
<b>Meeting date:</b>	18 August 2009
<b>Chair:</b>	Kristen Pratt, Director Disability Inclusive Development in lieu of Laurie Dunn ADG OPS (unwell)
<b>Peer reviewers providing formal comment &amp; ratings:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mark Sayers, Partnerships and Volunteers Section</li> <li>- Ms Katherine Yuave, Health Section, AusAID, Port Moresby</li> <li>- Dr Krishna Hort, Independent Reviewer, Nossal Institute, Melbourne</li> </ul>
<b>Independent Appraiser:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dr Krishna Hort, Independent Reviewer, Nossal Institute, Melbourne</li> </ul>
<b>Other peer review participants:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Megan Anderson, Director NGOs and Community Engagement Section</li> <li>- Robyn Biti, HIV Advisor, HHTG AusAID</li> <li>- Megan McCoy, Pacific Regional Section, NZAID</li> </ul> <p><b>PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED COMMENTS:</b>  Paul Nichols, Quality &amp; Performance Management, OPS  Corinne Taranawsky, Human Development Unit  Jill Bell, HHTG  Suva Post, AusAID</p>

**C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators**

completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser

Quality	Rating (1-6) *	Comments to support rating	Required Action (if needed)
1. Clear objectives	5	<p>The goal and objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consistent with international policy and Australian Government commitments, and with AusAID policy in terms of Development for All, and working with NGOs</li> <li>- Sufficiently clear, measurable and likely to be feasible in the 2 year time period. Appropriate for the partnership level.</li> </ul> <p><u>However.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is not a sense of a shared vision for the partnership or how the partnership will contribute to the goal. A "higher order" objective is needed that 'sums up' the current objectives, and provides a joint statement of how the partnership contributes to the goal. This could be related to what the partners want to "leverage" from the partnership (ref <i>"the scaling-up of existing efforts and demonstration activities for future application – in line with the globally –agreed program, this will include integration of comprehensive national plans for the prevention of blindness into health care systems, strengthening national Vision 2020 coordinating bodies and collaboration at international, regional and country level with community-based organisations and the private sector.."</i>) and the need to build partner government support.</li> <li>- Objectives are a mix of higher order outcomes for the partners (Objectives 1 and 2), and process order outcomes for the remaining objectives.</li> <li>- The extent of national partner government commitment is likely to vary across the countries involved. One of the reasons for the partnership approach is to build that support and commitment.</li> <li>- Links between the goal and all of the objectives are not immediately obvious esp. (d) and (e).</li> <li>- Difficult to assess whether objectives are achievable and within the timeframe of specific countries.</li> </ul>	<p>Replace "incidence" with "prevalence" in the goal as this is the usual measure of preventable blindness</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p> <p>Preparation of a "higher order" objective that combines (a) improving access of disadvantaged people in countries of the region to comprehensive eye care services and (b) increasing national government and national and regional donor commitment and funding towards eye care services and preventing avoidable blindness.</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p> <p>Next level of work should involve specific guidelines and timeframe for ABI.</p>



**C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators**

completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser

2. Monitoring and Evaluation	5	<p>The document provides the framework and sets out the principles and requirements for adequate M&amp;E.</p> <p>M&amp;E is noted as a key principle under Principle 1(c) accountability and 18, development of a knowledge base.</p> <p>The reporting process will include reporting of M&amp;E both against partnership outcomes, and against partnership performance.</p> <p>The proposed independent review will further strengthen M&amp;E.</p> <p>M&amp;E activities include annual and exception reporting of performance against objectives (against yet to be determined performance indicators) and of the partnership itself. This seems reasonable as these reports will inform Annual Partnership Discussions.</p> <p>It is noted that those with vision impairment should contribute to M&amp;E.</p> <p><u>However,</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partnership Framework document does not provide adequate direction and structure to ensure M&amp;E is appropriately undertaken.</li> <li>It appears as if the burden of M&amp;E sits with one of the partners rather than both. Apart from reading the reports and attending meetings, what will AusAID do to monitor the effectiveness of the partnership? To what extent is there joint responsibility for M&amp;E?</li> <li>Can the M&amp;E system to be prepared by Vision 2020 be inclusive of the national government's own monitoring system?</li> <li>It is not clear if Vision 2020 Australia have a broader framework to guide M&amp;E.</li> </ol>	<p>An additional principle be included in those listed under delivery mechanisms which specifies the need to establish appropriate M&amp;E structures and processes, based on and strengthening existing systems, and for regular reporting of results.</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p> <p>Strengthen AusAID's role in M&amp;E – as it stands AusAID will be involved in such activities "where appropriate".</p> <p>Vision 2020 should identify M &amp; E indicators that align with national government priorities that include avoidable blindness.</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p>
3. Sustainability	5	<p>The sustainability of the partnership's investments is a significant issue given the focus of partnership activities for "scale up" involves a significant investment with a fairly short time span, and with the channelling of funding through non-government rather than government systems.</p> <p>Document includes reference to sustainability in Principles (notably) #23. A number of principles also refer to building capacity, developing national ownership and aligning with national policy (which will all contribute to sustainability) and notes that the Vision 2020 implementing partners have capacity and commitment to sustainability.</p> <p>Partnership builds on and extends existing relationships between the parties and provides a sound basis for future work. Aspects of the Guiding Principles (eg 19, 20, 22, 23, 26) outline mechanisms that could sustain the Partnership Goal beyond the life of the partnership itself.</p> <p>Attention to sustainability of individual activities is also required as part of the workplan.</p> <p><u>However,</u></p> <p>Sustainability needs to be given greater focus. The suggested "higher level" objective would go some way to increase the focus on sustainability, as the two aspects of this objective are ways of achieving sustainability.</p>	<p>Identify sustainability of partnership investments/activities as a key risk, and document how it will be assessed and addressed at a partnership level.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eg strengthen partner government / NGO relations through national PBL committees. Activities under the workplan may include research on investment and on-going financing options, and use research to advocate for adequate budget commitments from governments, health financing systems and donors.</li> </ol> <p><b>-completed</b></p>

**C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators**

completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser

<p>4. Implementation &amp; Risk Management</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Assessment of implementation and risk management is based on an assessment of the proposed partnership mechanism, and on the capacities and reputation of the implementing NGO partners.</p> <p>The Partnership Framework shifts responsibility for implementation and risk management of implementation to the implementing NGO partners.</p> <p>The Partnership Framework provides a structure and mechanism for managing the planning, reporting and funding of activities through the implementing partners which provides adequate guidance and structure.</p> <p><u>However</u></p> <p>Roles and responsibilities of the partners are not clear in some areas, such as funding, planning and communication.</p> <p>While implementation is not through partner government systems, it is appropriate in the development context of eye care services to use non-government channels to pilot and scale up interventions with the aim of building partner government commitment and resourcing.</p> <p>The risks identified are at the partnership level, but do not include sustainability – see “risk” (3)</p> <p>Risk management (7.1 and 7.2) rely on reporting which is retrospective rather than planning and mitigation prior to implementation.</p>	<p>Sustainability should be included as a risk.</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p> <p>Should clarify whether the annual report should also include an annual plan and budget to match the annual tranche funding.</p> <p>Clarify the reference to strategic planning and vision, and add planning, funding and communication responsibilities.</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p> <p>Risk management strategies should include planning and mitigation strategies in addition to reporting.</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p>
<p>5. Analysis and lessons</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Annex provides a brief but useful summary of the context for the decision to establish the partnership and the rationale for using this mechanism.</p> <p>Given the circumstances, the approach and mechanism seems sound.</p> <p>Cross cutting issues, notably gender are identified and noted among the key principles.</p> <p>The programming logic seems sound, particularly at an operational level and the technical solutions proposed in the indicative workplan appear robust and appropriate.</p> <p><u>However</u></p> <p>Reference in the Annex to more in depth analysis and constraints for the achievement of <i>Vision 2020-Right to Sight</i> objectives at national and regional levels would be useful.</p> <p>The Partnership Framework is largely supply driven.</p>	<p>Although adequate, reference to more indepth analysis could be added to Annex.</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p> <p>Clarify how “lessons learned” will be used to improve performance or be shared in other contexts.</p> <p>Target the criteria for selecting activities to be demand driven, by adding to the requirements under ‘delivery mechanisms’.</p> <p><b>-completed</b></p> <p>And define ‘demand’ in this context.</p>

**\* Definitions of the Rating Scale:**

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

**D: Next Steps** completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting

<p>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</p>	<p>Who is responsible</p>	<p>Date to be done</p>
<p> </p>	<p> </p>	<p> </p>

**E: Other comments or issues** completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the APR meeting

<p>•</p>
----------



**F: Approval** *completed by Director DIDT, on behalf of ADG (unwell)*

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):


\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Kristen Pratt

signed:

21/9/9  
< date >**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

