

Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool and Scoring Matrix

Last revised: September 2023

This tool is used to assess and provide comments on the quality of the design document, drawing on the Matrix (included from page 4).

This document should be read in conjunction with the [Investment Design Quality Assurance Guidance](#) (internal DFAT document). Please refer to the guidance for further details on the quality assurance process.

Investment name:
Start date:
End Date:
Total proposed funding allocation: AUD ____
Risk profile: <i>low/medium/high/very high risk</i>
Value profile: <i>low/medium/high value</i> [low <\$3m; high = \$100m and above]
Investment outcomes: <i><State the end program outcomes expected from this investment></i>
Investment description: <i><Briefly describe how this investment will be implemented></i>
Appraiser/peer reviewer name (and position, if internal to DFAT):
Date of appraisal or peer review:

Design Quality Scoring

Appraisers and formal peer reviewers should address each design quality criterion with reference to the Investment Design Quality Scoring Matrix.

Satisfactory rating

6 - Very high quality; does not require amendment before proceeding

5 – Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas

4 – Adequate quality; needs some work to improve

Less than satisfactory rating

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.

Criterion	Score
1. Relevance	
2. Effectiveness	
3. Efficiency	
4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)	
5. Sustainability	
6. Gender equality	
7. Cross-cutting issues (including disability inclusion, social inclusion, climate change, innovation, and private sector)	
8. Risk management and safeguards	

Independent Appraisal / Formal Peer Review Comments

Appraisers and formal peer reviewers should provide comments to support a rating – usually 1-3 paragraphs are sufficient) and, if needed, describe what action are required to improve the rating.

- 1. Relevance:** how well does the design explain why DFAT should make this investment, and the evidence underpinning this rationale?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
 - 2. Effectiveness:** does the design clearly describe end of program and intermediate outcomes, and a strong program logic? Are the policy dialogue arrangements clear to leverage reform?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
 - 3. Efficiency:** will the investment demonstrate value for money, and will it be an economical and ethical use of Australia's (and other partners') resources? Will governance and management arrangements enable effective implementation of the investment?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
 - 4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL):** are MEL arrangements appropriate for measuring progress towards expected outcomes?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
 - 5. Sustainability:** will expected benefits be long-lasting, and institutionalised through local systems?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
 - 6. Gender equality:** how well does the design address gender equality?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
 - 7. Cross-cutting issues:** does the design adequately address disability inclusion, social inclusion, climate change, innovative approaches, and private sector engagement?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
 - 8. Risk management and safeguards:** does the design address what could go wrong, and explain appropriate responses?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
- Other comments or issues for attention**

Investment Design Quality Scoring Matrix

This matrix sets out DFAT's expectations for investment design quality, and guidance on the application of scoring for appraisers, peer review chairs and participants, investment managers and delegates.

It builds on the [DFAT Design and Monitoring & Evaluation and Learning Standards](#) (Standard 4: Investment Design).

Investment design quality is scored on six-point scale (below). Each design quality criterion must be scored by each appraiser. When determining a score, reviewers should consider the available evidence on the design, normally restricted to the publicly available investment design document, regional or country development plans and policy statements or sectoral guidance, and may include reference to internal and sensitive material. Particular attention should be paid to justifying ratings of three and four.

Satisfactory rating

6 – Very good: satisfies criteria in all areas; does not require amendment

5 – Good: satisfies criteria in almost all areas; may need minor work to improve in some areas

4 – Adequate: on balance satisfies criteria; does not fail in any major area, needs some work to improve

Unsatisfactory rating

3 – Less than adequate: on balance does not satisfy criteria and/or fails in at least one major area; needs work to be improved in core areas

2 – Poor: does not satisfy criteria in several major area; needs major work to improve

1 – Very poor: does not satisfy criteria in any major area; needs major overhaul

This matrix emphasises the importance of analysis and evidence to support DFAT's investment decisions. High quality analysis of the investment context, including political economy analysis and gender analysis, should inform all of DFAT's investments. Recommendations and lessons learned from evaluations, independent reviews/evaluations, appraisal reports, aides-memoire, feedback from partners and other stakeholders, and independent research conducted in the context or sector should be clearly stated and responded to.

Some designs (including those for facilities and other extremely flexible, adaptive investments, design and implement arrangements, and innovative procurement trials) may defer development of some elements of the design (e.g. a detailed program logic) to implementation. In these cases this must be explained clearly, and responsibilities for development, quality assurance, and approval of these elements must be identified. Please contact designmail@dfat.gov.au to discuss how to adapt this matrix for these types of investments.

1. Relevance

Does the design explain why DFAT should make the proposed investment, and the evidence that has informed decisions?

Focus areas:

- Strategic focus and policy alignment
- Analysis and lessons
- Modality selection

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>DFAT’s strategic intent for the investment is explicitly set out, and reflects the priorities and objectives in the relevant development plan (and sector strategies, where relevant).</p> <p>It is clear how the investment aligns with Australia’s and the partner country’s formal policy commitments.</p> <p>The investment’s intersection with a broader range of Australian and partner country interests are described and analysed. Australia’s comparative advantage and influence is leveraged.</p>	<p>There is reference to DFAT’s strategic intent for the investment and reflects the priorities and objectives in the relevant development plan (and sector strategies, where relevant).</p> <p>Australia’s and the partner country’s formal policy commitments are set out, and alignment and linkages between them and the investment are demonstrated. Australia’s comparative advantage and influence is considered.</p>	<p>DFAT’s strategic intent is not identified and links to the relevant development plan (and sector strategies, where relevant) are weak.</p> <p>Policy commitments are summarised, with little analysis or description of their relationship to the proposed investment. Statements are general. Links to partners’ plans and strategies are poorly articulated.</p>	<p>There are cursory references to DFAT’s formal and publicly stated policy commitments.</p> <p>There are cursory references to partners’ plans and strategies.</p>
<p>Relevant analyses, including political economy or climate impact analysis and commissioned research are provided, along with details of consultation and feedback from local stakeholders including government, civil society, and the private sector.</p> <p>Lessons and recommendations from reviews and evaluations are explicitly addressed including how the findings and management responses have been integrated into the design.</p>	<p>Information from secondary sources is used to justify the investment. There is evidence of consultation with and incorporation of feedback from key stakeholders (including local stakeholders).</p> <p>Lessons and recommendations from reviews and evaluations are considered.</p> <p>Plans for conducting further analysis and using the evidence collected are stated clearly.</p>	<p>Assertions are based on few sources and references, with little reference to past lessons, reviews, or evaluations relevant to the investment. There is limited evidence of consultation with and incorporating feedback from key stakeholders.</p> <p>Plans for future analysis are non-specific, or not focused on use of the evidence collected.</p>	<p>The justification for Australia’s investment is poorly explained, and the evidence is weak based on earlier phases or similar interventions.</p> <p>There is no evidence of engagement with key stakeholders.</p> <p>There are no plans for future analysis.</p>

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>A range of delivery options / modalities to address the identified development challenges have been explored.</p> <p>The chosen approach(es) to delivering development assistance draw on high quality analysis (for example, political economy analysis) and lessons from past practice.</p> <p>There is considered assessment of alternative delivery options (including working in partner systems, sector wide approaches, partnerships, facilities, projects, co-financing, multilateral, NGO, TA, twinning, WoG engagement, and other modalities).</p>	<p>There is some discussion of alternative delivery options / modalities for addressing identified development challenges.</p> <p>There is a credible evidence-based explanation for why the chosen approach(es) to delivering development assistance are appropriate for the context.</p>	<p>Alternative options are not outlined.</p> <p>There is little explanation for the chosen approach(es) to delivering development assistance.</p>	<p>Alternative options are not outlined and there is no explanation for the chosen approach(es) to delivering development assistance.</p>

2. Effectiveness

Are the changes the investment is expected to deliver clearly identified, along with an explanation of how they will occur?

Focus areas:

- Outcomes and program logic
- Delivery approach(es)
- Policy dialogue and reform opportunities

Good, very good (rating 5-6)	Adequate (rating 4)	Less than adequate (rating 3)	Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)
<p>Both end of investment and intermediate outcomes fulfil the requirements in the 'adequate/rating 4' box at right.</p> <p>There is evidence to support DFAT's assertions that these outcomes are achievable, and that available resources, context, including climate context, and relationships have been analysed to confirm this.</p> <p>There is evidence that outcomes have been developed in consultation with stakeholders (particularly the partner government if relevant).</p> <p>End of Program outcomes or intermediate outcomes integrate gender equality, climate change, and localisation intent.</p>	<p>Outcome statements identify changes that can reasonably be expected to occur as a result of the investment, and define:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An 'end state' when the outcome has been achieved • Who or what is expected to change • The type of change expected to occur: knowledge (awareness of new ideas, techniques or strategies); action (behaviour change based upon new information/ideas); or condition (organisational or societal condition changes due to the stakeholders' actions) • When the changes are expected to be seen <p>DFAT's level of ambition for the investment is realistic, taking into account the human and financial resources, context, including climate context, and relationships.</p> <p>Outcomes are demonstrably acceptable to identified key stakeholders.</p>	<p>It is not clear who or what will change as a result of the investment, in what way, and/or by when.</p> <p>Outcomes are overly or insufficiently ambitious, taking into account the human and financial resources, context, and relationships.</p> <p>Stakeholder perspectives on outcomes are poorly explained.</p> <p>End of Program outcomes and/or intermediate outcomes fail to integrate gender equality, climate change, and localisation intent.</p>	<p>Outcomes are set out as general statements of intent, or strategic goals.</p> <p>Stakeholder perspectives are not defined.</p>

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>A program logic explains the causal sequence through which DFAT expects to achieve the desired outcomes, beginning with inputs, moving through activities, outputs, intermediate and end of investment outcomes, and a compelling case for how the end-of-program outcomes are expected to contribute to the investment's broader goals. It should also identify assumptions and uncertainty, such as the uncertainty over climate change and disasters on the program logic.</p> <p>The program logic is articulated in a graphic and in plain English, with clear and specific language, and was developed through extensive consultation and stakeholder involvement.</p> <p>It is supported by strong evidence and past practice, and demonstrates analysis and testing in the specific context, including explanations of assumptions and risks.</p>	<p>End of program outcomes or intermediate outcomes consider cross-cutting issues such as gender equality, climate change, and localisation intent.</p> <p>There is a program logic that explains credible causal links between activities, outputs, and outcomes. The program logic also articulates some assumptions and uncertainty.</p> <p>The program logic is expressed in a graphic and in plain English, using language that can be understood by stakeholders.</p> <p>There may be little evidence of previous success or achievement, but there is an explanation of how it will be tested and reviewed throughout implementation.</p>	<p>Links between activities, outputs and outcomes are tenuous, poorly defined, and/or depend on significant assumptions that pose crucial threats to the investment.</p> <p>The graphic or narrative explanation is absent or unclear.</p> <p>Evidence to support the logic is absent, with little to no reference to ongoing testing and review.</p>	<p>There is little evidence, or outline of causal linkages, to suggest that the investment will achieve the intended outcomes.</p>
<p>The delivery approach is clearly articulated and there is evidence it will be able to achieve the intended outcomes.</p> <p>Key stakeholders have been closely involved in developing the delivery approach.</p> <p>The approach provides strong flexibility which allows for continued adaptation to context.</p>	<p>The delivery approach is clearly articulated and there is evidence that it is appropriate to the context and may be able to achieve the intended outcomes.</p> <p>Key stakeholders (e.g. partner government) have agreed to the delivery approach.</p> <p>The approach provides some flexibility to adapt to context.</p>	<p>The delivery approach is not clearly explained and there is limited evidence it will achieve the intended outcomes.</p> <p>Key stakeholders have not been consulted on the delivery approach.</p> <p>There is very limited ability to adapt to context once implementation begins.</p>	<p>The delivery approach is inappropriate, and/or there is no explanation.</p> <p>No flexibility is evident.</p>

<i>Good/very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor/very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>Australia’s expectations for leveraging the investment to strengthen policy engagement and dialogue are set out. Contributions to broader objectives are clearly articulated.</p> <p>Roles, responsibilities, and opportunities for policy dialogue are outlined, with reference to DFAT and partner staff at various levels.</p> <p>Policy dialogue matrix is included and comprehensive, including roles, responsibilities, and broader policy reform opportunities, and is coordinated across Australia’s engagement (beyond a single investment).</p>	<p>Opportunities for policy and budget dialogue are outlined.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities are described for DFAT and partners (including WoG).</p> <p>Policy dialogue matrix is included, including roles, responsibilities, and possible reform opportunities. Signals ambition for policy dialogue to be coordinated with other Australian engagement. There are clear plans to develop the matrix further during implementation.</p>	<p>Opportunities for policy and budget dialogue are implicit or broadly stated.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities are unclear or not described in detail.</p> <p>Policy dialogue matrix is limited/not completed.</p>	<p>References to potential for policy and budget dialogue are absent or cursory.</p> <p>No policy dialogue matrix.</p>

3. Efficiency

Is there a compelling argument that this investment will demonstrate value for money, and be an economical and ethical use of Australia’s (and other partners’) resources?

Focus areas:

- Governance
- Management arrangements and capabilities
- Value for money
- Financing and resourcing

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>Tailored governance arrangements will enable a wide range of representatives and stakeholders, including the partner government, to participate in decision-making.</p> <p>Governance arrangements and MEL arrangements are fully integrated.</p> <p>Gender equality and inclusive participation will be pursued explicitly.</p>	<p>Specific and workable governance arrangements for the investment are set out, reflecting formal agreements between Australia and key partners.</p> <p>Strategies to broaden participation and stakeholder engagement in decision-making are outlined.</p>	<p>Standard governance arrangements between the key partners are outlined, with no or little adaptation for this investment.</p> <p>There are no or few opportunities for partner government, vulnerable groups, civil society, private sector, or other stakeholders to influence decision making.</p> <p>Links between decision-making and performance data are not clearly set out.</p>	<p>Governance arrangements are poorly defined, or unlikely to achieve participation and support from key parties in practice.</p> <p>There are no or cursory references to the use of performance information for decision-making.</p>
<p>The roles and responsibilities of DFAT and partners throughout implementation are clearly described, along with processes for their evolution and review over time.</p> <p>Accountability for outputs and outcomes are articulated.</p> <p>DFAT’s management role and FTE resources are clearly outlined. For multi-country or regional investments, processes for engaging with geographic areas (Posts and desks) are clear e.g. in planning, ongoing communication, and reporting, including country-level work plans.</p> <p>Australia and expected delivery partners have demonstrated capacity to deliver what is expected.</p>	<p>The roles and responsibilities of DFAT and partners are clearly described.</p> <p>If not defined, there are plans to negotiate and clarify accountability for outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>There is evidence that Australia and potential delivery partners will have capacity to carry out what is expected of them.</p> <p>DFAT’s management role and FTE resources are outlined. For multi-country or regional programs there is consideration of engagement processes with geographic areas (Post and Desks).</p>	<p>Roles and responsibilities are unclear or not fully described.</p> <p>There are no clear plans to define accountability for outcomes.</p> <p>It is not clear whether Australia and potential delivery partners will be capable of carrying out what is expected of them.</p>	<p>Processes for defining roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities are absent.</p> <p>Risks to implementation, related to capacity, personnel, and partnerships in the context are not explored.</p> <p>Australia’s and potential partners’ capabilities are not discussed.</p>

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>Analysis of alternative delivery or financing options and delivery arrangements provides a clear justification of the value for money of the selected delivery approach, including selection and relative costs of implementation partners.</p> <p>The process for, or justification for, selection of delivery partner/s that will ensure sufficient capacity, experience, and expertise to implement the program.</p>	<p>Value for money is justified through a narrative analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed approach, based on lessons learnt and prior experience, but may not include a detailed cost-benefit or efficiency analysis.</p> <p>There is a credible process for, or justification for, selection of delivery partner/s.</p>	<p>Value for money is implied through reference to previous experience and external benchmarks, but not explicitly justified in the investment design.</p> <p>The process for selecting delivery partner/s is unclear or not credible.</p>	<p>Value for money is not clearly justified in the investment design.</p> <p>Processes for selecting delivery partners are absent.</p>
<p>A detailed input and resource schedule is provided, with internal transaction costs and inputs from DFAT, independent contractors, and implementing partners, for implementation, policy dialogue, quality assurance, risk management and MEL resources. (The budget and schedule may be indicative and/or provide a clear framework to allow ongoing flexibility – note this may be for internal DFAT audience only.)</p>	<p>An inputs and resource schedule is provided which outlines the major cost categories and funding allocations, but detailed input costing may be provided through a procurement process or later detailed planning stage requiring further scrutiny at inception. (The budget and schedule may be indicative and/or provide a clear framework to allow some flexibility – note this may be for internal DFAT audience only.)</p>	<p>A high-level inputs schedule is provided which fails to include all the inputs and costs which may be required.</p>	<p>The inputs schedule is scant or not provided.</p>

4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

Will MEL arrangements ensure that performance information is collected, and available to decision-makers throughout implementation?

Focus areas:

- Measurement of results
- Use of MEL
- Independent MEL
- Resources for MEL

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>All of DFAT’s Design and MEL Standards 3 Program Logic and 4 Investment Design are met.</p> <p>End-of-program outcomes (EOPO) and Intermediate Outcomes (IO) are expressed in terms of key performance indicators pitched at the right level.</p> <p>Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators have been appropriately embedded in the MEL framework and reporting milestones.</p> <p>The MEL framework is attached as an annex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is linked to the program logic, - Includes indicative indicators as appropriate for the design at EOPO, IO and output level, and - Key evaluation questions are included for EOPO, IO and output level <p>The approach to MEL is appropriate for the intention of the design. (is the design appropriate for consideration of impact evaluation or real-time evaluation)</p>	<p>Most of DFAT’s Design and MEL Standards 3 Program Logic and 4 Investment Design are met. Any shortcomings are described and justified.</p> <p>End-of-program outcomes (EOPO) and Intermediate Outcomes (IO) are expressed in terms of key performance indicators pitched at the right level.</p> <p>Reporting on Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators have been appropriately considered. If not reported, this is justified.</p> <p>The MEL framework is attached as an annex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is linked to the program logic, - Includes indicative indicators as appropriate for the design, - Key evaluation questions are included <p>The approach to MEL is appropriate for the intention of the design. (is the design appropriate for consideration of impact evaluation or real-time evaluation)</p>	<p>Key elements of DFAT’s Design and MEL Standards 3 Program Logic and 4 Investment Design are not met.</p> <p>End-of-program outcomes (EOPO) and Intermediate Outcomes (IO) are not expressed in terms of key performance indicators. Or it is pitched at a level that is not matching the resources and time available.</p> <p>Tier 2 or Tier 3 indicators mentioned but not identified.</p> <p>The MEL framework is attached as an annex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not linked to the program logic, - Included indicative indicators not realistic for the design, - No key evaluation questions are included <p>No thought around the approach to MEL, or an approach that is not appropriate for the intention of the design.</p>	<p>DFAT’s Design and MEL Standards 3 Program Logic and 4 Investment Design have not been applied.</p> <p>End-of-program outcomes (EOPO) and Intermediate Outcomes (IO) are not clear. Or appropriate level for the resources and time available.</p> <p>Reporting on Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators not mentioned.</p> <p>No MEL framework is attached as annex or not filled out.</p>

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>Cross-cutting priorities like gender, disability, and social inclusion as well as climate change are clearly considered in the MEL system.</p> <p>The design has considered use of partner systems for (and where appropriate feeds into) data collection and reporting, and supplements them where necessary. Australia's requirements are harmonised with other actors.</p> <p>If partner systems are not available, it is explained how data will be collected and how partner systems will be built over time (could be other donors' responsibility). If it is within the design, it is resourced and part of monitored interventions.</p>	<p>Cross-cutting priorities like gender, disability, and social inclusion as well as climate change are briefly considered in the MEL system.</p> <p>The design has considered use of partner systems for (and where appropriate feeds into) data collection and reporting to some extent, including supplementing them where necessary. Australia's requirements are harmonised with other actors.</p> <p>If partner systems are not available, it is explained how data will be collected.</p>	<p>Cross-cutting priorities like gender, disability and social inclusion as well as climate change are not adequately considered in the MEL system.</p> <p>The design has not considered (or mentions routinely without thought) the use of partner systems for data collection.</p>	<p>The MEL system is parallel to, and does not intersect with, local partners' data without explanation or justification.</p>
<p>Expectations for use of MEL information for decision-making are clearly set out. Timing of reporting of analysed data synchs with decision-making. Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops are articulated.</p> <p>It is clear what stakeholders will be included in decision making and when, based on what information.</p>	<p>Expectations for use of MEL information are outlined, including when and how partners will use data for decision-making. Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops are articulated.</p> <p>It is clear who will be included in decision making.</p>	<p>Expectations for use of MEL information is unclear, including when and how partners will use data for decision-making.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops are not clearly articulated.</p> <p>It has not been articulated who will be involved in decision making.</p>	<p>Use of MEL information is not articulated.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities have not been outlined. It is not clear how decisions will be made and by whom.</p>
<p>DFAT has a strong role in monitoring (e.g. site visits, reviewing data and reporting) and this role is clearly set out, and resourcing is understood.</p> <p>The design explains when and how independent expertise and technical advisory group input will be engaged and its specific role, including timing and purpose of independent reviews/evaluations.</p>	<p>DFAT's role in monitoring (e.g. site visits, reviewing data and reporting) is set out but effort and/or resourcing is unclear.</p> <p>The design explains when and how independent expertise and technical advisory group input will be engaged, including timing of independent reviews/evaluations.</p>	<p>DFAT's role in monitoring (e.g. site visits, reviewing data and reporting) is mentioned as an afterthought.</p> <p>The design mentions independent reviews/evaluations, but no timing is articulated, and the design does not include when and how independent expertise and technical advisory group input will be engaged.</p>	<p>No arrangements are articulated for independent MEL.</p> <p>DFAT's role not mentioned.</p> <p>No mention of either independent expertise and technical advisory group input or independent reviews/evaluations.</p>

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>Appropriate human and financial resources are identified for developing and implementing the MEL Plan and System.</p> <p>Budget is defined and detailed (Standard reference 4-7% of the investment budget).</p> <p>If building capacity of partner systems has been identified, this is budgeted for beyond MEL budget.</p> <p>The MEL Plan and baseline are built into the Statement of Requirements/grant, with milestones at 6 and 12 months respectively.</p>	<p>Appropriate human and financial resources are identified for developing and implementing the MEL Plan and System.</p> <p>4-7% of the investment budget is dedicated to MEL resources.</p> <p>Building capacity of partner systems is identified but no budget has been allocated.</p> <p>The MEL Plan and baseline are built into the Statement of Requirements/grant with appropriate milestones.</p>	<p>Budget for MEL is included in implementation costing but not separately identified.</p> <p>Less than 4% of the investment budget is dedicated to MEL without clear justification.</p> <p>Need for strengthening partners' MEL systems is referred to but not addressed.</p> <p>The MEL Plan and baseline are mentioned in the Statement of Requirements/grant, but milestones are not articulated.</p>	<p>There is neither allocated budget nor identified expertise for MEL.</p> <p>There is no mention of partner systems.</p> <p>There is no mention of MEL Plan and baseline due in early implementation.</p>

5. Sustainability

Will the investment lead to benefits and partnerships that will last beyond the duration of the investment?

Focus areas:

- Lasting, climate-resilient benefits
- Local systems and localisation
- Leveraging resources

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>The program logic includes references to the policy, institutional, behavioural, financial and/or environmental changes that are expected to last beyond the life of the investment (the end of investment outcomes and overarching development objectives).</p> <p>A definition and strategy for sustainability is clearly articulated in the design.</p>	<p>The program logic references aspects of sustainability that may be relevant to the context and nature of the investment, and a sustainability strategy is articulated to work towards enduring and lasting benefits.</p>	<p>The program logic fails to address key elements of sustainability that are critical to the context or nature of the investment, though they may be implicit or justified elsewhere in the design.</p>	<p>Consideration of key sustainability issues are not reflected in the investment design.</p>
<p>‘Thinking and working politically’ is integrated throughout the design, and the investment will be well placed to pursue windows of opportunity for reform.</p> <p>The investment uses local systems and institutions appropriately and adequately, with a strong focus on policy dialogue and a clear reform agenda.</p> <p>Locally led development/localisation is explicitly considered in the design, embedded in the logic, and an initial strategy and/or plan included. A diverse range of actors is considered across partner government, CSOs, SMEs, and supply chains.</p>	<p>The investment’s delivery approach recognises the constraints and challenges to sustainability, and articulates an approach to policy dialogue and a reform agenda.</p> <p>There is a plan to increasingly work with local systems and with local partners and institutions.</p> <p>Locally led development/localisation is considered and a strategy and/or plan is expected to be delivered during implementation. A range of local actors are considered.</p>	<p>Approaches to policy dialogue and reform agenda are implicit or poorly articulated.</p> <p>The design mentions work with local partners but key constraints to longer term benefits and change are not adequately addressed.</p> <p>Localisation is referenced but there is limited consideration, and no specific strategies or plans. Entry points for strategy, participation, decision making and financing are not outlined.</p>	<p>Policy dialogue and reform are not mentioned.</p> <p>The delivery approach is entirely independent of local systems and institutions, and sustainability is likely to be low.</p> <p>Localisation is not considered.</p>

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
The investment considers the longer-term impacts of climate change in the relevant sector and articulates proactive steps to ensure investment benefits are climate resilient.	The investment considers long-term impacts of climate change, and there is a plan to ensure benefits are climate resilient.	Climate resilience is referred to, but there is no plan or steps identified to support climate resilient outcomes.	Climate resilience is not considered.
Domestic partner resources and those of other donors/sources of funding are well described and leveraged.	Opportunities for leveraging domestic and external resources are identified in the design, although implementation may not be dependent or reliant on them.	The design articulates linkages and dependencies with other partners and resources, but fails to adequately align Australian assistance, explain opportunities to leverage other resources, or contribute to longer term goals.	The program operates as a standalone investment, without buy-in from local partners or leverage opportunities. All activities are entirely dependent on resources from Australia for implementation.

6. Gender Equality

Does the investment adequately address gender equality (including intersectionality)?

Focus areas:

- Gender equality outcomes are included in the program logic
- Gender analysis is mainstreamed throughout design

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>A high-quality, intersectional gender analysis is included as a design annex. It highlights key enablers and barriers to women's participation, and these are addressed.</p> <p>The gender analysis has been used to inform the design, and is reflected within the design narrative. It has informed specific actions which are planned to promote gender equality throughout implementation.</p>	<p>A gender analysis is included as a design annex.* Key enablers and barriers to gender equality and women's participation are identified, and these are addressed in the design narrative.</p> <p>The gender analysis has been used to inform the design including actions or further analysis throughout implementation.</p> <p>*Note a gender analysis and gender outcome are mandatory requirements. Overall score for Gender Equality must be a 3 if either is absent (unless the investment is exempt).</p>	<p>There is no gender analysis annex. References to gender analysis or key enablers and barriers related to gender are few and/or cursory, and any strategies to enhance gender equality are implicit rather than clearly articulated.</p> <p>Plans for further analysis are set out, and a strategy to integrate gender equality throughout implementation is described.</p>	<p>There is no gender analysis annex. There are no references to gender in the design, or there is a poor understanding of opportunities to address gender equality and women's empowerment through this investment.</p> <p>There are no specific plans for further analysis or actions to promote gender equality throughout implementation.</p>

<p>The design includes one or more gender equality outcomes (End of Program Outcome or Intermediate Outcome), which are logically integrated into the overall program logic / theory of change. These outcomes describe an intent to achieve gender transformative change.</p> <p>Governance and MEL arrangements (including collection of sex-disaggregated data) will ensure that gender equality is addressed throughout implementation.</p>	<p>The program logic includes at least one gender equality outcome (End of Program Outcome or Intermediate Outcome).* The outcome describes an intent to proactively address power imbalances and/or harmful social norms to advance gender equality.</p> <p>A strategy for enhancing women’s participation in governance and management of the program over time is described. MEL arrangements will ensure collection of sex-disaggregated data.</p> <p>*Note a gender analysis and gender outcome are mandatory requirements. Overall score for Gender Equality must be a 3 if either is absent (unless the investment is exempt).</p>	<p>Gender equality outcomes are treated as an ‘add-on’ and are not logically integrated into the program logic / theory of change.</p> <p>The program logic includes outcomes that employ gender-related terminology, but doesn’t describe an intent to proactively address power imbalances and/or harmful social norms to advance gender equality.</p> <p>Governance, MEL and implementation arrangements refer to gender or women’s participation, but do not set out clear plans or strategies to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment.</p> <p>MEL arrangements make cursory or vague mentions of gender.</p>	<p>Gender equality outcomes are missing from the design.</p> <p>There are cursory, if any, references to gender in the investment’s governance, management, and MEL arrangements. There is no mention of sex-disaggregated data.</p>
---	--	--	--

7. Cross-Cutting Issues (Including Disability Inclusion, Social Inclusion, Climate Change, Innovation, Private Sector)

Does the investment adequately address disability inclusive development, broader social inclusion, climate change, innovation, and private sector engagement?

Focus areas:

- Were people with disabilities and/or organisations of people with disabilities (OPDs) consulted in the design process and benefit from the investment on an equal basis with others?
- Does the investment adequately integrate climate change and disaster risk reduction?
- Consideration of innovation and private sector engagement

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>The program logic and implementation arrangements reflect detailed analysis of opportunities and issues related to the cross-cutting policy priorities of disability-inclusive development, broader social inclusion, climate change and disaster resilience, innovation and engaging the private sector.</p> <p>The design document articulates relevant development context and problem definition related to climate and disaster impacts, based on analysis and evidence, and identifies ways to address these issues throughout implementation, as appropriate for the context and nature of the investment.</p> <p>Cross-cutting issues are integrated into MEL, including disability-disaggregated data and relevant climate-related indicators, and the implementation plan includes specific plans for further analysis and independent reviews of progress and opportunities.</p> <p>The design integrates people with disabilities and OPDs into the program logic, MEL, and governance structures.</p>	<p>Key opportunities and barriers are included in the design's program logic and implementation arrangements.</p> <p>The investment design acknowledges the challenges of disability-inclusive development, climate change, innovation, and private sector engagement as relevant to the context and nature of the investment.</p> <p>The MEL and implementation plans include plans for further analysis of cross-cutting issues, and independent review of progress and opportunities.</p> <p>The design integrates people with disabilities and/or OPDs into either the program logic, MEL, and/or governance structures</p> <p>The program encourages innovation through either policy reform, data, new forms of financing, technological transfer and/or innovative partnerships)</p>	<p>The relevance and importance of cross-cutting issues of disability-inclusive development, climate change, innovation and private sector engagement are implicit in the design, rather than specifically addressed.</p> <p>There is no climate change outcome or explanation.</p> <p>There are few if any references to relevant cross-cutting issues in the governance, implementation, and MEL arrangements of the investment.</p> <p>Entry points for private sector/SMEs, churches, and CSOs are not clear.</p>	<p>Significant aspects of the context or nature of the design related to disability-inclusive development, innovation, private sector engagement and climate change, are missing or ignored in the investment design.</p> <p>Entry points for private sector/SMEs, churches, and CSOs are not outlined.</p> <p>There is no climate change outcome or explanation.</p>

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
<p>The program displays a commitment to driving reform (policy reform, new forms of financing, technological or data innovation and/or innovative partnerships)</p> <p>Note: a climate change outcome (either EOPO or IO) is strongly encouraged to support climate resilience. Investments that do not have a climate change outcome should provide an explanation.</p>	<p>Note: a climate change outcome (either EOPO or IO) is strongly encouraged to support climate resilience and contribute to the climate goal. Investments that do not have a climate change outcome should provide an explanation.</p>		

8. Risk Management and Safeguards

Does the design identify all relevant risks in detail, and set out plans to mitigate their effects?

Focus areas:

- Risk
- Safeguards

Good, very good (rating 5-6)	Adequate (rating 4)	Less than adequate (rating 3)	Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)
<p><i>Design document</i></p> <p>The design discusses the risk context, including climate risk. It discusses the key risks and proposes effective mitigations. Risks linked to a range of key assumptions from the program logic are outlined with risk treatments and DFAT risk owners.</p> <p>The design discusses governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities, and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks.</p> <p>The design presents a considered and proportionate response to managing safeguard risks relating to people and the environment through the life of the investment.</p> <p>The design includes a good environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.</p> <p>Due diligence of lead partners and subcontracted partners is considered, and assessment findings built into the design.</p> <p>The design discusses the fraud risk context and draws on lessons learnt in developing effective controls and treatments to manage key fraud risks. Governance arrangements to oversight fraud risks are discussed.</p>	<p><i>Design document</i></p> <p>The design does not fully discuss the risk context. It discusses most of the key risks, including climate risks, identifies key assumptions and a range of fiduciary and safeguard risks, and mostly proposes effective mitigations.</p> <p>The design discusses governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities, DFAT risk owners, and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks.</p> <p>The design generally presents a considered and proportionate response to managing safeguard risks relating to people and the environment.</p> <p>The design includes an adequate environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.</p> <p>The design does not fully discuss the fraud risk context. The design discusses most key fraud risks and mostly includes effective controls and treatments. Governance arrangements to oversight fraud risks are discussed.</p> <p>Due diligence is considered, and assessment findings built into the design.</p>	<p><i>Design document</i></p> <p>The risk context has not been considered in a substantive way. The design only discusses some key risks and/or does not propose effective mitigations. The design does not consider climate risk.</p> <p>The design does not adequately discuss governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks.</p> <p>The design briefly refers to safeguarding but does not detail how the investment will manage safeguard risks relating to people and the environment.</p> <p>The design does not include an adequate environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.</p> <p>The fraud risk context has not been considered in a substantive way. Design discusses some key fraud risks and/or does not include effective mitigations. Governance arrangements to oversee fraud risks are not discussed sufficiently.</p>	<p><i>Design document</i></p> <p>The risk context has not been considered. The design discusses a limited number of key risks and/or does not propose effective mitigations. The design does not consider climate risk.</p> <p>The design does not discuss governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks.</p> <p>The design does not mention safeguards risks or environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.</p> <p>The design has not considered the fraud risk context, key fraud risks, nor proposed effective mitigations. Governance arrangements to oversee fraud risks are not discussed.</p>

Good, very good (rating 5-6)	Adequate (rating 4)	Less than adequate (rating 3)	Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)
<p><i>Risk Register</i></p> <p>The risk register has been fully completed in accordance with DFAT’s Development Risk Management Policy and Practice Notes and takes into account as relevant:</p> <p>(a) general risks that hinder DFAT’s ability to achieve end of investment outcomes; and</p> <p>(b) five (5) specialised risk domains that have independent policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Child Protection 2. Counter-Terrorism Resourcing 3. Environment and Social Safeguards 4. Fraud Control 5. Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH). 	<p><i>Risk Register</i></p> <p>The risk register has generally been completed in accordance with DFAT’s Development Risk Management Policy and Practice Notes and takes into account as relevant:</p> <p>(a) general risks that hinder DFAT’s ability to achieve end of investment outcomes; and</p> <p>(b) five (5) specialised risk domains that have independent policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Child Protection 2. Counter-Terrorism Resourcing 3. Environment and Social Safeguards 4. Fraud Control 5. Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH). 	<p><i>Risk Register</i></p> <p>The risk register has not been fully completed in accordance with DFAT’s Development Risk Management Policy and Practice Notes.</p> <p>Some of the specialised risk domains have been considered, but it is evident that one, which is relevant, has not been considered.</p>	<p><i>Risk Register</i></p> <p>The risk register has not been provided or it is missing much of the information required.</p> <p>Some of the specialised risk domains have been considered, but it is evident that more than one relevant risk domain has not been considered.</p>