

Investment design: Quality assurance guidance

All DFAT investment concepts, design documents and investment design summaries¹ must be quality assured to meet DFAT's standards. This document provides design managers with guidance on completing quality assurance for concepts and design documents.

Formal quality assurance is completed using the separate Investment [Design Quality Assessment Tool and Scoring Matrix](#). This tool is underpinned by [DFAT Design and Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning \(MEL\) Standards](#). Quality assurance requirements are proportionate to investment value and risk rating. Contact designmail@dfat.gov.au for advice.

Delegates are responsible for the quality of the investments they approve.

Canberra-based First Assistant Secretaries and their delegates are accountable for verifying that minimum quality standards have been met before approving investment concepts and designs. Quality assurance processes are in place to support delegates in these decisions.

¹ Throughout this document, 'design' refers to both investment design documents (which are prepared for DFAT-led designs) and investment design summaries (which are prepared for Partner-led designs).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Investment design: Quality assurance guidance	1
What quality assurance do I need to complete?	3
FAQ – General	4
Informal quality assurance	5
Key templates	5
How to manage informal quality assurance	5
Independent appraisal	6
Key templates:	6
How to manage an independent appraisal	6
FAQ – Independent Appraisals	8
Formal Peer Review	10
Key templates:	10
How to manage a peer review	10
FAQ – Peer Review	12
Development Program Committee	14
Key templates & FAQ:	14
How to manage DPC consideration:	14
TEMPLATE: QUALITY ASSURANCE SUMMARY FOR DESIGN APPROVAL	16
TEMPLATE: INFORMAL COMMENTS	17
TEMPLATE: DRAFT PEER REVIEW AGENDA	18
TEMPLATE: SUMMARY OF INDEPENDENT APPRAISALS	19

What quality assurance do I need to complete?

Quality assurance (QA) includes informal quality assurance, independent appraisal, peer review and Development Program Committee (DPC) consideration. QA is proportional to the risk rating and value of the investment.

Table: Investment concepts: Quality assurance requirements

	Under \$10m ²	\$10m to under \$50m	\$50m to under \$100m	\$100m and above	High risk or facility (any \$) ³
Informal QA	Optional	Optional	Optional	Optional	Optional
Formal peer review	Not required	Optional	Optional	Optional	Optional
DPC	Not required	Not required	Not required	Required	Required

Table: DFAT-led and Partner-led designs: Quality assurance requirements

Informal QA	Required	Not sufficient	Not sufficient	Not sufficient	Not sufficient
Independent Appraisal	Optional	Required	Required	Required	Required
Formal Peer Review	Optional	Optional	Required	Required	Required
DPC	Not required	Not required	Not required	At DPC direction	At DPC direction

² Investment concepts are optional for low-medium risk designs under \$10 million.

³ This refers to the overall risk rating before controls. Refer to the Aid Programming Guide for further information.

FAQ – General

I've been asked to comment on a design. What should I do?

The request for comment on a design document or summary should clearly state whether you have been asked to provide informal quality assurance comments, an independent appraisal, or attend a formal peer review as a participant, and provide guidance on the template. If you are unsure, ask the design manager to clarify. The [DFAT Design and Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning Standards](#) and [Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool & Scoring Matrix](#) provide guidance on design quality criteria.

Can I conduct different/additional quality assurance processes?

Many programs choose to conduct additional informal quality assurance exercises (e.g. design reference groups, theory of change workshops, etc.), to foster ownership, build relationships and/or socialise the investment. These activities are strongly encouraged. They should be documented through the design approval and related attachments.

Scoring and use of the appraisal tool are mandatory only where independent appraisals and formal peer reviews are required.

What is a design reference group, and should I have one for my design?

A design reference group is an informal QA mechanism that can socialise early products (such as the concept note, aide memoire, theory of change, MEL, first draft design etc) or discuss key questions throughout the design process. Reference group members can comprise internal DFAT stakeholders, external experts or partner government or organisation representatives – any combination that makes sense for the investment. Reference groups can be convened as early as the planning stages of an investment, via meetings or through regular updates via email.

Reference groups are a good way to bring along key stakeholders in your design process, particularly if it is a complex or multi-country/regional design. It can speed up formal QA processes by incorporating feedback throughout the design process. Reference groups work best where members are committed to participating on an ongoing basis, and where the delegate (or a close report to the delegate) chairs (to stay updated and influence key decisions).

What documentation is required and how do I file it?

A Quality Assurance Summary must be attached to every design approval minute, regardless of the investment's risk and value. This summarises the peer review and appraisal scores (if any) and processes to date, as well as any key amendments to the final design. All approval minutes, concept and design documents, and attachments must be uploaded to AidWorks and filed in EDRMS.

Informal quality assurance

Required for all investment concepts, and design documents and summaries under \$10 million.

An informal quality assurance process involves providing the concept or design to one or more DFAT staff, partner representatives and/or external consultants, receiving comments and revising the design or concept in response.

Program areas may choose to carry out informal quality assurance processes prior to mandatory independent appraisals and formal peer reviews.

Key templates

[Suggested template for informal comments](#)

[Quality Assurance Summary for Design Approval](#)

How to manage informal quality assurance

- 1. Identify the expertise required.** Select one or more people who have sufficient experience and knowledge to recommend improvements. The Design and Program Advice section (DPA) can provide coordinated comments across thematic areas (including gender, disability inclusion, climate and risks and safeguards) by contacting designmail@dfat.gov.au. You can also consider inviting experienced officers from other geographic programs and sector areas to take part.
- 2. Provide the investment concept or design document and quality assessment documentation to the reviewer(s).** Reviewers should be asked to consider the extent to which an investment concept or design meets [DFAT Design and Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning Standards](#). Concepts should be assessed against Standard 1: Investment Concept Note. Designs should be assessed against Standard 4: Investment Design. For design documents, the [Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool & Scoring Matrix](#) can also be used as guide for evaluating design quality (its use is recommended but not mandatory in an informal quality assurance process). Comments may be provided to the design manager by email and/or in a verbal briefing. You can distribute the [suggested template for informal comments](#) to those reviewing to capture and collect feedback.
- 3. Revise the concept/design in accordance with the comments provided.**
- 4. Complete the Quality Assurance Summary** (for design documents and summaries). A [Quality Assurance Summary](#) must be attached to the design approval minute which goes to the delegate to approve the design. The summary is also uploaded to AidWorks and filed in EDRMS.

Independent appraisal

Required for all design documents and summaries for investments of \$10 million or more and all high-risk and facility investments.

Independent appraisals are professional technical assessments of design quality conducted by experts who are internal or external to DFAT using the [Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool & Scoring Matrix](#). Depending on the value and type of investment, you will need to seek either two or three independent appraisals of the design document.

For **investments between \$10 million and \$50 million, a minimum of two independent appraisals** are required:

1. A consolidated **internal independent appraisal** coordinated by the Design and Program Advice Section (DPA). This can be arranged by contacting designmail@dfat.gov.au.
2. An appraisal by one independent expert external to DFAT.

For **investments \$50 million or over, rated high risk or facilities, a minimum of three independent appraisals** are required:

1. A consolidated **internal independent appraisal** coordinated by the Design and Program Advice Section (DPA). This can be arranged by contacting designmail@dfat.gov.au.
2. An appraisal by one independent expert external to DFAT.
3. A third appraisal by either an independent experienced DFAT officer (e.g. with sectoral expertise) OR an independent expert external to DFAT.

Additional appraisals may be carried out by either external or internal experts at the program's discretion, as long as they are independent of the program. (See FAQ below for advice on who is 'independent'.)

Key templates

[Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool and Scoring Matrix \(separate document\)](#)

[Summary of Independent Appraisals template](#)

[Quality Assurance Summary for Design Approval](#)

How to manage an independent appraisal

1. **Contact designmail@dfat.gov.au to provide indicative timeframes for the consolidated internal appraisal.** DPA coordinates the consolidated internal independent appraisal across thematic areas including design, risk, safeguards, gender equality, disability inclusion, climate integration and sectoral areas. Ten working days are required to coordinate, please contact the inbox to discuss timeframes if required. (If you are also having a separate internal appraiser, please advise DPA.)
2. **Determine the expertise required for other independent appraisers and contract personnel if required.** Other appraisers (whether internal or external) must have relevant country, sector, technical and/or thematic expertise. Complementarity of skills and backgrounds should be considered (e.g. an M&E specialist and a sector specialist will provide different perspectives). For external appraisers, consider engaging personnel through existing mechanisms such as the [Design Review and M&E panel](#) or the [Governance Helpdesk](#). Independent experts could also come from whole-of-government or other development partners. Most appraisals take two to five days to complete. Where you will hold a peer review (investments \$50 million or over or high risk or facilities), allow for attendance at the peer review meeting in the contract for external appraisers.

OFFICIAL

3. **Provide documentation to designmail@dfat.gov.au and other internal and external appraisers.** Provide the appraisers with the design document and any other relevant documents, including the investment concept, if one was completed. All appraisers should be sent and tasked to complete [DFAT's Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool & Scoring Matrix](#). Good practice is to allow 10 working days to return the appraisal.
4. **Receive and review appraisal feedback.** You can use the [Independent Appraisal Summary template](#) to collate scores and key feedback.
5. **If investment is \$50 million or over, or high risk, or a facility, conduct the peer review – see [Peer Review](#) process.**
6. **Incorporate feedback into the investment design.** This can be completed by the Design Team or partner with DFAT guidance.
7. **Complete the [Quality Assurance Summary for Design Approval](#).** The Summary must outline feedback and changes made in response, and explain any decisions not to incorporate appraisal comments. (If you have an external design team or it is a partner-led design, you can request that they complete the Quality Assurance Summary.)
8. **If required, provide the updated design and quality assurance summary to appraisers for further review.** You must complete this step where appraisals had initial low or inadequate scores (3 or below). You can seek to confirm higher scores based on amendments, or outline the changes that have been made to address appraisal feedback. (See FAQs below.)
9. **Attach the final [Quality Assurance Summary](#) to the Design Approval Minute for the delegate.** The summary and appraisal reports must also be uploaded to AidWorks. The full appraisals can also be provided to the delegate if requested.

Note on AidWorks data entry: as of September 2023, AidWorks has not been updated to reflect changes to the Design Quality Matrix. Scores for 'Gender equality' should be added to 'Gender equality and cross-cutting issues', and 'Cross-cutting issues' should be added to 'Private sector and innovation'.

FAQ – Independent Appraisals

I have received appraisal scores for a design that are less than adequate. What do I do now?

If a design receives scores of three or below for one or more of the design criteria, you should work with the design team or partner to address the comments received. Appraisals should be clear on what steps are required to ensure the design meets quality criteria – if not, clarify with the appraisers.

Once you have revised the design, it must be re-circulated to the independent appraisers with either:

- › an invitation to provide revised scores via email; or
- › a detailed explanation of changes made and how these relate to the original comments.

The process followed (including both original and revised scores, where relevant) must be set out in the Quality Assurance Summary.

How long does an independent appraisal process take?

In order to complete the appraisal, you will need to have the draft design ready and the external appraiser/s contracted. You should allow enough time for the appraisers to send their appraisals to you (ten working days is good practice). You then need to allow enough time to consider the feedback and makes changes to the design document.

How many days should I include in the contract for external appraisers?

Up to five is generally sufficient, including to account for the peer review meeting and any review of the revised design if required.

What does ‘independent’ mean? Can my colleague provide an appraisal?

An appraiser is considered independent if they have not been directly involved in developing the investment design and do not have any other conflicts of interest or bias.

Individuals who **would not be considered independent** include:

- › Contractor who contributed to the design.
- › Contractor involved in delivery of the current phase of the investment.
- › DFAT staff involved in current phases of the program.
- › DFAT manager who oversaw the design process.
- › Officer reporting to or in the same section as the DFAT design or investment manager.

How many independent appraisals are required?

All investments of \$10 million to under \$50 million must have a minimum of two independent appraisals – one internal DFAT appraisal (coordinated by DPA) and one appraiser external to DFAT.

All investments of \$50 million or more, or rated high-risk, or facility investments, must have a minimum of three independent appraisals – one consolidated internal DFAT appraisal (coordinated by DPA), one external to DFAT, and one other (either internal or external).

OFFICIAL

There are other DFAT staff I would like to have as independent appraisers. Can they do the internal appraisal instead of DPA?

DPA provides a coordinated internal appraisal as an efficient way of ensuring important thematic areas are consulted as part of the design process (including risks, safeguards, gender, disability inclusion and climate change). This consolidated appraisal reduces your transaction costs in reaching out to multiple, separate internal areas separately. You can seek additional internal appraisals from other experienced DFAT staff, or alternatively DPA can include other internal contributors in the coordinated internal appraisal.

Why are the categories in the Design Scoring Matrix different to those in AidWorks?

The scoring matrix was updated in September 2023; however changes have not yet been updated in the AidWorks system.

Gender equality replaced the category **Gender equality and cross-cutting issues** to reflect enhanced gender equality requirements in design.

Cross-cutting issues (including disability inclusion, climate change, private sector and innovation) replaced the category **Private sector and innovation**.

Formal peer review

Required for all design documents and summaries for investments of \$50 million or more, and all high-risk investments and facility investments (regardless of value).

The peer review requirement is in addition to the requirement for independent appraisal. All investments requiring peer review must have at least three independent appraisals (see above section [Independent Appraisal](#)).

In a formal peer review meeting, independent appraisers (internal representatives contributing to the coordinated internal appraisal, plus at least two other appraisers) talk through their quality scores across all criteria (as per the [scoring matrix](#)) with the peer review chair and design manager. Other peer review participants can be invited to attend the meeting to observe or provide feedback on the design, but do not provide formal scores.

The Chair moderates the discussion. The Chair's primary role is to

- moderate consensus score across appraisers on the agreed quality scores for the investment (the Chair has final say if consensus cannot be reached); and
- agree on next steps to strengthen the design.

For investments managed at post, it is generally expected that **Canberra leads the peer review** to ensure joint ownership (noting investments must be jointly signed off by post and Canberra delegates).

External design team members may attend the peer review to receive feedback and seek clarification on appraisal comments. Personnel from partner organisations (such as implementing partners or lead agencies for partner-led designs) generally do not take part to enable discussion of difficult and sensitive issues such as partner capability and contracting arrangements. Design managers should consider whether a portion of the peer review should be DFAT-internal to allow for any sensitive or classified issues to be discussed.

Key templates

[Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool and Scoring Matrix \(separate document\)](#)

[Summary of Independent Appraisals template](#)

[Draft Peer Review Agenda](#)

[Quality Assurance Summary for Design Approval](#)

How to manage a peer review

1. **Identify and brief the chair.** The chair is usually the investment's delegate in Canberra, and must be at minimum EL2. Your briefing can outline to the Chair that they are responsible for the credibility of the peer review, including that:
 - › there is frank and comprehensive discussion of all aspects of the design;
 - › agreeing on consensus scores across appraisers;
 - › noting specific areas of focus for DFAT during implementation;
 - › next steps and agreed actions are clear for the design manager and design team; and
 - › the [Quality Assurance Summary](#) attached to the design approval minute accurately documents the above areas and peer review outcomes.

OFFICIAL

2. **Identify and task independent appraisers.** See [Independent Appraisal](#) section above. One internal appraisal is coordinated by the Design and Program Advice section (contact designmail@dfat.gov.au). A further two appraisers must be identified (at least one external).
1. **Identify peer review participants.** In addition to appraisers, participants can include design team members; experienced officers with country or sector experience; representatives from posts or geographic desks (particularly for regional or multi-country designs); technical advisers; investment managers involved in similar designs; and representatives from DFAT areas including gender equality, disability inclusion, risks, safeguards, and climate integration (contact designmail@dfat.gov.au for advice on contacts).
2. **Circulate invitation and relevant documents.** Formal peer reviews must be scheduled for a minimum of 90 minutes (120 minutes is recommended). A [draft Peer Review Agenda](#) is available for you to adapt. Documents should include the design document, the investment concept (if one was completed), independent appraisals, independent appraisal scores (see [Independent Appraisal Summary template](#)) and any other relevant documents (e.g. recent evaluations, analyses, etc.). It is good practice to circulate the design at least 10 days prior to the meeting, and independent appraisals at least five days prior to the meeting (refer to the process for managing an [independent appraisal](#) above).
3. **Conduct meeting.** Background to the investment should be brief, and the meeting focused on appraisal and reviewer comments. It is good practice for Design Managers to review and collate key areas of feedback from the appraisals for the chair prior to the meeting, including provide options to respond and suggested next steps – see the [template Summary of Independent Appraisals](#). This can help to focus the meeting on any areas of difference between appraisals, or priority areas for discussion. Minutes are not required. Key outcomes of the meeting are:
 - a. Agreed consensus scores across appraisers.
 - b. Clear next steps and agreement on changes to be made to the design.
 - c. Any areas for noting for implementation.
4. **Incorporate feedback into the investment design.** This can be completed by the external Design Team or partner with DFAT guidance.
5. **Complete the [Quality Assurance Summary](#).** The Summary must outline feedback received and changes made in response, and explain any decisions not to incorporate appraisal comments. (If you have an external design team or it is a partner-led design, you can request that they complete the Quality Assurance Summary.)
6. **Circulate revised design and draft [Quality Assurance Summary](#) to appraisers and peer review participants.** Summarise appraisal and peer review scores, comments and DFAT responses (including any decisions not to reflect appraisal/formal peer review comments in the design) in the [Quality Assurance Summary](#). Appraisers should have an opportunity to review the final design and correct inaccuracies in the summary before it is finalised. You can also seek to confirm higher quality scores based on amendments that have been made since peer review.
7. **Attach the final [Quality Assurance Summary](#) to the [Design Approval Minute](#) for the delegate.** The summary and appraisal reports must also be uploaded to AidWorks. The full appraisals can also be provided to the delegate if requested.

Note on AidWorks data entry: as of September 2023 AidWorks has not been updated to reflect changes to the Design Quality Matrix. Scores for 'Gender equality' should be added to 'Gender equality and cross-cutting issues', and 'Cross-cutting issues' should be added to 'Private sector and innovation'.

FAQ – Peer Review

We have received independent appraisal scores that are varied. We might have trouble reaching consensus at peer review. What should we do?

If agreement cannot be reached amongst appraisers at the peer review, the Chair should determine the final scores during the meeting, giving regard to the points made by appraisers and the actions proposed to respond to feedback. With the agreement of appraisers, provisional scores can be provided subject to certain amendments being made, or further review by appraisers once the design is revised. This should be documented in the Quality Assurance Summary.

The scores agreed during peer review were less than adequate for some criteria. What do I do now?

If a design receives scores of three or below for one or more of the design criteria, you should work with the design team or partner to address the comments received. Appraisals should be clear on what steps are required in order to ensure the design meets quality criteria – if not, clarify with the appraisers during peer review.

Once you have revised the design, it must be re-circulated to peer review participants with either:

- › an invitation to appraisers to provide revised scores via email; or
- › a detailed explanation of changes made and how these relate to the original comments.

The process followed (including both original and revised scores, where relevant) must be set out in the Quality Assurance Summary.

What happens if we cannot receive a score of 4 or above?

Sometimes the specifics of the context or investment may mean it is not possible to score a 4 or above in some criteria. In this case, an investment manager may still put the design up to the delegate with a score of 3 or under. The delegate can then make an informed decision on whether to approve this investment, understanding the rationale for any quality criterion shortcomings.

What is the difference between appraisers and peer review participants?

Independent appraisers provide scores and written comments using the [Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool & Scoring Matrix](#), and contribute to consensus scores negotiated during the meeting.

Participants attend the meeting and may provide written or verbal comments, but do not provide scores. Inviting a broad range of officers to participate can support cross-department learning and skill-sharing.

It would be useful for an implementing partner or partner organisation to attend the peer review.

Can we invite them?

Formal peer review meetings must enable discussion of difficult and sensitive issues (for example, partner capability and contracting arrangements).

Personnel from partner organisations (such as implementing partners, organisations leading partner-led designs, or co-financers) generally do not attend. However, the Chair and design manager can choose to include other parties if it makes sense to do so (for example, in design-implement processes).

In this case, Design managers should consider whether a portion of the peer review should be DFAT-internal to allow for any sensitive issues to be discussed.

OFFICIAL

Can external design team members participate in the peer review meeting?

Yes. The extent of their involvement is at the discretion of the chair and design manager. Design managers should consider whether a portion of the peer review should be DFAT-internal to allow for any sensitive or classified issues to be discussed.

Why are the categories in the Design Scoring Matrix different to those in AidWorks?

The scoring matrix was updated in September 2023, however changes have not yet been updated in the AidWorks system.

Gender equality replaced the category **Gender equality and cross-cutting issues** to reflect enhanced gender equality requirements in design.

Cross-cutting issues (including disability inclusion, climate change, private sector and innovation) replaced the category **Private sector and innovation**.

Development program committee

Required for investments over \$100 million, and all high risk or facility investments (regardless of value).

All other quality assurance (including informal QA, independent appraisal and/or peer review) must be completed prior to concepts or designs being considered by the DPC.

DPC endorsement must be received before the delegate can approve the concept/design.

The Development Program Committee (DPC – previously the Aid Governance Board) provides advice to delegates on concepts and/or implementation of investments that have a value of \$100 million or more and/or are rated ‘high risk’, and all facilities. Please refer to the [DPC intranet page](#) for further information.

The DPC considers investments at the **concept stage**. Following review of a concept, the DPC may also request to see designs. DPC consideration involves an assessment by the Quality and Risk Assurance Unit (QRAU), which provides advice to the DPC on investment concept and design quality and risk.

Key templates & FAQ

[Refer to the DPC Covering Minute template – Investments](#)

[Refer to the DPC FAQs](#)

How to manage DPC consideration:

1. **Identify timing for DPC consideration of the concept or design.** The DPC generally meet monthly. Forward meeting dates and related deadlines can be found on the DPC intranet page.
2. **Contact the DPC Secretariat to reserve a place on the forward agenda.** You should notify the Secretariat (DPC.Secretariat@dfat.gov.au) as early as possible, as meeting agendas can book up quickly. If your timing changes, keep the Secretariat updated.
3. **The DPC Secretariat will confirm tasking for the agenda item via email.** This will include the confirmed meeting time and submission due dates.
4. **Develop documents and seek First Assistant Secretary clearance.** Note that concepts/designs going to the DPC must be cleared by the relevant FAS (even where investments are high risk or facilities that are under a FAS’ financial delegation). All quality assurance processes must be completed prior to submission to the DPC. For concepts, this involves informal quality assurance. For designs, this involves independent appraisal and peer review.
5. **Submit quality-assured, FAS-cleared documents to the DPC Secretariat by the advised deadline.** Documents include the covering minute, concept/design, and relevant attachments.
6. **QRAU independent assessment of the concept/design.** Following submission, the QRAU will assess the concept/design, including reviewing the quality assurance process completed. The QRAU may reach out to design managers to discuss the concept/design before finalising their assessment.
7. **Concept/design and QRAU assessment are circulated to DPC members by the DPC Secretariat.**
8. **DPC meeting and endorsement/feedback.** The relevant FAS and other staff (often including the Design manager) attend the DPC meeting to discuss the investment and receive feedback. The DPC provide feedback and advise on next steps (e.g. if the concept is endorsed, the design process can proceed). Outcomes are documented in DPC Minutes (available through the DPC Secretariat).

OFFICIAL

9. **Feedback incorporated in concept/design.** If required, DPC feedback is incorporated into the design/concept (or other steps as required by the DPC e.g. further review by the QRAU).
10. **Delegate approval of design/concept.** Once actions and feedback from the DPC have been resolved, the delegate can approve the design/concept. The Approval Minute for the Investment Concept or Approval Minute for Investment Design must document DPC endorsement.

Template: Quality assurance summary for design approval

This document must be attached to all design approval minutes and uploaded into AidWorks.

Quality assurance undertaken

Short summary of all quality assurance undertaken. Refer to the mandatory requirements and any additional quality assurance processes. Include names of appraisers and peer reviewers and the dates of any relevant meetings.

Issues for DFAT attention during implementation

Set out issues requiring DFAT attention during implementation. Include resources required for investment management/oversight and policy dialogue.

Summary of issues raised and DFAT responses

Issue	DFAT response/action

(add rows for each comment or issue)

Template: Informal Comments

For use in informal quality assurance processes; not a substitute for independent appraisal or formal peer review.

Source	Issue/section/page	Change required/requested	DFAT response

Template: Draft peer review agenda

**Formal peer review of [investment name]
[date, time, location]**

- 2:00 – 2:10** **Welcome by Chair [name, position]**
- Quick self-introduction of participants around the table
 - Purpose of formal peer review
- 2:10 – 2:20** **Brief background to [investment] and the design process**
- Short introduction of [investment] and DFAT’s strategic intent
 - Outline of process to date
- 2:20 – 2:30** **Summary of key issues raised in appraisals/written comments from formal peer reviewers and planned responses**
- 2:30 – 3:40** **Discussion of appraiser and formal peer reviewer scores and comments for each quality criterion as it relates to [investment], and their implications for implementation. Consensus on a single score reflecting the peer review’s collective opinion for each criterion:**
- Relevance
 - Effectiveness
 - Efficiency
 - Monitoring and Evaluation
 - Sustainability
 - Gender Equality and Cross-Cutting Issues
 - Risk Management and Safeguards
- 3:45 – 4:00** **Chair summary on agreed outcomes:**
- Is [investment] fit for purpose and suitable to fund?;
 - Consensus scores;
 - Further treatment of risks and management strategies;
 - Summary of any further improvements; and
 - If investment is recommended, summary of specific areas of management focus for DFAT during implementation, including DFAT resourcing for managing the program and policy dialogue with partners.
 - Provide approximate timeframe for circulating the Quality Assurance Summary (and if required, timeframe for recirculating the amended document)

Template: Summary of independent appraisals

Scores

	Relevance	Effective-ness	Efficiency	Monitoring, evaluation & learning	Sustainability	Gender equality	Cross-cutting issues	Risk & safeguards
Consensus Score								
Independent appraiser name								
Independent appraiser name								
Internal DFAT appraisal (coordinated by DPA)								

Summary of feedback

Criteria	Feedback – for action in design	Feedback – for implementation	Proposed response/comment from design manager or team
Relevance			
Effectiveness			
Efficiency			
Monitoring, evaluation & learning			
Sustainability			
Gender equality			
Cross-cutting			
Risk & safeguards			