



Australian Government  
AusAID

## Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design

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

<b>Initiative Name:</b>	Strategic Partnerships for Health		
<b>AidWorks ID:</b>	INH378	<b>Total Amount:</b>	\$56.780 million
<b>Start Date:</b>	1 July 2007	<b>End Date:</b>	30 June 2011

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

<b>Initial ratings prepared by:</b>	Angela Mercuri
<b>Meeting date:</b>	16 April 2008
<b>Chair:</b>	Susan Ivatts, Director Health & HIV Thematic Group
<b>Peer reviewers providing formal comment &amp; ratings:</b>	Chris Hoban, Principal Adviser Operations
<b>Independent Appraiser:</b>	– Chris Hoban, Principal Adviser Operations
<b>Other peer review participants:</b>	– Jim Tulloch (Principal Health Adviser), Syed Haider (ING), Jeff Prime (PAC), Trisha Gray (Phil) Zoe Mander-Jones (Partnerships Policy Unit), Gai Sheridan (Design Adviser, DPAG), Timothy Gill (PAC), Paul Roche (Pakistan), Beth Slatyer (HHTG Health Adviser)

### C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators

*completed by Activity Manager*

Quality	Rating (1-6) *	Comments to support rating	Required Action: overall this Initiative was given a satisfactory rating. However, the following action is required as the Initiative moves into implementation
1. Clear objectives	5	Approach is strongly aligned to health policy priorities, pursuit of effectiveness and quality agenda.	Independent Appraiser noted that the objective would be more powerful if it focused more directly on key success criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- contribute to quality &amp; effectiveness;</li> <li>- in the Asia Pacific region;</li> <li>- through expertise, analysis and knowledge;</li> <li>- is of practical value and used by AusAID and partners.</li> </ul>

**C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators***completed by Activity Manager*

2. Monitoring and Evaluation	4	<p>M&amp;E Approach for Components 2 and 3 is based on utilising existing systems and supporting their improvement.</p> <p>HHTG will establish a governance group for Component 1 which will comprise Knowledge Hub principals, AusAID and appropriate external representatives to provide strategic guidance to the work of the Hubs.</p> <p>Under Component 1 performance indicators to track value added by both the mechanism of the knowledge hubs and the products they produce to be jointly developed and monitored by HHTG and the hubs.</p>	At the component level this criterion would benefit from ensuring that assumptions are not unrealistic about the capacity of country and global QAIs to track performance and measure success. Performance narrative needs to include both quantitative and qualitative data for all components. Under component 1 it will be important to capture the value added by the partnership modality. For component 3 make greater use of assessments such as those undertaken by MOPAN.
3. Sustainability	5	<p>Assistance under all three components is predicated on commitment to working in partnership and engagement throughout implementation.</p> <p>The approach recognises potential risks to sustainability; these are identified and sensible mitigation action is presented.</p>	The approach is sound and sustainability issues are appropriately addressed.
4. Implementation & Risk Management	4	<p>The Note recognises several risks and outlines a pragmatic approach to their management.</p> <p>With regard to Component 1, further up front dialogue with knowledge hubs is necessary to put in place collaboration mechanisms, governance arrangements within hubs. The governance group being established will assist in risk management.</p> <p>Over coming months HHTG and the hubs will undertake further work to clarify/document roles/responsibilities of parties to ensure maximum use of hubs products, especially knowledge management, dissemination and application.</p> <p>Sustained AusAID engagement under each Component is required</p>	Rationale and approach are sound. Good discussion of risks. Implementation would be enhanced with the following: promoting of learning and sharing across components; explore ways of leveraging cross-regional learning through funding under components 2 and 3.
5. Analysis and lessons	5	A process of continuous learning and reflection is required.	Good quality

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

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

<b>D: Next Steps</b> <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>		
Provide information on all steps required to finalise the design based on <i>Required Actions</i> in "C" above, and additional actions identified in the peer review meeting	Who is responsible	Date to be done
1. Rephrase the initiative objective to focus more directly on key success criteria, ie contribute to quality and effectiveness in the Asia Pacific region; stronger focus on expertise, analysis and knowledge which is of practical value and used by AusAID and its partners	Angela Mercuri Initiative manager	End of July 2008
2. Ensure that performance narrative includes both qualitative and quantitative data under each component. For Component 1 agree on most appropriate indicators to capture value added by the partnership modality	Initiative Manager (Component 1 and overall initiative) and program managers at country level especially for Components 2 and 3	Component 1 indicators to be agreed with Knowledge Hubs in November 2008; then ongoing monitoring during implementation; for component 3 greater use to be made of assessments such as those undertaken by MOPAN during implementation
3. < action >	< name >	< date >

<b>E: Other comments or issues</b> <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

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

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

Susan Ivatts, Peer Review  
Chair

signed:

*S Ivatts*

31 July 2008

**When complete:**

- Email this report to [QualityReports@ausaid.gov.au](mailto:QualityReports@ausaid.gov.au)
- Scan and attach the signed report to the Initiative in AidWorks  
*(this is temporary, until the changes are completed in AidWorks to allow the information to be entered directly)*
- The original signed report must be placed on a registered file