Quality at Entry Report
Initiative Name: Australian Community Development and Civil Society Strengthening Scheme (ACCESS) Phase II
AidWorks ID:
Start Date: March 2008   End Date: March 2012
Total Amount: $26,500,000

	Rating	Explanation	Pending Action (if needed)
1. Clear objectives	5	ACCESS has clear and concise objectives articulated in the design document. The purpose is to improve democratic governance in 16 districts in Indonesia. The strategic direction and program approach adopted for ACCESS II builds on ACCESS I. These are: strengthening engagement between civil society and government; empowering citizens' participation for democratisation; and scaling-up impact, and is consistent with the draft country strategy and the draft governance strategy. The activities align with the purpose and objectives of the program. The program is designed to complement the work of other donors in the sector, and to contribute to the GOI National Community Empowerment Program. It is strongly supported by the policy environment of both the Indonesian and Australian governments. The initiative emphasises the strengthening of strategic partnerships with the GOI, decentralised institutions and local community service organisations.	
2. Monitoring framework	4-5	The program contains a monitoring structure, with a performance assessment framework monitoring the outcomes and processes, and learning and feedback embedded in the initiative. The performance measures for key partners of	Continual review of information generated from M&E activities will be required.

| | | ACCESS are based on the ACCESS Principles and the Program Operations Handbook.

A Mid-Term Review will be undertaken approximately twenty-three (23) months after the Program Start Date to assess the effectiveness and feasibility of the initiative. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Sustainability | 4 | ACCESS has been working in Indonesia since 2002 and has established partnerships and linkages in the civil society sector, with government, NGOs and CSOs.

Local project implementation activities will be appraised for sustainability. ACCESS will focus on embedding its community development driven participatory planning processes within the CSO network, within the government processes, or through support from other donors.

Sustainability will be achieved through engagement at the district level and through contribution to policy and programs at the national level. | More exploration required on the options through which to embed sustainability and an exit strategy.

Sustainability of institutional capacity building and support programs will be considered in the later years of the initiative. |
| 4. Implementation and Risk Management | 4 | Annex G contains a comprehensive risk management framework, detailing the implementation and contextual risks.

HIV/AIDS vulnerabilities are addressed in the design document, and anti-corruptions measures are incorporated into the program's operational and governance arrangements.

The flexibility of the design will enable necessary adjustments to risks as they emerge. | The change in the boundaries of ACCESS target areas will require regular monitoring.

Maintaining communication with managing contractor, the advisers and AusAID to mitigate potential risks. |
| 5. Analysis and lessons | 5 | Continuous learning and improvement is achieved through constant reflection and feedback from stakeholders, including GOI, CBOs, and the DSC.

The ACCESS I action-reflection cycle has | |

| | | been a cornerstone of the programs success and will be utilised in ACCESS II and will enabled the initiative to adapt to changing circumstances and improve performance and outcomes. The lessons learnt will be reflected in the District Community Engagement Plan.

The design integrates AusAID policies on gender, peace and conflict, anti-corruption, HIV Aids and partnerships arrangements. | |

Initially rated by:	Endorsed by peer review on:	Approved by Chair:	
Name & Date Dilani Edirisuriya (14 June 2007)	*Date*	*Name & Date*	

Guidance on Quality Principles

1. Clearly stated objectives that contribute to higher level strategy objectives
- consistent with the country strategy and broader Australian priorities and policies?
- clear, measurable and realistic?
- Strengthen key strategic partnerships?
- clearly reflect needs of key beneficiaries and stakeholders?
- clearly supported by partner government and other key donors?

2. Monitoring framework can effectively measure progress towards objectives
- adequate details on what it will measure and how it will be operationalised?
- reporting will be enough for management decisions and for accountability and lessons learning?
- evidence base will be adequate for the conclusions that will need to be drawn?
- different roles and levels of monitoring for different parties (eg Australian mission, partner government, delivery organisation) known and workable?

3. Appropriately addresses sustainability
- stakeholder ownership, partner policies, programs and political context conducive for longer term benefits; or otherwise taken into account?
- planned assets, technical, organisational or institutional changes or reforms can be sustained?
- costs of initiative, during and after implementation, allowed for with evidence they can be met?

4. Implementation and Risk Management
- Sound implementation arrangements
- Roles and responsibilities of all main parties clearly identified and will be effective, particularly for "when things go wrong"?

- Design framework is robust to allow for necessary adjustments to risks as they emerge?
- Main risks and plans to prevent or mitigate them are identified?
- Quality control mechanisms for the initiative's major deliverables are adequate?

5. **Based on sound technical analysis and continuous learning**
   - cross-cutting issues (eg gender equality, environment, anti-corruption, partnerships) taken into account?
   - analysis takes into account gender, institutional, economic, financial, organisational and human resource issues as per AusGuide?
   - lessons from previous experience in the sector and/or country taken into account?
   - programming logic is sound, based on situation analysis and identifies a plausible solution?
   - technical solutions proposed are both high quality and appropriate to the context?

Definitions of Rating Scale

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6, above the line)
6 Very high quality; needs ongoing management and monitoring only
5 Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas
4 Adequate quality; needs some work to improve

Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3, below the line)
3 Less than adequate quality; needs work to improve in core areas
2 Poor quality; needs major work to improve
1 Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

For further information, please contact the Design and Procurement Advisory Group.