

Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design for Asia Pacific Malaria Elimination Network

A: AidWorks details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>			
Initiative Name:	Asia Pacific Malaria Elimination Network (APMEN)		
AidWorks ID:	< insert AidWorks ID >	Total Amount:	\$6.5m
Start Date:	October 2009	End Date:	December 2013

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>	
Initial ratings prepared by:	Peter Lindenmayer
Meeting date:	2 September 2009
Chair:	Andrew Laing
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Peter Lindenmayer, HHTG – (Advice on earlier draft also provided by Jim Catchlove, Procurement & Advisory Services)
Independent Appraiser:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dr Tony Stewart (External Appraiser) – Peter Lindenmayer Rob Condon (Part Time Adviser, Communicable Diseases)
Other peer review participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Jim Tulloch, Principal Health Adviser – Sue Elliott, Director, HHTG – Anh-Thu Nguyen, Manager, Pacific Malaria Program – Lucy Phillips, HHTG

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>			
Quality	Rating (1-6) *	Comments to support rating	Required Action (if needed)
1. Clear objectives	4	Objectives consistent with AusAID's sectoral objectives, outcome focussed and plausible. It was noted that they had been revised by the design team in response to feedback on earlier drafts and had not yet been formally endorsed by the APMEN Assembly. As the objectives were still subject to final endorsement by the full Network Assembly, the maximum QAE score appropriate at this stage was 4 (with an expectation of this increasing in the QAI if endorsement was obtained at the Assembly).	Endorsement of Network model and objectives by Assembly in February 2010.
2. Monitoring and Evaluation	4	It was agreed that overall the M&E framework was reasonable, though there were some views that the link to the long term goals of elimination could be stronger. Some further work on detail at activity level should be undertaken. A score of 4 was agreed	Further development of the M&E framework by the Secretariat and/or Working Groups, which should then be presented to the February 2010 Assembly for endorsement.

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

3. Sustainability	4	At this stage it was difficult to comprehensively assess the likely sustainability of APMEN, but based on the fact that the overall model for network functioning appeared sound, there was already evidence of active membership involvement, and the multi-country approach was likely to attract interest from other funding bodies, there were grounds for optimism about longer term effectiveness. On this basis, a QAE score of 4 was agreed.	
4. Implementation & Risk Management	4	The general approach to implementation was sound, and although ownership appeared to be developing, this needed to be finally demonstrated. In view of some deficiencies in the timeliness of UQ's financial reporting for PACMISC, these aspects should be considered in the contract negotiations and structure. Risk Management was not as strong or pro-active as it could be, but was considered adequate for this stage of the initiative. Risks related to the co-Secretariat model would need to be monitored by the Network Assembly, and should be subject to further assessment by the proposed independent Progress Review recommended for November 2010. Overall, a QAE rating of 4 for this criterion.	Some amendments to be made to incorrect statements in sections of the ADD
5. Analysis and lessons	4	These aspects of the design were considered satisfactory.	

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

On the basis of these findings, it was agreed that HHTG should proceed to seek FMA 9/10 approval for APMEN, advise UQ of changes required in the design document, and commence funding agreement negotiations. The following conditions should be included in the agreement with UQ:

- a) Annual tranche payments to UQ for APMEN to be conditional upon
 - o APMEN Assembly approval of budget for the forthcoming year (ie February 2010 Assembly to approve budget for 2011 calendar year, and so on)
 - o AusAID satisfaction with program and financial reports for the previous calendar year
- b) The APMEN Monitoring and Evaluation Framework be further developed by the Secretariat in consultation with members and presented for ratification by the APMEN Assembly in February 2010. (Timing and content of reporting to AusAID should be aligned with reporting to the Network as a whole.)
- c) An independent (external) Progress Review be undertaken in November 2010 (funded from the AusAID M&E costs allocation), and the results presented to AusAID and the 2011 Assembly meeting.
- d) Confirmation that APMEN Work Program budget beyond Year 2 (ie from 2011) in the ADD is indicative only, and that this will be subject to modification based on comments by APMEN members prior to its submission to annual APMEN assemblies for approval.
- e) Consideration be given to increasing the amount available for the Emerging Issues Fund from 2011 onwards (with any increase to be taken from other parts of the Work Program).

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators*completed by Activity Manager***F: Approval** *completed by ADG or Minister-Counsellor who chaired the peer review meeting*

On the basis of the final agreed Quality Rating assessment (C) and Next Steps (D) above:

☒ **QAE REPORT IS APPROVED**, and authorization given to proceed to:☒ **FINALISE** the design incorporating actions above, and proceed to implementationor: ☐ **REDESIGN** and resubmit for appraisal peer review☐ **NOT APPROVED** for the following reason(s):

_____Andrew Laing, Senior
Associate

signed:

8/9/09
< date >

