



Australian Government
AusAID

Quality at Entry Report and Next Steps to Complete Design for Australia Africa Community Engagement Scheme

A: AidWorks details

Initiative Name:	Australia Africa Community Engagement Scheme		
AidWorks ID:	INJ318	Total Amount:	\$90,000,000
Start Date:	1 July 2011	End Date:	30 June 2015

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details

Initial ratings prepared by:	Tracey Newbury
Meeting date:	27 April 2011
Chair:	Lisa Rauter
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Russell Miles, Director NGO Section – Peter Lindenmayer, Program Manager, Middle East Section
Independent Appraiser:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ludmilla Kwitko, Independent Reviewer
Other peer review participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sue Graves, Counsellor AusAID Nairobi – Alice Oyaro, Program Manager, AusAID Nairobi – Lisa Staruszkiewicz, 1st Secretary, AusAID Nairobi – Naomi Dumbrell, Director East Africa Section – Tracey Newbury, Program Manager, East Africa Section – Olivia Chambers, Program Officer, East Africa Section – Andrea Cole, Africa Strategy, Performance and Partnerships Section – Daniel Kark, Strategy, Performance and Partnerships Section – Linda Kelly, Design Consultant – Jessica Kenway, M&E Design Consultant – Dr Julianne Stewart, Anglican Board of Mission Australia (ACFID Nominee)

C: Safeguards and Commitments		
Answer the following questions relevant to potential impacts of the activity.		
1. Environment	Have the environmental marker questions been answered and adequately addressed by the design document in line with legal requirements under the <i>Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act</i> ?	N/A
2. Child Protection	Does the design meet the requirements of AusAID's Child Protection Policy?	N/A
3. Imprest Account	Does the business case and risk assessment support the use of an imprest account as the most efficient, effective and ethical use of Commonwealth funds in accordance with the Commonwealth Financial Framework and AusAID policy?	N/A
COMMENTS	More work is required on the design to identify these policies and how they will be addressed. Links should also be made to how the NGO will address these policies.	

D: Initiative/Activity description	
4. Description	<p>The Australia Africa Community Engagement Scheme (AACES) has three linked elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a partnership program with ten Australian NGOs delivering basic services for poor and marginalised people in Africa in the areas of food security, maternal and child health, water supply and hygiene and sanitation [\$80 million]; (ii) activities to improve and enhance good development practices in Africa, inform policy engagement, and increase the Australian public's understanding of African development challenges and how Australia is responding [\$1-2 million]; and (iii) a resource facility to support coordination of the Scheme and other NGO activities over the five year program. Support will include monitoring and evaluation, and reporting of outcomes and impacts of NGO activities in Africa [\$8-9 million]. <p>The program will be managed through a joint AusAID/NGO steering committee. Other program features include an innovations fund to support experimentation and new directions in the program and a resource facility to support coordination, communication and program level monitoring.</p> <p>The program is supported by a strong monitoring and evaluation system which gives attention to monitoring of individual NGO projects, whole of program monitoring, value for money, and assessment of key management arrangements such as the partnership agreement and the effectiveness of the resources facility.</p>
5. Objectives Summary	<p>Objective 1: Marginalised people have sustainable access to the services they require.</p> <p>Objective 2: AusAID policies and programs in Africa are strengthened particularly in their ability to target and serve the needs of marginalised people.</p> <p>Objective 3: Australian public are more informed about development issues in Africa.</p>

E: Quality Assessment and Rating *(no more than 300 words per cell)**completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting*

Criteria	Assessment	Rating (1-6) *	Required Action (if needed)
6. Relevance	<p>1. Further discussion is required about why this modality has been selected and how the partnership relevant to the Australian Government.</p> <p>2. The link between the design and partner governments' priorities and interests needs to be further explained.</p>	5	<p>1. Identify in the design document the efficiencies of a donor working in partnership with NGOs (further actions in criterion 7 below)</p> <p>2. Provide further explanation of the ten NGO's involvement with partner governments</p> <p>b. During implementation AusAID will seek to establish relationships to inform and involve partner governments in the AACES program</p>

<p>7. Analysis and Learning</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Terminology around what is meant by 'most marginalised' people is unclear. 2. Further information and explanation of the AACES partnership is required (monitoring addressed in M&E criterion). 3. For future learning it is important to be explicit about the design process, decision making and concepts which have underpinned AAECS development. 	<p>4</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify discussion around most marginalised and include attention to power and ethnicity 2. Provide a more detailed explanation about the partnership approach, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the development of the approach with the ANGOs and the African partners and how this has changed over time b. widen comment on page 17 to include different partnership levels/relationships building on both lessons learned from other partnerships and partnership literature c. clarify expectations of the partnership (phases of partnership) d. explain what has worked so far in AACES include key elements of the draft partnership agreement e. include partnership risks and the limits of the partnership 3. a. Revisit Section 3 (Development of this design) to provide some additional information about the different design stages. b. Map out design process more explicitly. Why have changes been made? c. Provide more detail on the Strength Based Approach discussion
--	---	-----------------	--

<p>8. Effectiveness</p>	<p>1. Expectations for Objective 2 & 3 should be more modest due to the relatively low level of resources devoted to these objectives.</p> <p>2. Why are the objectives expressed differently in the PDD, as opposed to the Concept Paper and the Design Guidance? The change is important for learning.</p> <p>3. Integrating Objectives 2 and 3 is a positive step, their implementation will require further development and discussion. How/ when will this take place; and who will be responsible?</p> <p>4. Further details on the roles and responsibilities of the Steering Committee and Resource Facility are required including dispute Resolution. <i>(The Panel acknowledged roles and responsibilities and some processes such as dispute resolution will be more clearly defined during implementation and after the first Steering Committee meeting in late 2011).</i></p>	<p>4</p> <p>1. Provide additional information on the objectives including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> scheduling the implementation of the three objectives the risks a description of the way the objectives link to the overall intention of adding depth and coverage to the Africa program <p>2. Explain how the objectives were developed, including a description of how they have moved from a focus on access to services to 'sustainable access', with attention to advocacy and policy</p> <p>3. Further discussion on the phased implementation of the program including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> describing the program will start with a focus on Objective one and then phase in objective two and three. explanation the phasing in of the other 'Australian community based organisations' activity and the innovations fund. <p>4. a. Provide more detail on the Steering Committee and Resource Facility, with some attention to roles and responsibilities, decision making, dispute resolution, leadership, limits of the committee and relationship between the two. The above points can be articulated as planned steps forwards for implementation</p>
-------------------------	--	--

9. Efficiency	<p>1. There are two elements of the design that add to the complexity (and therefore cost) and which may not yield sufficient benefits to justify these costs. These are: funding to "Other Australian organisations" (6.3.3) and the Innovations fund (6.4.1).</p> <p>2. Clarification of the AACES budget across the three objectives is required.</p> <p>* Rating of 5 – panel noted at the program level efficiency be noted as a large challenge and (as outlined in the design) continued to be monitored throughout the duration of the program.</p>	5	<p>1. Further clarification to be provided on the Australian Community Based Organisation (other Australian Organisations) and the innovations fund including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The community Based Organisation activity is a separate but complementary activity b. Further explanation of the staging of both these activities within the AACES program c. further explanation around the flexibility of the design and progression of these activities <p>2. A more detailed AACES Budgeted will be included</p>
---------------	---	---	--

<p>10. Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>1. More effective integration into the overall text of the design is required, including defining some of the links between M&E and program implementation; and the ability of the M&E system to demonstrate achievement.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>1. Aspects to be clarified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. quality assurance requirements NGOs M&E & baseline data b. scope including how the 10 NGO's achievements will be synthesised and attributed to the AACES program c. rational for different types of information (Snapshots & Annual Report) d. headings for the Annual Reports and how these compare to mid-term reviews e. implementation and M&E f. roles and responsibilities of the Resource Facility and Steering Committee in relation to M&E g. M&E for the AACES partnerships h. M&E system review i. funding for M&E both at the program and NGO level
--------------------------------------	--	----------	---

11. Sustainability	<p>1. Additional risk relating to working in this new way (partnership) need to be included.</p> <p>2. The sustainability of any influence on AusAID's policy and programs is less certain</p> <p>3. More discussion is required on environmental issues in relation to marginalised people.</p>	5	<p>1. Additional Risks to be included:</p> <p>a. risks related to the Africa context</p> <p>b. further explanation on risks of working with NGOs</p> <p>c. risk of working in a different way (partnership)</p> <p>2. Make some stronger statement to link to the Africa strategy and involvement of thematic areas in the AACES development</p> <p>3. Further explanation to be given of environmental policies, Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change in relationship to vulnerability to disasters</p>
12. Gender Equality	<p>1. Gender is well integrated within the program but a few additions are required to ensure the links are made.</p>	5	<p>1. Gender equality will be revised in relation to:</p> <p>a. M&E</p> <p>b. Objective 2</p> <p>c. the key sector areas</p>

*** Definitions of the Rating Scale:**

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6)		Less than satisfactory (1, 2 and 3)	
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

E: Next Steps *completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting*

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. Changes made to Design Document	Linda Kelly & Jessica Kenway	20 May 2011
2. Contracting of NGOs for the first tranche payment and implementation can proceed	AusAID	23 May 2011

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

- A general tidy up will be done to the Design document to correct editing errors

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

- Overall more explanation will be given to scope and phasing of the AACES program
-

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 implementation
- or: ☐ **REDESIGN** and resubmit for appraisal peer review

- ☐ **NOT APPROVED** for the following reason(s):
- _____
- _____
- _____

Lisa Rauter

signed:



5/5/11
< date >

