

Quality at Entry Report and Next Steps to Complete Design for

Australia Indonesia Electoral Support Program 2011-2015

A: AidWorks details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>			
Initiative Name:	INJ632		
AidWorks ID:	Australia Indonesia Electoral Support Program	Total Amount:	\$20,000,000
Start Date:	1 Jan 2011	End Date:	30 June 2015

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>	
Initial ratings prepared by:	Hannah Derwent
Review date:	November 2010
Chair of the process:	Danielle Heinecke
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	Sam Zappia, Chief of Operations, AusAID Doug Ramage, Democratic Governance Advisor, AusAID
Independent Appraiser:	Scott Guggenheim, World Bank (during this time, Scott Guggenheim was seconded to the World Bank. Previous to this, in his time at AusAID, he'd had no involvement with the elections design process or the earlier peer review).
Other peer review participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tony Liston, AusAID - Michael Bergmann, AusAID - Luke Arnold, AusAID - Ade Ganie, AusAID - Jo Hall, AusAID - Chris Nelson, AusAID - Michael Bliss, DFAT - Paul Robilliard, DFAT - Australian Electoral Commission - Indonesian Electoral Commission - Bappenas (Indonesian Planning Agency)

C: Safeguards and Commitments <i>(new!) completed by Activity Manager</i>		
<i>Answer the following questions relevant to potential impacts of the activity.</i>		
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> ?	Yes
2. Child Protection	Does the design meet the requirements of AusAID's Child Protection Policy?	Yes

D: Initiative/Activity description *completed by Activity Manager (no more than 300 words per cell)*

3. Description	<p>The Australia Indonesia Electoral Support Program (the Program) proposes providing up to \$20 million over five years to improve the quality and credibility of Indonesia's elections. This will be achieved through the improved management of elections by electoral management bodies and increased public engagement in the elections process.</p> <p>The program will build on existing AusAID-funded programs and provide continued support to the long-standing and highly regarded peer-to-peer relationship between the Australian Electoral Commission (AEC) with the Indonesian National Elections Commission (<i>Komisi Pemilihan Umum - KPU</i>). AusAID will also provide a grant to a not for profit organisation with strong links to CSOs (selected through a Competitive Grants Process), which will be responsible for delivering closely coordinated work programs under the two objectives.</p>
4. Objectives Summary	<p>The Program is designed to assist both Indonesian state institutions and civil society organisations to improve the quality of electoral processes and systems. The Program will support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Indonesian Electoral Commission (KPU - <i>Komisi Pemilihan Umum</i>) and the Indonesian Electoral Monitoring Agency (Bawaslu - <i>Badan Pengawas Pemilu</i>) to improve how they manage elections, with a focus on the national legislative and presidential elections planned for 2014 and local executive elections that will take place from 2011 to 2013; • The transparent and participatory development of electoral laws and regulations; • Educating voters about the elections process in targeted districts; and • Public monitoring of elections in targeted districts.

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)
5. Relevance	<p>Credible elections are fundamental for Indonesia's development and stability and are in Australia's national interest. The 2009 elections were problematic in many ways, thus increasing the need for support and attention to be paid in the lead-up to the 2014 election. Indonesia has asked for donor assistance from Australia for the 2014 elections and this is relevant considering Australia's long-term interest in ensuring a stable and democratic Indonesia.</p>	6	None required
6. Analysis and Learning	<p>The design has a good situational analysis, with a clear analysis of the problems and risks. The environment, architecture and the dynamics affecting the conduct of elections in Indonesia is well covered. There was some concern amongst the reviewers that the main problems identified in the situation analysis as affecting Indonesia's 2009 elections would not be addressed by the program directly. However, the design document explains that GoI does not welcome assistance in these areas. The program will thus the reviewers were satisfied that the program will do all it can within these parameters.</p>	5	None required
7. Effectiveness	<p>The design proposes working both through the AEC and CSOs. The peer reviewers agreed that the AEC is experienced in working in Indonesia and technically very strong. The reviewers did acknowledge however, that the KPU has entrenched weaknesses that will be difficult to overcome, though the proposed assistance with legislative changes will help. There was overall support for the on grant mechanism to CSOs.</p>	5	None required

E: Quality Assessment and Rating <small>(no more than 300 words per cell)</small> <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting</i>			
8. Efficiency	Delivery through the AEC was considered sound. As for the delivery partner model, it was agreed that delivering through CSOs would be a good way to get results and also to develop their capacity. However, Sam Zappia suggested that using a managing contractor might not be the most cost-effective in delivering the program and that the design needed to clarify the delivery mechanism.	4	Program will need to ensure that the AEC is managed on a performance basis. The procurement option for selecting the delivery partner needs to be reviewed.
9. Monitoring and Evaluation	It was agreed that there are aspects to the quality of the election that will be easy to measure, including any electoral fraud and inclusion of minorities. However, attribution to AusAID for a successful election will be difficult to measure. Peer reviewers agreed that overall, the M and E guidelines in the document were sufficient to provide a good base for setting up an M and E Framework when the program starts.	5	None required
10. Sustainability	It was agreed that the intention of the program is to be an agent of change in a sector that is fraught with complex power relationships and many stakeholders. However, through flexibility and responding to shifting opportunities, the program aims to influence reform that will provide a good base for legitimate elections. Also, other country experiences suggest that building up CSO capacities to monitor elections is one of the best and most sustainable activities that donors can support and that will require continued commitment.	5	None required
11. Gender Equality	It was agreed that the 40% target for women's participation and intention to promote gender mainstreaming is good. Appropriate attention has been paid to ensuring gender issues are addressed in the management and delivery of the program.	5	None required

* 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 <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the Appraisal Peer Review meeting</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. changes to be made to the M & E sections of the design according to comments in Sam Zappia's QAE report	Elizabeth St George	November 2010
2. Final comments from peer reviewers that are to be collected over email (September/October) to be incorporated into design document	Elizabeth St George	November 2010
3. Implementation strategy section (Part 3) to be revised, strengthened and better defined in accordance with peer reviewer comments.	Hannah Derwent and Luke Arnold	December 2010
4. Implementation: design team to investigate alternative implementation model to commercial contractor model and change design accordingly if possible.	Hannah Derwent	January 2011

F: Other comments or issues <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the APR meeting</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the Appraisal Peer Review, changes have been made to the design to clarify how the non-AEC components of the program will be funded and managed. The procurement option for the delivery partner has been revised. The selection

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

process will now be through a Competitive Grants mechanism directly with a civil society organisation, rather than a managing contractor.

- Since the Appraisal Peer Review, the design team has worked with Operations Policy and Outreach (OPS) and ASPP (OPS) to develop the delivery partner implementation mechanism for the majority of the program. With this model, the delivery partner will be a CSO already working in the sector selected through a Competitive Grants Program. This model was chosen over the traditional tender process which results in a commercial contract. This was done because of the uniqueness of the electoral CSO sector in Indonesia which has high capacity and with which AusAID will need to engage to implement this program. In light of this, it was difficult to see any further value add from a commercial contractor. Further, for sustainability, this model is preferable. Engaging directly with CSOs working in the sector will assist them to be more autonomous in setting the agenda, allow for better information flows in and out of AusAID and also assist AusAID in learning how to work better with CSOs in Indonesia – something which will become more important as more Indonesia CSOs become larger, more professional in their conduct and more able to compete internationally.

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):

Danielle Heinecke

signed:



7/2/11
< date >

When complete:

- Copy and paste the approved ratings, narrative assessment and required actions (if any) (table D) into AidWorks
- The original signed report must be placed on a registered file