

Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design for Multi-country Market Development Facility

A: AidWorks details *completed by Activity Manager*

Initiative Name:	Multi-country Market Development Facility		
AidWorks ID:	INI998	Total Amount:	\$13.8 million
Start Date:	1 December 2009	End Date:	30 June 2013

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

Initial ratings prepared by:	Brett Nietschke and Edward Smith, Food Security and Rural Section
Meeting date:	13 October 2009
Chair:	Jacqui De Lacy, ADG Sustainable Development Group
Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Simon Cramp, Director, Polynesia and Micronesia Section – Jacqueline Lees, Policy Officer and Edward Archibald, Analyst, Economic section (joint QAE provided) – Jacqueline Clark, First Secretary, Suva Post; Jeff Prime, First Secretary, Dili Post; and Peter Wilson, Development Program Specialist, Honiara Post (joint QAE provided by the Program Post's)
Independent Appraiser:	– Alan Gibson, Director, The Springfield Centre for Business in Development
Other peer review participants:	– See attached Peer Review minutes

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators*completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser*

Quality	Rating (1-6) *	Comments to support rating	Required Action (if needed)
1. Clear objectives	5	<p>Market based approaches are likely to have broad impacts ranging from increased economic activity to greater use of social services. This could help catalyse AusAID and other donors to consider increasing development efforts channelled through means other than the public sector.</p> <p>The goal statement is clear. The program seeks to address development challenges through stimulating investments that make markets more competitive and accessible (more choices and opportunities) to poor men and women. There is also potential to bring greater investments to less formal markets such as the non cash, or subsistence economy, as well as non formal employment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a clearer explanation of the need for the implementation teams to provide country specific annual objectives for the program; – explain how AusAID reporting requirements will be satisfied; and – ACIAR provide AusAID with knowledge around supply chains and systems through their Pacific Agri Business Development Initiative (PARDI). Maintain close collaboration throughout implementation.
2. Monitoring and Evaluation	5	<p>The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) approach is comprehensive and considered to be 'Best Practice'. This is a 'live M&E approach', linking real time learning with decision making. This M&E framework is commensurate with the M4P approach.</p> <p>Design and implementation of the M&E framework is well resourced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – a table or column be added to the PDD that outlines how AusAID will use and analyse information – including key information for stakeholders and the information they require.
3. Sustainability	5	<p>The program has the potential to address/remove systemic blockages that have to this point been significant barriers to other international efforts to address poverty.</p> <p>It is clearly the intent of the design that interventions deliver sustainable outcomes and changes that are perpetuated by the stakeholders involved.</p> <p>Given the live approach to M&E and the short term nature of interventions, a picture of sustainability should emerge as the program is implemented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – greater clarity about the inherent sustainability of its interventions in market systems; – be explicit about the need and likely process required to consider the sustainability of the facility's function at an early stage of implementation; and – be appropriately ambitious about AusAID's ongoing commitment to sustain functions either directly, or with other donors, partner governments, or civil society and the private sector.

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators*completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser*

4. Implementation & Risk Management	4	<p>A comprehensive list of risks is identified and management responses are appropriate.</p> <p>Continuous analysis that informs decision making, suggests the approach will be successful on the whole.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – as a relatively new approach for AusAID, there needs to be a clear mechanism for internal review of the management arrangements; – strengthen section 6.9 of the PDD to reflect how AusAID manages internal reviews and applies lessons learnt; – training for AusAID staff and other stakeholders in-country to explain the market based approach; and – test management/communication scenarios.
5. Analysis and lessons	5	<p>There is much interest in this program including its design and the role of market based approaches for producing systemic change with far reaching impacts. The analysis suggests the M4P approach is able to achieve significant and sustainable results.</p> <p>The governance/management mechanisms will provide ongoing assessment as to the appropriateness of programming and continuous learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – to ensure internal learning is a priority, the PDD should outline how AusAID uses lesson learnt to embed the market development approach into broader programming and into policy development; – reflect the broader international development context, particularly its contribution to MDG1, and its significant role in international agreements in the Pacific such as the Cairns Compact and Pacific Partnerships for Development; and – better articulate how the M&E system will be used to influence learning and communication - including influencing other stakeholders.

*** 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

D: 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. The required actions (as outlined above) were identified by the Peer Reviewers as issues that need to be addressed before the project design can be finalised. Each of these actions will be addressed, and an updated PDD produced.	Alwyn Chilver, Principal Rural Development Adviser	12/11/09

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no outstanding issues

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):

Jacqui De Lacy

signed:


30/11/09.
< date >**When complete:**

- Copy and paste the approved ratings, explanation and actions (table C) into AidWorks
- The original signed report must be placed on a registered file