

## Report on Quality at Entry and Next Steps to Complete Design for the Pacific Public Sector Linkages Program

<b>A: AidWorks details</b> <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>			
<b>Initiative Name:</b>	Pacific Public Sector Linkages Program		
<b>AidWorks ID:</b>	INI864	<b>Total Amount:</b>	<b>\$18,750,000</b>
<b>Start Date:</b>	1 July 2009	<b>End Date:</b>	30 June 2013

<b>B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details</b> <i>completed by Activity Manager</i>	
<b>Initial ratings prepared by:</b>	The ADG of the Pacific Branch granted an exemption from independent appraisal and an appraisal peer review meeting (minute on file 09/3937).
<b>Meeting date:</b>	n/a
<b>Chair:</b>	n/a
<b>Peer reviewers providing formal comment &amp; ratings:</b>	n/a
<b>Independent Appraiser:</b>	n/a
<b>Other peer review participants:</b>	n/a

<b>C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators</b> <i>completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser</i>			
<b>Quality</b>	<b>Rating (1-6) *</b>	<b>Comments to support rating</b>	<b>Required Action (if needed)</b>
1. Clear objectives	4	Individual Pacific PSLP activities have their own objectives, but those for the program as a whole are vague. This is somewhat unavoidable given that the program is a funding mechanism designed to support a wide range of small activities.	Review of M&E frameworks for similar programs, including whether and how they link individual activities to overall objectives.
2. Monitoring and Evaluation	4	Agencies will be required to submit progress and completion reports. For the size of the average grant (\$150,000 to \$200,000 per annum) this level of monitoring is appropriate.  However, at the whole of initiative level it is difficult to get a sense of overall achievement.	As above, and also an in-country review of a sample of activities will be undertaken in 2011.
3. Sustainability	4	Most interventions supported under the program are small and targeted to the identified needs of participants. There are no recurrent costs involved.  However, the sustainability of impact of small interventions is questionable, and we have no independent reporting from which to draw conclusions about impact.	As much as possible we try to link Pacific PSLP activities to broader development objectives and programs.  The in-country review will be tasked with looking at the sustainability of impact of past phases of a sample of activities.

C: Quality Rating Assessment against indicators <i>completed by Activity Manager / Peer Reviewers / Independent Appraiser</i>			
4. Implementation & Risk Management	5	Due to their nature (eg staff exchanges, short term training), implementation of Pacific PSLP activities is straightforward and low risk. In terms of AusAID's management of the program, improvements could be made in keeping Posts informed of the program and of visits to their countries by agencies undertaking Pacific PSLP activities.	Secretariat to regularly send lists of recent reports and spreadsheet of activities to Posts.  Secretariat to regularly remind agencies of the importance of notifying Posts of visits.
5. Analysis and lessons	5	The predecessor of Pacific PSLP, the Pacific Governance Support Program, was subject to an administrative review, an independent completion report and a re-design. The findings of these various reviews have been taken into account in the development of Pacific PSLP.	

* 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 <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
Note: As this QAE has been prepared after the program has started, the following steps will be undertaken during implementation		
1. Review of M&E frameworks for similar programs	Pacific PSLP manager, with consultant inputs as required.	Third quarter 2010
2. In-country review	Organised by Pacific PSLP manager, undertaken by consultant	First quarter 2011

E: Other comments or issues <i>completed by Activity Manager after agreement at the APR meeting</i>
•

**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):

---



---



---

	signed:	
--	---------	--