Australian Government
AusAID

Quality at Entry Report and
Next Steps to Complete Design for
Access to Quality Education Program, Fiji

A: AidWorks details

Initiative Name:	Access to Quality Education Program, Fiji

AidWorks ID:	INJ515	**Total Amount:**	AU$25million
Start Date:	2011	**End Date:**	2016

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details

Initial ratings prepared by:	Padric Harm, Program Manager, Bilateral Education (Fiji) / Freya Beaumont, Bilateral Education (Fiji) *Ratings:* Relevance – 6 Analysis & learning – 5 Effectiveness – 5 Efficiency – 5 M&E – 4 Sustainability – n/a Gender Equality – 6
Meeting date:	06/08/2010
Chair:	Romaine Kwesius, Acting Minister Counsellor, Pacific

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 1 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

B: Appraisal Peer Review meeting details

Peer reviewers providing formal comment & ratings:	Glenn Cummings, Crisis Prevention, Stabilisation and Recovery Group	Rachel Slater, Social Protection Adviser
	Ratings:	*Ratings:*
	Relevance – 6	Relevance – 5
	Analysis & learning – 4	Analysis & learning – 5
	Effectiveness – 4	Effectiveness – 3
	Efficiency – 4	Efficiency – 4
	M&E – 4	M&E – 2
	Sustainability – 4	Sustainability – 3
	Gender Equality – 4	Gender Equality – 3
Independent Appraiser:	Stephen Passingham, Principal Education Adviser	
	Ratings:	
	Relevance – 5	
	Analysis & learning – 3	
	Effectiveness – 3	
	Efficiency – 3	
	M&E – 3	
	Sustainability – 3	
	Gender Equality – 4	
Other peer review participants:	Suva:	Canberra:
	Sarah Goulding: Counsellor, Fiji, Tuvalu and Regional	Jerry Strudwick: Pacific Education Adviser
	Jacqueline Clark: First Secretary, Development Cooperation	Jeremy Guthrie: Director, Melanesia Section
	Freya Beaumont: Bilateral Education (Fiji)	Ines Tallos: Human Development Section
	Padric Harm: Program Manager, Bilateral Education (Fiji)	Stacey Walker: Procurement & Agreement Services
	Richelle Turner: First Secretary, Contracts	Christina Parasyn: Policy Officer, Disability Inclusive Development
	Kirsty McNeil: Acting Counsellor, DFAT	Laurence McCulloch: Working in Partner Systems
	Paulini Sesevu: Senior Program Manager, Health and Law/Justice	Patrick Mullins: DFAT
	Tammy Malone: Food Security and Rural Section (Canberra)	

C: Safeguards and Commitments

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 2 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

C: Safeguards and Commitments

1. Environment	Have the environmental marker questions been answered and adequately addressed by the design document in line with legal requirements under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act*?	Yes
2. Child Protection	Does the design meet the requirements of AusAID's Child Protection Policy?	Yes

D: Initiative/Activity description

| 3. Description | The new *Access to Quality Education Program, Fiji* will be a five year program aimed at reducing the barriers for children to accessing education in Fiji. The program has been prepared to help maintain gains made in education through reducing the negative impacts of the political situation and the global economic crisis on the poorest families and settlements in Fiji.

The program will be made up of three components: Reduce financial barriers to access to schools; Improve school facilities & learning environments; and Support to the Ministry of Education (MoE) to improve education quality and analysis.

The program will work with schools, communities and the MoE to improve access and quality of education in Fiji. The program will be implemented through a Managing Contractor. The program recognises that given 98% of schools are run by NGO's, community groups and religious organisations (rather than government), it is important to work with school management bodies as well as MoE.

The program is designed as a Framework for Delivery to allow for real time analysis of the situation and the flexibility to respond should circumstances change in Fiji. A design and implement approach will allow for establishment of baselines and further analysis on barriers to accessing education and appropriate assistance modalities. |
|---|---|

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 3 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

3. Description	The new *Access to Quality Education Program, Fiji* will be a five year program aimed at reducing the barriers for children to accessing education in Fiji. The program has been prepared to help maintain gains made in education through reducing the negative impacts of the political situation and the global economic crisis on the poorest families and settlements in Fiji. The program will be made up of three components: Reduce financial barriers to access to schools; Improve school facilities & learning environments; and Support to the Ministry of Education (MoE) to improve education quality and analysis. The program will work with schools, communities and the MoE to improve access and quality of education in Fiji. The program will be implemented through a Managing Contractor. The program recognises that given 98% of schools are run by NGO's, community groups and religious organisations (rather than government), it is important to work with school management bodies as well as MoE. The program is designed as a Framework for Delivery to allow for real time analysis of the situation and the flexibility to respond should circumstances change in Fiji. A design and implement approach will allow for establishment of baselines and further analysis on barriers to accessing education and appropriate assistance modalities.
4. Objectives Summary	The goal of the program is to improve the ability of children from very poor communities, including those with a disability, to access a quality school education. The objective is to work with the MoE and other education service providers to adequately support poor families to mitigate financial and other barriers that limit access to school education for poor girls and boys in remote and rural areas of Fiji and urban squatter settlements within Suva and Nadi. In support of this objective, the purpose of the program involves a highly targeted approach focussing on three related components: • mitigating the effects of political instability and the global economic crisis on the most vulnerable people through reducing financial barriers to accessing school education • investing in school infrastructure in the poorest communities to ensure that facilities are adequate and safe, and contribute to improved student learning outcomes and • conducting targeted research and analysis on the systemic challenges to achieving improved education outcomes in Fiji. This activity will involve a range of short-term, demand-driven technical assistance and the provision of flexible support to MoE priorities, including curriculum development and assessment, and also the provision of assistance to MoE to key thematic areas relevant to its ongoing sector planning. The purpose reflects a strategy attending to priority education need amongst the most vulnerable populations and schools underpinned by action research and analysis addressing issues, constraints and opportunities in agreed thematic areas including education and social protection, along with work towards the better definition of the nature and extent of poverty in Fiji. The program's strong focus on access will ultimately contribute to reducing barriers to school education. With poverty issues addressed, the program's focus will expand to embrace quality provisions for school education leading towards improved student learning outcomes. Enhancing the overall student experience is fundamental to the Access for Quality Education Program, Fiji. It will also provide an important platform for providing assistance to the education sector, as well as for remaining engaged with the MoE within the interim government.

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 4 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

E: Quality Assessment and Rating

Criteria	Assessment	Rating (1-6) *	Required Action (if needed)
5. Relevance	The program is strongly consistent with: 1) Australia's response to the 2006 coup 2) AusAID's draft Pacific Education and Training Framework 3) AusAID's Disability and Gender Strategies 4) The Fiji Ministry of Education's Education Sector Strategic Development Plan (ESSDP) 2009-2011 and 5) Maintaining MDG2 of universal primary education (noting that whilst the MoE states that Fiji has achieved MDG2, this is using enrolment rather than completion data) The new program is designed to continue to support the people of Fiji and maintain engagement with MoE, both of which is consistent with Australia's approach for Fiji following the 2006 coup. The importance of having a program for reducing financial barriers to education is clear through increased unemployment, poverty and urbanisation to squatter settlements. The economic impacts following the 2006 coup and the 2009 global economic crisis appear to be increasing poverty in Fiji. The 2008 education situation analysis identifies increasing drop out rates with high school fees and levies noted as becoming an increasing barrier to access. The majority of school buildings and facilities are built and maintained by local communities/management groups. Maintenance is poorly resourced by school committees and MoE, and actually many buildings are not structurally sound. This was highlighted during Cyclone Tomas where 30 schools were damaged, with 15 schools heavily damaged. The activity builds on AusAID strengths / adds value in relation to other donors although the donor field is changing rapidly with many donors reducing ODA to Fiji under the current regime and new donors taking their places. It is important that key sectors do not drop off the agenda at this time of change and ensuring support to education should be a priority. One issue is whether this is the right balance between addressing supply-side and demand-side constraints – i.e. how far is the fall in enrolment and completion rates due to poor quality of education and how much is it due to lack of cash to pay for education? The design builds on the ICR's recommendations to address the quality of education through assessment, curriculum and teacher quality whilst also incorporating a social protection/access component in order to address the current economic and political situation. There is currently no differentiation (apart from transport / boarding) between the needs of rural and urban school children and how the programme will address them. For example, if children are being turned away from schools in urban areas because demand is too high, then this may suggest that access to cash for schooling is not the problem that they face, and therefore that cash transfers may not be the most appropriate response. Similarly, school feeding is unlikely to be particularly useful in rural areas where children attend local schools but may be very important in urban schools or for boarders.	5	Further analysis could usefully rank the different challenges in order to justify the current balance between component 1 and 2. These issues will need to be considered during the detailed analysis in the design phase about the right interventions for component 1.

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 5 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

E: Quality Assessment and Rating

| 6. Analysis and Learning | The PDD (problem analysis section) strongly highlights the particular needs for education within Fiji, and incorporates the analysis of the problems facing the sector and is developed in a way so as to mitigate the key issues. The proposed program draws and builds on the AusAID Situation Analysis final report, the Independent Completion Report for FESP, the Concept Note and the TORs to provide considerable detail in describing the context. The PDD clearly articulates a broad rationale for support based on specific evidence, such as declining enrolment, attendance and completion rates; increasing poverty; implications of rural to urban migration; weaknesses in current knowledge and information systems; loss of experienced MoE personnel due to compulsory retirement; declining GoF budgets and community resilience.

This program represents a divergence from the previous education program in Fiji. The focus has shifted away from support for the central ministry to assistance at a service delivery level, targeting disadvantaged schools and vulnerable groups sending their children to school. Given that the previous program was unable to demonstrate any significant improvement in learning outcomes for students, this approach appears sensible.

However, due to the difficulty in obtaining reliable statistics it is difficult to know how many children are currently out of school and therefore what number will benefit from this program. Estimated dropout rates are noted in the document (15% in primary school and 25% in secondary school). In noting that children are being turned away from overcrowded urban schools, statements such as 'where those children are remains a mystery' are problematic.

Certain specifics need to stand out more – e.g. that education is not free in Fiji. It would also be useful to make comparisons when using statistics. E.g. there is a statement that only 5% of the M&E recurrent budget is allocated to capital works – but we need to know how that corresponds to other countries in similar circumstances.

The program design does take into account previous AusAID programs in this sector as well as other donor programs, and includes those lessons learnt in the analysis and design. A weakness of the document is that the lessons learnt are not included as a separate section, but rather part of the analysis.

Currently, the PDD provides too broad a menu of interventions, all to be piloted before the best mix and targeting mechanisms are finalised. However, the political situation and the development and education context argue for a far simpler approach based (for example) on a school grants program.

However, the current PDD does not offer a clear and adequate analytical basis upon which we can elaborate an approach. There is, for example, no analysis or rationale for the cash transfer approach and no consideration of the history of the Family Assistance Program and the lessons this experience provides. This lack of analysis and clarity leads it to propose a broad range of possible interventions, the best mix and targeting of which will be piloted and 'finalised in the first three months of the program' (p.viii). The PDD also suggests that a broad 'range of studies will need to be undertaken during Phase 1 of the program' (annex 1), the duration of this phase being unspecified. | 4 | The program contains a significant research focus across all components: this will be key in determining target population and the most appropriate method of delivery of assistance. It is critical that sufficient resources are dedicated to this research at the beginning of the program as it will determine the program's long term success.

The inception stage, as well as throughout implementation, needs to work with the World Bank's Family Assistance Program (which includes poverty mapping and analysis activities) to ensure clear data and analysis

When using data ensure that context and comparisons are used

Include a separate section on lessons learnt from FESP (Australia) and FESP (EU)

Simplify the program and provide clarification of how interventions will be selected (including how many will be selected) and the criteria for selection.

Clearly identify i) the evidence base for a much more focused program, ii) knowledge gaps and iii) a process and timetable for further analysis to inform implementation of program components and activities, and possible future investments |

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 6 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

E: Quality Assessment and Rating

| 7. Effectiveness | **Outcome/Objectives Measurement** Whilst the objectives and components through which they will be delivered are clear, it is not so clear how they will be measured. Neither output indicators (e.g. how many school building improved, how many households receiving cash transfers) nor outcome indicators (how many children complete / enrol in each grade in targeted households) measures are articulated.

The stated objective of the program is clear; however its reference to social barriers to education will be difficult to measure. The purpose of the program and the components themselves focus on the financial barriers to education. There is little reference to what the social barriers are to education in Fiji (other than poverty).

High-level outcomes are identified (eg page 21). However, there is no clear and explicit link between each of the possible interventions listed in the summary table (page 20) and these outcomes. A more focused program will facilitate the process of clarifying objectives and to ensuring they are realistic and measurable.

Components Vs Objectives There is a tension (NOT a contradiction but a tension) between the components proposed and the objective. On p. 14 there is a statement that activities under component 1 'will ultimately overcome barriers to school education'. It is unlikely that the activities under component 1 will overcome the structural barriers to education – i.e. it won't sweep the barriers themselves away, rather it will help households hurdle them. In the context of urban migration these barriers are going to increase not decrease so the program will relieve the problems that household face but probably won't stop the problems altogether. A structural change would be something like – more schools built close to where people live, or school fees abolished.

Disability Responses on disability could be on the supply and the demand side but they are currently only discussed in relation to transfers. Different types of disability need to be clearer. There are children with disabilities who need separate schooling (i.e. special schools) but there are also children who could operate perfectly well in regular schools if investments in school buildings were sensitive to their needs (e.g. ramps, not steps) and development of policies, training and curriculum (as outlined in the framework) worked towards greater access by children with disability to basic education (not just special education). This supply-side is not addressed at present and M&E indicators need revision to ensure program can achieve the intended outcomes (they currently focus only on special schools rathe than basic education more broadly).

Flexibility and Risk Management The program is also requires flexibility in both the management of the program and the management of the relationship with MoE should the political relationship change.

The main risks associated with this program stem from the proposed activities under Component 1. In order to ensure that these risks are mitigated, further analysis and planning will need to occur before these activities can be implemented. This will occur in the initial months of program inception.

Wide Range of Interventions As its currently stands, it is difficult to assess whether the proposed program will work given i) the wide range of possible interventions, ii) the absence of a clear link between interventions and outputs and outcomes, and iii) the lack of unambiguous objectives, an adequate monitoring and evaluation framework, a budget and a time schedule. The PDD proposes a wide range of possible interventions to be piloted over an unclear period of time, and accompanied by a wide range of studies (17 are listed in annex 1) that have an unspecified link with determining the best mix and the targeting of interventions. | 4 | Clarify output and outcome indicators and provide at least an indicative budget.

M&E framework to be developed to reflect baselines and analysis under the design phase

The objective of the program needs to be considered in light of the planned activities. Targeted financial support to improve access for poor families to education, targeted facilities improvement to provide a safe environment and analysis and research in support of MoE objectives, may not address the social barriers to education. This link needs to be more explicit.

Clarify where a sustainable structural change will result from the program (barriers to education removed) versus where the program will help households deal with barriers without actually removing barriers.

Include a broader level of analysis on the situation of children with disability in education. Clarify where the entry points are on disability and what activities will take place, including opportunities for involvement of Disabled People's Organisations in governance and program processes, development of a strategy (by the Contractor) on how children with disability will be included and revision of indicators in M&E framework

Ensure a simple program structure and a clear mechanism for choosing a few interventions and studies particularly under component 1. Ensure that there is a manageable number of interventions and priority studies which are appropriately sequenced. |

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 7 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

E: Quality Assessment and Rating

| 8. Efficiency | **Budget Breakdown** In the absence of a budget breakdown, it is not possible to assess whether the inputs will provide value-for-money. Concerns about what is deliverable under component 1 have been explained in the previous section on effectiveness. In particular, it is not clear whether the component 1 activities are expected to remain at pilot stage throughout the lifetime of the program or whether they are expected to go to scale. If they are designed in the context of the need to respond to global recession and other risks then they need to get to scale quickly to protect school enrolments. A rough calculation of what this would mean for the budget: approx 180,000 under 20s in Fiji, about 2/5th of them poor and half of them school-going age, each provided with AUD100 a year in cash transfers (1/20th of the cost of a years schooling) would cost AUD3.6 million a year. If Component 1 goes to scale, there are not sufficient resources in the budget to deliver it.

While the PDD makes a sound assessment of risks, weaknesses in the analysis and lessons learnt, a weak M&E framework and the lack of a budget mean it is very difficult to score in terms of efficiency. It is not possible to make any assessment of value-for-money although global evidence suggests well managed school grants schemes can provide greater value for money than more centralised or top-down approaches.

Core Education Team The staff resources for the Core Education Program Team appear appropriate but are likely to depend on some specific social protection technical support to design and implement possible cash transfer / school feeding programmes / block grants. Many donor agencies are reluctant to fund cash transfers / stipends for education if they are managed in MoE because there is no firewall between the service provider and the buyer but the level of autonomy of the Core Education Program Team may help avoid the firewall risk.

Implementation Arrangements Implementation arrangements are harmonised with other donors and aligned with partner government systems as much as they can be. Among donors there is a shift away from traditional donors towards those with less engagement in Paris and Accra principles (e.g. China and Taiwan). The program design document is very clear on the risks, particularly those associated with Australia / Fiji diplomatic relations and has identified some mechanisms to manage the program. It remains, however, a high risk program and the specificities of the relationships between the Core Education Program Team and the MoE require more articulation. The proposed method of program implementation appears sound. As noted, component 1 will be further defined during the inception stage to determine the most appropriate method of improving access – cash direct to families or to schools. Care needs to be taken not to be over-optimistic in what can be delivered. The school feeding option may be more difficult to implement than the cash based systems.

Given that 98% of schools are independently managed and have displayed remarkable resilience despite budget cuts, capacity to manage money well obviously exists within the system. The facilities component should be as participatory as possible and allow individual schools to choose projects and contractors. Community inputs should be used to ensure that the school retains ownership over the projects.

To mitigate damage from natural disasters the disaster risk reduction approaches identified in the design are critical. It is important that building back better is fully incorporated into any construction undertaken as part of the program.

Managing Contractor The program will be implemented through a managing contractor. This approach was decided by the design team as the most appropriate mechanism given the context. There are no other bilateral donors or multilateral agencies in the sector that Australian can co-fund through or with. Also there are no NGOs with the required capacity operating in Fiji who could implement a program of this size. In the current context, using partner government systems is not an option. The PDD does recognise the limitation of using a managing contractor model and the program has been designed to mitigate these issues and to be more flexible to changing needs and circumstances. Suva Post will be involved in management of the program and is best placed to be able to judge if something is not being implemented properly and how to resolve the issue.

This program includes many new and innovative ways of targeting assistance and for this to be properly implemented and monitored requires program managers to have relevant expertise. Also the recent changes in the mandatory retirement age (from 65 to 55) have significantly reduced the capacity of MoE, particularly at senior levels. For this reason, there is a high Technical Assistance element of the design. Where possible, recruitment for the Core Education Team will be encouraged to be local possibly to include retired MoE officials, where appropriate. | 4 | Clarify an indicative budget for each component and management component

Clarify how lines of reporting will work for the Core Education Program Team

Clarify how the program will be contracted as a design and implement approach and the tasks for the MC in the first year of the program and then how the workplan/budget will be agreed in later years.

Develop a plan for year one. |

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 8 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

E: Quality Assessment and Rating

9. Monitoring and Evaluation	The draft monitoring and evaluation framework in the document outlines the general issues that will be included as well as a roadmap for development. The monitoring and evaluation framework will be finalised by the MC in the first three months of the program. This will be done in conjunction with AusAID and MoE. The reason for this is to ensure that the correct baseline data is collected at the outset of the document, as well as to ensure the incorporation of the activities under Component 1 into the M&E framework. Ongoing monitoring of the program will occur through Suva Post and the PCC.	4	Clarify the program objectives, outputs and outcomes
	The M&E framework as outlined appears to be adequate to monitor the impact of the program. A significant level of reliance will be placed on the MoE systems. Having the M&E Specialist spend time in country during the initial phase of the program is a good idea. Given that the method of implementation is to be determined for component 1, it will be useful to have an M&E Specialist in country during this period to provide input on possible M&E impacts of any design decisions. The document notes the significant number of layoffs of experienced education professionals due to the change in retirement age. It may be possible to hire some of these people, who have great experience in the Fiji education system, to act as a team of ongoing monitors. Presumably there is a reasonable geographic spread of these people. This mechanism could be used to complement the planned semi-annual visits by the Education Program Team (capital based).		Look at including ex-MoE employees (ie recently retired employees) in the Core Team to monitor the program
	The M&E element of the PDD needs to be elaborated based on clear objectives, outputs and outcome indicators. In part it is undermined by the fact that there is not a comprehensive set of outcome indicators (even in Annex 3 there are indicators but not targets). So, for example, we know that the aim is to upgrade schools but we don't know how many. It is not stated if or how M&E data will be gender disaggregated nor how the Core Education Program Team will work with and support capacity development in the MoE to monitor. There will be a dependence on the completion of an MoE baseline but it is unclear when this might take place. It is not possible to say whether M&E is adequately resourced in the absence of a budget breakdown.		Explain clearly that the indicators will only be agreed after additional analytical work has taken place and the size of activities has been agreed. The M&E framework will be finalised in the design phase.
	MoE capacity building on EMIS will need to be informed by the lessons of FESP (Australia), FESP (EU), the FAP and other recent project support.		Identify lessons of current and recent support to inform the elaboration of an adequate M&E approach

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 9 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

E: Quality Assessment and Rating

| 10. Sustainability | The program aims to work with MoE and support their priorities where possible. However, it needs to be recognised that in the current Fiji context, interventions are designed to mitigate particular circumstances and to minimise the impact of these situation on vulnerable populations, and therefore may not necessarily be highly sustainable. This program is designed to ensure that Australia stays engaged in the education sector, recognising that it is a very important sector for development and that the current circumstances (both economic and political) could threaten the impact of education in Fiji. However, the program is designed to be an interim measure due to these circumstances and not necessarily a long-term solution (although there are aspects that do deal with capacity and quality).

Questions about sustainability need to be addressed in contexts similar to those of fragile states or difficult circumstances. Sustainability needs to be considered more as lasting benefits to disadvantaged individuals and schools in their capacity to cope with the challenges they face and to benefit from education, rather than eradicating the causes of poverty or adversity per se. In this sense, the resilience community-managed schools have demonstrated to date is a key factor in assessing the prospects for positive impact.

The program supports poor families in having access to education through some form of access assistance program. This element of the program is not sustainable in the long term. Access to education for poor families can only be guaranteed by broad economic growth in Fiji, improving their livelihoods, boosting government budgets resulting in greater public expenditure in the education sector.

The research component should deliver lasting insights into education in Fiji.

The use of shadow systems, aligned with the government's financial processes is a good idea. This allows for easier integration into the government's systems in the future should this program ultimately be handed over to the MoE.

On one level this programme is all about sustainability – it focuses on getting children into quality education so that they can subsequently break the inter-generational transmission of poverty i.e. people who are poor as children will not automatically be poor as adults.

Investments in components 2 and 3 should contribute to improved education (supply-side) and to improved information and evidence to support good education programming in the future.

However, there are two issues that threaten the sustainability of the program outcomes:

1. Can the changes be delivered within the 5 year timeframe? The timing of activities and implications for what can be delivered in 5 years could be given more attention. An example is that many activities need to take place before any pilot transfers could take place (especially establishment of baseline, poverty mapping, etc). This would leave limited time to design and implement pilots, learn from them and implement a scaled-up transfer programme. There is a risk that the programme may not reach an implementation phase for component 1 by the end of the 5 years. If those involved in the program agree that the pilots do not have time to go to scale, it may therefore be necessary to scale back the objective under component 1 so that it reflects this.

2. Will the program result in structural changes or the establishment of permanent systems to support access to education? It is not clear from the document whether it intends to remove barriers to education or provide support to households so that they can, on a household by household basis, overcome the barriers. If it is the latter, when the program finishes (in the absence of uptake by government) the barriers will still remain but support to households will end. | 4 | |

Additional column notes (right):
- Construct a timeline of activities
- Add a clear statement about what sustainable outcomes are expected e.g. will the barriers to education access disappear? Or will a permanent system be established to help poor households hurdle them?

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 10 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

E: Quality Assessment and Rating

11. Gender Equality	The program is designed to encourage all children to attend school. No special provision is made to target girls, rather targeting is done on the basis of poverty. This appears to be appropriate. The M&E framework notes that a gender parity index for net enrolments may be an indicator for the program. It is unclear from the framework whether other indicators are able to be gender disaggregated by the MoE database. It would be useful if this was possible. It might also be useful to be able to establish gender disaggregated data of those specifically helped by the program, rather than just at the national level The program design document explicitly addresses issues but does so only in a partial way. There are clear indications that the program designers have considered the specific hardships in de facto and de jure female headed households that mean that children do not attend school. It would be helpful to follow this up with an indication of how these might be tackled through the program (e.g. targeting FHH in component 1?). There is no analysis of how gender relations shape opportunities to access education. Are girls enrolment and completion rates lower than boys? Many cash transfer programmes for education do focus explicitly on getting girls to school and keeping them there. It would be useful to know if that is an issue in Fiji. Gender equality is considered in part but this could be improved with greater focus on analysis during program development and implementation informing management decisions on operational matters at MoE, district and school/community levels.	4	Ensure gender disaggregated data where possible/appropriate Analysis of gender differences in girls/boys access to education and suggestions as to how component 1 might address this

* 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

F: 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 *Required Actions* in "C" above, and additional actions identified in the peer review meeting	Who is responsible	Date to be done
1. Incorporate all the issues listed in "required actions" in the design document	Suva Post	27/08/2010
2. Clearly articulate that the document is a Framework for Delivery and specify how the decision points will be made (including an indicative budget).	Suva Post	27/08/2010
3. Include in document external analysis on lessons learnt in social protection programs in difficult situations	Suva Post	27/08/2010
4. Strengthen Monitoring and Evaluation Systems	Suva Post/MC	Inception Stage

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 11 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011

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

- The Peer Review agreed that it was not clear from the Design Document that it was intended as a Framework for Delivery rather than a complete list of activities. Many of the concerns about the program were around the large range of activity and not having clear analysis about what will be done. The design document will be revised to ensure that it is clear that the design is a Framework for Delivery and more information will be inputed into the document about the criteria for choosing activities under each component and how the budget will be approved.

- The ratings given above reflect the incorporation into the PDD of the changes agreed in the peer review and articulated in the QAE.

H: Approval   *completed by **ADG or Minister-Counsellor** who chaired the peer review meeting*

On the basis of the final agreed Quality Rating assessment (E) and Next Steps (F) 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):

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

Romaine Kwesius Acting Minister Counsellor, Pacific	Signed: *RVhesus*	Date: 2/9/10

Quality at Entry Report Template for Activity Managers, registered # 088
Business Process Owner: Technical Group Manager, Quality and Performance Management

UNCLASSIFIED   page 12 of 12
Template current to 30 June 2011