

# Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool and Scoring Matrix

Last revised: February 2023

The [Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool and Scoring Matrix](#) is an attachment to the [Investment Design Quality Assurance and Scoring Guidance](#) and must be used to assess and provide comments on the quality of the design document.

## Attachments included in this resource:

<b>Attachment A: Investment Quality Assessment Tool &amp; Scoring Matrix</b>	Page 1
Design quality scoring	
Independent appraisal/Formal peer review comments	
Investment Design Quality Scoring Matrix	Page 9
<b>Attachment B: Quality assurance summary for design approval</b>	Page 20
<b>Attachment C: Summary of Independent appraisal and formal peer review scores</b>	page 21
<b>Attachment D: Suggested template for informal comments</b>	Page 22
<b>Attachment E: Draft Formal peer review agenda</b>	Page 23
<b>Attachment F: Sample design quality assurance timeline</b>	Page 24

# Attachment A: Investment Quality Assessment Tool & Scoring Matrix

This tool must be used to assess the quality of the design document, using the DFAT Investment Design Quality Scoring Matrix. All independent appraisals and written formal peer review comments must be uploaded to AidWorks. Delegates should see all collated scores in the design approval minute.

<b>Investment name:</b>
<b>Start date:</b>
<b>End Date:</b>
<b>Total proposed funding allocation: AUD_____</b>
<b>Risk profile:</b> <i>low/medium/high risk</i>
<b>Value profile:</b> <i>low/medium/high value</i> [low <\$3m; high = \$100m and above]
<b>Investment outcomes:</b> <i>&lt;State the end program outcomes expected from this investment&gt;</i>
<b>Investment description:</b> <i>&lt;Briefly describe how this investment will be implemented&gt;</i>
<b>Appraiser/peer reviewer name (and position, if internal to DFAT):</b>
<b>Date of appraisal or peer review:</b>

## DESIGN QUALITY SCORING

Appraisers and formal peer reviewers should address each design quality criterion with reference to the Investment Design Quality Scoring Matrix.

### ***Satisfactory rating***

- 6 - Very high quality; does not require amendment before proceeding
- 5 – Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas
- 4 – Adequate quality; needs some work to improve

### ***Less than satisfactory rating***

- 3 – Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
- 2 – Poor quality; needs major work to improve
- 1 – Very poor quality; needs major overhaul.

Criterion	Score
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Monitoring and evaluation	
Sustainability	
Gender equality and cross-cutting issues	
Innovation and private sector	
Risk management and safeguards	

## INDEPENDENT APPRAISAL/FORMAL PEER REVIEW COMMENTS

Appraisers and formal peer reviewers should provide comments to support a rating – usually 1-3 paragraphs are sufficient) and, if needed, describe what action are required to improve the rating.

1. **Relevance:** how well does the design explain why DFAT should make this investment, and the evidence underpinning this rationale?

**Score:**

**Comments:**

**Actions:**

2. **Effectiveness:** does the design clearly describe end of program and intermediate outcomes, and a strong program logic? Are the policy dialogue arrangements clear to leverage reform?

**Score:**

**Comments:**

**Actions:**

3. **Efficiency:** will the investment demonstrate value for money, and will it be an economical and ethical use of Australia's (and other partners') resources? Will governance and management arrangements enable effective implementation of the investment?

**Score:**

**Comments:**

**Actions:**

4. **Monitoring and evaluation:** are M&E arrangements appropriate for measuring progress towards expected outcomes?

**Score:**

**Comments:**

**Actions:**

5. **Sustainability:** will expected benefits be long-lasting, and institutionalised through local systems?

**Score:**

**Comments:**

**Actions:**

6. **Gender equality and cross-cutting issues:** how well does the design address gender equality and women's empowerment, and cross cutting issues including disability inclusion and climate change?

**Score:**

**Comments:**

**Actions:**

7. **Innovation and private sector:** does the design adequately explore opportunities to use innovative approaches and private sector engagement?

**Score:**

**Comments:**

**Actions:**

8. **Risk management and safeguards:** does the design address what could go wrong, and explain appropriate responses?

**Score:**

**Comments:**

**Actions:**

**Other comments or issues for attention**



## INVESTMENT DESIGN QUALITY SCORING MATRIX

This matrix sets out DFAT's expectations for investment design quality, and guidance on the application of scoring for appraisers, peer review chairs and participants, investment managers and delegates. Information about quality assurance requirements, including when scores must be applied, are set out in the [Aid Programming Guide](#) and DFAT's [Investment Design Quality Assurance and Scoring Guidance](#).

Investment design quality is scored on six-point scale (below). Each design quality criterion must be scored by each appraiser and peer reviewer. When determining a score, reviewers should consider the available evidence on the design, normally restricted to the publicly available investment design document, development investment plans, and policy statements, and may include reference to internal and sensitive material. Particular attention should be paid to justifying ratings of three and four.

### ***Satisfactory rating***

**6 - Very good:** satisfies criteria in all areas

**5 – Good:** satisfies criteria in almost all areas

**4 – Adequate:** on balance satisfies criteria; does not fail in any major area

### ***Unsatisfactory rating***

**3 – Less than adequate:** on balance does not satisfy criteria and/or fails in at least one major area

**2 – Poor:** does not satisfy criteria in several major area

**1 – Very poor:** does not satisfy criteria in any major area

This matrix emphasises the importance of analysis and evidence to support DFAT's investment decisions. High quality analysis of the investment context, including political economy analysis and gender analysis, should inform all of DFAT's investments. Recommendations and lessons learned from evaluations, independent reviews/evaluations, appraisal reports, aides-memoire, feedback from partners and other stakeholders, and independent research conducted in the context or sector should be clearly stated and responded to.

Some designs (including those for facilities and other extremely flexible, adaptive investments, design and implement arrangements, and innovative procurement trials) may defer development of some elements of the design (e.g. a detailed program logic) to implementation. In these cases this must be explained clearly, and responsibilities for development, quality assurance, and approval of these elements must be identified. Please contact [designmail@dfat.gov.au](mailto:designmail@dfat.gov.au) to discuss how to adapt this matrix for these types of investments.

## 1. RELEVANCE

*Does the design explain why DFAT should make the proposed investment, and the evidence that has informed decisions?*

### Focus areas:

- Strategic focus and policy alignment
- Analysis and lessonsModality selection

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>The design meets the four development tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pursuing national interest and extending Australia’s influence;</li> <li>• Impact on promoting growth and reducing poverty;</li> <li>• Australia’s value-add and leverage (reflects Australia’s relative advantages); and</li> <li>• Making performance count (stronger focus on results and value for money, drawing on previous sector performance, including other donor experiences)</li> </ul>	<p>The design meets the four development tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pursuing national interest and extending Australia’s influence;</li> <li>• Impact on promoting growth and reducing poverty;</li> <li>• Australia’s value-add and leverage (reflects Australia’s relative advantages); and</li> <li>• Making performance count (stronger focus on results and value for money, drawing on previous sector performance, including other donor experiences)</li> </ul>	<p>The design does not meet one or more of the four development tests.</p>	<p>The design does not meet one or more of the four development tests.</p>
<p>DFAT’s strategic intent for the investment is explicitly set out, and reflects the priorities and objectives in the relevant development plan (and sector strategies, where relevant).</p> <p>It is clear how the investment aligns with Australia’s and the partner country’s formal policy commitments.</p> <p>The investment’s intersection with a broader range of Australian and partner country interests are described and analysed.</p>	<p>There is reference to DFAT’s strategic intent for the investment and reflects the priorities and objectives in the relevant development plan (and sector strategies, where relevant).</p> <p>Australia’s and the partner country’s formal policy commitments are set out, and alignment and linkages between them and the investment are demonstrated.</p>	<p>DFAT’s strategic intent is not identified and links to the relevant development plan (and sector strategies, where relevant) are weak.</p> <p>Policy commitments are summarised, with little analysis or description of their relationship to the proposed investment. Statements are general. Links to partners’ plans and strategies are poorly articulated.</p>	<p>There are cursory references to DFAT’s formal and publicly stated policy commitments.</p> <p>There are cursory references to partners’ plans and strategies.</p>

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>Relevant analyses and commissioned research are provided, along with details of consultation and feedback from local stakeholders including government, civil society and the private sector. Lessons and recommendations from reviews and evaluations are explicitly addressed.</p>	<p>Information from secondary sources is used to justify the investment. There is evidence of consultation with and incorporation of feedback from key stakeholders (including local stakeholders).</p> <p>Plans for conducting further analysis and using the evidence collected are stated clearly.</p>	<p>Assertions are based on few sources and references, with little reference to past lessons relevant to the investment. There is limited evidence of consultation with and incorporating feedback from key stakeholders.</p> <p>Plans for future analysis are non-specific, or not focused on use of the evidence collected.</p>	<p>The justification for Australia’s investment is poorly explained.</p> <p>There is no evidence of engagement with key stakeholders.</p> <p>There are no plans for future analysis.</p>
<p>A range of options to address the identified development challenges have been explored.</p> <p>The chosen approach(es) to delivering development assistance draw on high quality analysis (for example, political economy analysis) and lessons from past practice. There is considered assessment of alternative delivery options (including working in partner systems, sector wide approaches, partnerships, facilities, projects, co-financing, multilateral, NGO, TA, twinning, WoG engagement, and other modalities).</p>	<p>There is minimal discussion of alternative options for addressing identified development challenges.</p> <p>There is a credible evidence-based explanation for why the chosen approach(es) to delivering development assistance are appropriate for the context.</p>	<p>Alternative options are not outlined.</p> <p>There is little explanation for the chosen approach(es) to delivering development assistance.</p>	<p>The approach(es) to delivering development assistance are either not described, or described without reference to other options, or justification of the delivery approach.</p>

## 2. EFFECTIVENESS

*Are the changes the investment is expected to deliver clearly identified, along with an explanation of how they will occur?*

### Focus areas:

- Outcomes and results focus
- Program logic
- Delivery approaches
- Policy and partner engagement

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>Both end of investment and intermediate outcomes fulfil the requirements in the 'adequate/rating 4' box at right.</p> <p>There is evidence to support DFAT's assertions that these outcomes are achievable, and that available resources, context, and relationships have been analysed to confirm this.</p> <p>There is evidence that outcomes have been developed in consultation with stakeholders (particularly the partner government).</p>	<p>Outcome statements identify changes that can reasonably be expected to occur as a result of the investment, and define:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An 'end state' when the outcome has been achieved</li> <li>• Who or what is expected to change</li> <li>• The type of change expected to occur: knowledge (awareness of new ideas, techniques or strategies); action (behaviour change based upon new information/ideas); or condition (organisational or societal condition changes due to the stakeholders' actions)</li> <li>• When the changes are expected to be seen</li> </ul> <p>DFAT's level of ambition for the investment is realistic, taking into account the human and financial resources, context, and relationships.</p> <p>Outcomes are demonstrably acceptable to identified key stakeholders.</p>	<p>It is not clear who or what will change as a result of the investment, in what way, and/or by when.</p> <p>Outcomes are overly or insufficiently ambitious, taking into account the human and financial resources, context, and relationships.</p> <p>Stakeholder perspectives on outcomes are poorly explained.</p>	<p>Outcomes are set out as general statements of intent, or strategic goals.</p> <p>Stakeholder perspectives are not defined.</p>



<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>A program logic explains the causal sequence through which DFAT expects to achieve the desired outcomes, beginning with inputs, moving through activities, outputs, intermediate and end of investment outcomes, and a compelling case for how the end-of-program outcomes are expected to contribute to the investment's broader goals.</p> <p>The program logic is articulated in a graphic and in plain English, with clear and specific language, and was developed through extensive consultation and stakeholder involvement.</p> <p>It is supported by strong evidence and past practice, and demonstrates analysis and testing in the specific context, including explanations of assumptions and risks.</p>	<p>There is a program logic that explains credible causal links between activities, outputs, and outcomes.</p> <p>The program logic is expressed in a graphic and in plain English, using language that can be understood by stakeholders.</p> <p>There may be little evidence of previous success or achievement, but there is an explanation of how it will be tested and reviewed throughout implementation.</p>	<p>Links between activities, outputs and outcomes are tenuous, poorly defined, and/or depend on significant assumptions that pose crucial threats to the investment.</p> <p>The graphic or narrative explanation is absent or unclear.</p> <p>Evidence to support the logic is absent, with little to no reference to ongoing testing and review.</p>	<p>There is little evidence, or outline of causal linkages, to suggest that the investment will achieve the intended outcomes.</p>
<p>There is a clear justification for the implementation approach and partner selection. Analysis of options for delivery arrangements is based on principles agreed with key stakeholders, and draws on strong evidence.</p>	<p>The delivery approach is clearly articulated, there is evidence that it is appropriate to the context, and it has been agreed to by key stakeholders (e.g. partner government).</p>	<p>The delivery approach and/or rationale for partner selection are not clearly explained and/or justified.</p>	<p>The delivery approach and/or partner selection is inappropriate, and/or there is no explanation or justification.</p>
<p>Australia's expectations for leveraging the investment to strengthen policy engagement are set out. Contributions to broader objectives are clearly articulated.</p> <p>Roles, responsibilities and opportunities for policy dialogue are outlined, with reference to DFAT and partner staff at various levels.</p>	<p>Opportunities for policy and budget dialogue are outlined.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities are described for DFAT and partners (including WoG).</p>	<p>Opportunities for policy and budget dialogue are implicit or broadly stated.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities are unclear or not described in detail.</p>	<p>References to potential for policy and budget dialogue are absent or cursory.</p>

### 3. EFFICIENCY

*Is there a compelling argument that this investment will demonstrate value for money, and be an economical and ethical use of Australia’s (and other partners’) resources?*

**Focus areas:**

- Governance
- Management arrangements and capabilities
- Value for money
- Financing and resourcing

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>Tailored governance arrangements will enable a wide range of representatives and stakeholders, including the partner government, to participate in decision-making.</p> <p>Governance arrangements and M&amp;E arrangements are fully integrated.</p> <p>Gender equality and inclusive participation will be pursued explicitly.</p>	<p>Specific and workable governance arrangements for the investment are set out, reflecting formal agreements between Australia and key partners.</p> <p>Strategies to broaden participation and stakeholder engagement in decision-making are outlined.</p>	<p>Standard governance arrangements between the key partners are outlined, with no or little adaptation for this investment.</p> <p>There are no or few opportunities for partner government, vulnerable groups, civil society, private sector or other stakeholders to influence decision making.</p> <p>Links between decision-making and performance data are not clearly set out.</p>	<p>Governance arrangements are poorly defined, or unlikely to achieve participation and support from key parties in practice.</p> <p>There are no or cursory references to the use of performance information for decision-making.</p>
<p>The roles and responsibilities of DFAT and partners are clearly described, along with processes for their evolution and review over time.</p> <p>Accountability for outputs and outcomes, and DFAT’s roles in policy dialogue and quality assurance processes are articulated.</p>	<p>The roles and responsibilities of DFAT and partners are clearly described.</p> <p>If not defined, there are plans to negotiate and clarify accountability for outputs and outcomes, and roles in policy dialogue and quality assurance during early implementation.</p> <p>There is a credible process for, or justification for, selection of delivery partner/s.</p>	<p>Roles and responsibilities are unclear or not fully described.</p> <p>There are not clear plans to define accountability for outcomes, policy dialogue, and quality assurance.</p> <p>The process for selecting delivery partner/s is unclear or not credible.</p>	<p>Processes for selecting delivery partners and defining roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities are absent.</p> <p>Risks to implementation, related to capacity, personnel, and partnerships in the context are not explored.</p> <p>Australia’s and potential partners’ capabilities are not discussed.</p>

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>The process for, or justification for, selection of delivery partner/s that will ensure sufficient capacity, experience and expertise to implement the program.</p> <p>Accountability for implementation, quality assurance and policy influence are specifically outlined. Roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders throughout implementation are articulated.</p> <p>Australia and expected delivery partners have demonstrated capacity to deliver what is expected.</p>	<p>There is evidence that Australia and potential delivery partners will have capacity to carry out what is expected of them.</p>	<p>It is not clear whether or not Australia and potential delivery partners will be capable of carrying out what is expected of them.</p>	
<p>Analysis of alternative financing options and delivery arrangements provides a clear justification of the value for money of the selected delivery approach, including selection and relative costs of implementation partners.</p>	<p>Value for money is justified through a narrative analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed approach, based on lessons learnt and prior experience, but may not include a detailed cost-benefit or efficiency analysis.</p>	<p>Value for money is implied through reference to previous experience and external benchmarks, but not explicitly justified in the investment design.</p>	<p>Value for money is not clearly justified in the investment design.</p>
<p>A detailed input and resource schedule is provided, with internal transaction costs and inputs from DFAT, independent contractors, and implementing partners, for implementation, policy dialogue, quality assurance, risk management and M&amp;E resources.</p>	<p>An inputs and resource schedule is provided which outlines the major cost categories and funding allocations, but detailed input costing may be provided through a procurement process or later detailed planning stage requiring further scrutiny at inception.</p>	<p>A high-level inputs schedule is provided which fails to include all the inputs and costs which may be required.</p>	<p>The inputs schedule is scant or not provided.</p>

#### 4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

*Will M&E arrangements ensure that performance information is collected, and available to decision-makers throughout implementation?*

**Focus areas:**

- Measurement of results
- Use of M&E
- Independent monitoring and evaluation
- Resources for M&E

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>A detailed M&amp;E framework is linked to the program logic, and includes indicators and methods for assessing progress in key time periods against identified baseline data. A rationale and justification of selection of methods and tools for M&amp;E is provided.</p> <p>The system draws on (and where appropriate feeds into) partner country data collection and reporting systems, and supplements them where necessary. Australia's requirements are harmonised with other actors.</p> <p>All of DFAT's M&amp;E standards are met to a high standard.</p>	<p>An M&amp;E framework links expected performance (results and indicators) to the program logic.</p> <p>Sufficient information is provided to enable development of a detailed M&amp;E plan during early implementation, including collection of baseline information, review of the program logic, and development of methods and tools for data collection, analysis and reporting.</p> <p>Reporting expectations are clearly outlined with reference to DFAT's M&amp;E standards and reporting requirements (for example, monthly partner dialogues are set out within governance arrangements, and there are references to information needs for IMRs).</p> <p>Most of DFAT's M&amp;E standards are met, with any shortcomings described and justified.</p>	<p>Key elements of an M&amp;E system have been outlined, but this is not clearly linked to the program logic. OR there is an overly complex and unrealistic M&amp;E system.</p> <p>There is insufficient information provided to enable development of an M&amp;E plan during early implementation OR plans for M&amp;E are too strictly defined for the investment type and context.</p> <p>Reporting expectations are poorly defined, and it is not clear how DFAT will collect evidence to meet its internal M&amp;E standards and reporting requirements (e.g. IMRs).</p> <p>Key elements of DFAT's M&amp;E standards are not met.</p>	<p>A framework for M&amp;E with related indicators either absent or of poor quality, not linked to the program logic, and plans for developing and using the M&amp;E system to inform decision-making and policy dialogue are unclear.</p> <p>DFAT's M&amp;E standards are wholly or mostly unmet.</p>

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>Expectations for use of M&amp;E information for decision-making are clearly set out. Timing of collection of M&amp;E data synchs with decision-making. Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops are articulated.</p> <p>There is a system to ensure reporting information is available to decision-makers in 'real time' during implementation to support performance and policy conversations.</p> <p>Methods and tools for broad stakeholder reflection on progress are set out, including provision of data and reporting products for feedback and verification.</p> <p>There are plans for periodic review and re-design, and an appropriate level of flexibility to enable adaptive program management.</p>	<p>Expectations for use of M&amp;E information are outlined, including when and how partners will use data to for decision-making.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops are articulated.</p>	<p>Data collection, analysis and reporting is provided to partners routinely. Use of data for decision-making and feedback loops are not described.</p> <p>Opportunities for feedback and follow up rely on pro-active engagement from partners.</p> <p>There are no formal opportunities for broader stakeholders to be informed or influence the investment.</p>	<p>Standard reporting processes and products are outlined. Roles are responsibilities of partners and stakeholders, and use of data.</p>
<p>The design explains when and how independent expertise and technical advisory group input will be engaged.</p> <p>Terms of reference for expected evaluations/reviews are drafted.</p>	<p>DFAT's role in monitoring (e.g. site visits, reviewing data and reporting) is set out. Use of external independent monitoring and advisory bodies, such as technical advisory groups and/or consultants, are described.</p> <p>Timing and purpose of key review and evaluation points are identified.</p>	<p>Independent monitoring by DFAT officers or separately contracted consultants is implicit and not detailed in the investment design.</p> <p>Review and evaluation points are not identified.</p>	<p>No arrangements are articulated for independent monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Less than 4% of the investment budget, if any, is dedicated to M&amp;E.</p>
<p>Appropriate human and financial resource needs for M&amp;E and M&amp;E systems oversight have been identified, both within DFAT and the partner(s) (including input from qualified senior M&amp;E practitioners and independent expertise).</p> <p>4-7% of the investment budget is dedicated to M&amp;E, and this level is justified with reference to the investment type, performance information required, and context.</p>	<p>The budget has provision for human and financial resources, including those to be provided by DFAT outside the implementing partner's funding arrangements.</p> <p>4-7% of the investment budget is dedicated to M&amp;E.</p>	<p>Budget for inputs for M&amp;E is included in implementation costing but not separately identified.</p> <p>Less than 4% of the investment budget is dedicated to M&amp;E.</p>	<p>There is no discussion of budget for M&amp;E.</p>

## 5. SUSTAINABILITY

*Will the investment lead to benefits and partnerships that will last beyond the duration of the investment?*

### Focus areas:

- Lasting benefits
- Local systems
- Leveraging resources

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>The program logic includes references to the policy, institutional, behavioural, financial and/or environmental changes that are expected to last beyond the life of the investment (the end of investment outcomes and overarching development objectives).</p> <p>A definition and strategy for sustainability is clearly articulated in the design.</p>	<p>The program logic references aspects of sustainability that may be relevant to the context and nature of the investment, and a sustainability strategy is articulated to work towards enduring and lasting benefits.</p>	<p>The program logic fails to address key elements of sustainability that are critical to the context or nature of the investment, though they may be implicit or justified elsewhere in the design.</p>	<p>Consideration of key sustainability issues are not reflected in the investment design.</p>
<p>'Thinking and working politically' is integrated throughout the design, and the investment will be well placed to pursue windows of opportunity for reform.</p> <p>The investment uses local systems and institutions appropriately and adequately, with a strong focus on policy dialogue and a clear reform agenda.</p>	<p>The investment's delivery approach recognises the constraints and challenges to sustainability, and articulates an approach to policy dialogue and a reform agenda.</p> <p>There is a plan to increasingly work with local systems and with local partners and institutions.</p>	<p>An approach to policy dialogue and reform agenda are implicit or poorly articulated.</p> <p>The design mentions work with local partners but key constraints to longer term benefits and change are not adequately addressed.</p>	<p>Policy dialogue and reform are not mentioned.</p> <p>The delivery approach is entirely independent of local systems and institutions and sustainability is likely to be low.</p>

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>Requirements for DFAT staff time, effort, and capabilities for strategic and policy dialogue tasks are identified and will enable strategic dialogue within the context and sector.</p> <p>Domestic partner resources and those of other donors/sources of funding are well described and leveraged.</p>	<p>Requirements for DFAT staff time, effort, and capabilities for strategic and policy dialogue tasks are identified.</p> <p>Opportunities for leveraging domestic and external resources are identified in the design, although implementation may not be dependent or reliant on them.</p>	<p>Requirements for DFAT staff involvement in strategic and policy dialogue tasks are not clearly identified.</p> <p>The design articulates linkages and dependencies with other partners and resources, but fails to adequately align Australian assistance or explain opportunities to leverage other resources, or contribute to longer term goals.</p>	<p>Requirements for DFAT staff involvement are absent.</p> <p>The program operates as a standalone investment, without buy-in from local partners or leverage opportunities. All activities are entirely dependent on resources from Australia for implementation.</p>

## 6. GENDER EQUALITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

*Does the investment adequately address gender equality and women's empowerment?*

### Focus areas:

- Gender equality outcomes are included in the program logic
- Gender analysis mainstreamed throughout design

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>A high-quality gender analysis is included as a design annex. It highlights key enablers and barriers to women's participation, and these are addressed.</p> <p>Specific actions are planned to promote gender equality throughout implementation.</p>	<p>A gender analysis is included as a design annex. Key enablers and barriers to gender equality and women's empowerment are identified, and these are addressed.</p>	<p>There is no gender analysis annex. References to gender analysis or key enablers and barriers related to gender are few and/or cursory, and any strategies to enhance gender equality are implicit rather than clearly articulated.</p> <p>Plans for further analysis are set out, and a strategy to integrate gender equality throughout implementation is described.</p>	<p>There is no gender analysis annex. There are no references to gender in the design, or there is a poor understanding of opportunities to address gender equality and women's empowerment through this investment.</p> <p>There are no specific plans for further analysis or actions to promote gender equality and women's empowerment throughout implementation.</p>
<p>The design includes multiple gender equality outcomes (End of Program Outcome or Intermediate Outcome), which are logically integrated into the overall program logic / theory of change.</p> <p>Gender analysis and opportunities to improve women's empowerment are reflected in the program logic and throughout the design document.</p> <p>Governance and M&amp;E arrangements (including collection of sex-disaggregated data) will ensure that gender equality is addressed throughout implementation.</p>	<p>The program logic includes at least one gender equality outcome (End of Program Outcome or Intermediate Outcome).</p> <p>A strategy for enhancing women's participation in governance and management of the program over time is described.</p> <p>M&amp;E arrangements will ensure collection of sex-disaggregated data.</p>	<p>Gender equality outcomes are treated as an 'add on' and are not logically integrated into the program logic / theory of change.</p> <p>Governance, M&amp;E and implementation arrangements refer to gender or women's participation, but do not set out clear plans or strategies to improve gender equality and women's empowerment.</p> <p>M&amp;E arrangements make cursory or vague mentions of gender.</p>	<p>Gender equality outcomes are missing from the design.</p> <p>There are cursory, if any, references to gender in the investment's governance, management and M&amp;E arrangements.</p>



<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p>The program logic and implementation arrangements reflect detailed analysis of opportunities and issues related to the cross-cutting policy priorities of disability inclusive development, innovation, private sector engagement and climate change.</p> <p>Either the design document or annexes articulate problem definitions based on analysis and evidence and identify ways to address these issues throughout implementation, as appropriate for the context and nature of the investment.</p> <p>Cross cutting issues are integrated into the M&amp;E framework, and the implementation plan includes specific plans for further analysis and independent reviews of progress and opportunities.</p>	<p>Key opportunities and barriers are included in the design’s program logic and implementation arrangements.</p> <p>The investment design acknowledges the challenges of disability inclusive development, innovation, private sector engagement and climate change, as relevant to the context and nature of the investment.</p> <p>The M&amp;E framework and implementation plan include plans for further analysis of cross-cutting issues, and independent review of progress and opportunities.</p>	<p>The relevance and importance of cross-cutting issues of disability inclusive development, innovation, private sector engagement and climate change, are implicit in the design, rather than specifically addressed.</p> <p>There are few if any references to relevant cross-cutting issues in the governance, implementation, and M&amp;E arrangements of the investment.</p>	<p>Significant aspects of the context or nature of the design related to disability inclusive development, innovation, private sector engagement and climate change, are missing or ignored in the investment design.</p>

## 7. RISK MANAGEMENT AND SAFEGUARDS

*Does the design identify all relevant risks in detail, and set out plans to mitigate their effects?*

### Focus areas:

- Risk
- Safeguards

<b><i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i></b>	<b><i>Adequate (rating 4)</i></b>	<b><i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i></b>	<b><i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i></b>
<p><i>Design document</i></p> <p>The design discusses the risk context. It discusses the key risks and proposes effective mitigations.</p> <p>The design discusses governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks.</p> <p>The design presents a considered and proportionate response to managing safeguard risks relating to people and the environment through the life of the investment.</p> <p>The design includes a good environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.</p> <p>The design discusses the fraud risk context and draws on lessons learnt in developing effective controls and treatments to manage key fraud risks. Governance arrangements to oversight fraud risks are discussed.</p>	<p><i>Design document</i></p> <p>The design does not fully discuss the risk context. It discusses most of the key risks and mostly proposes effective mitigations.</p> <p>The design discusses governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks.</p> <p>The design generally presents a considered and proportionate response to managing safeguard risks relating to people and the environment.</p> <p>The design includes an adequate environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.</p> <p>The design does not fully discuss the fraud risk context. The design discusses most key fraud risks and mostly includes effective controls and treatments. Governance arrangements to oversight fraud risks are discussed.</p>	<p><i>Design document</i></p> <p>The risk context has not been considered in a substantive way. The design only discusses some key risks and/or does not propose effective mitigations.</p> <p>The design does not adequately discuss governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks.</p> <p>The design briefly refers to safeguarding but does not detail how the investment will manage safeguard risks relating to people and the environment.</p> <p>The design does not include an adequate environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.</p> <p>The fraud risk context has not been considered in a substantive way. Design discusses some key fraud risks and/or does not include effective mitigations. Governance arrangements to oversight fraud risks are not discussed sufficiently.</p>	<p><i>Design document</i></p> <p>The risk context has not been considered. The design discusses a limited number of key risks and/or does not propose effective mitigations.</p> <p>The design does not discuss governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks.</p> <p>The design does not mention safeguards risks or environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.</p> <p>The design has not considered the fraud risk context, key fraud risks, nor proposed effective mitigations. Governance arrangements to oversight fraud risks are not discussed.</p>

<b>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</b>	<b>Adequate (rating 4)</b>	<b>Less than adequate (rating 3)</b>	<b>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</b>
<p><i>Risk Register</i></p> <p>The risk register has been fully completed in accordance with DFAT’s Development Risk Management Policy and Practice Notes and takes into account as relevant:</p> <p>(a) general risks that hinder DFAT’s ability to achieve end of investment outcomes; and</p> <p>(b) five (5) specialised risk domains that have independent policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Child Protection</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Counter-Terrorism Resourcing</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">Environment and Social Safeguards</a></li> <li>4. <a href="#">Fraud Control</a></li> <li>5. <a href="#">Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH).</a></li> </ol>	<p><i>Risk Register</i></p> <p>The risk register has generally been completed in accordance with DFAT’s Development Risk Management Policy and Practice Notes and takes into account as relevant:</p> <p>(a) general risks that hinder DFAT’s ability to achieve end of investment outcomes; and</p> <p>(b) five (5) specialised risk domains that have independent policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <a href="#">Child Protection</a></li> <li>2. <a href="#">Counter-Terrorism Resourcing</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">Environment and Social Safeguards</a></li> <li>4. <a href="#">Fraud Control</a></li> <li>5. <a href="#">Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH).</a></li> </ol>	<p><i>Risk Register</i></p> <p>The risk register has not been fully completed in accordance with DFAT’s Development Risk Management Policy and Practice Notes.</p> <p>Some of the specialised risk domains have been considered, but it is evident that one, which is relevant, has not been considered.</p>	<p><i>Risk Register</i></p> <p>The risk register has not been provided or it is missing much of the information required.</p> <p>Some of the specialised risk domains have been considered, but it is evident that more than one, which is relevant, has not been considered.</p>

## ATTACHMENT B: QUALITY ASSURANCE SUMMARY FOR DESIGN APPROVAL

*This document must be attached to all design approval minutes, and uploaded into AidWorks.*

### QUALITY ASSURANCE UNDERTAKEN

*Short summary of all quality assurance undertaken. Refer to the mandatory requirements and any additional quality assurance processes. Include names of appraisers and formal peer reviewers and the dates of any relevant meetings.*

### ISSUES FOR DFAT ATTENTION DURING IMPLEMENTATION

*Set out issues requiring DFAT attention during implementation. Include resources required for investment management/oversight and policy dialogue.*

### SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AND DFAT RESPONSES

ISSUE	DFAT RESPONSE/ACTION

*(ADD ROWS FOR EACH COMMENT OR ISSUE)*

## ATTACHMENT C: SUMMARY OF INDEPENDENT APPRAISAL AND FORMAL PEER REVIEW SCORES

*(delete reference to peer review if not applicable)*

### Scores

	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Monitoring & evaluation	Sustainability	Gender & cross cutting	Innovation & private sector	Risk & safeguards
<b>Consensus Score</b>								
Independent appraiser name								
Independent appraiser name								
Formal peer reviewer name and area e.g. Investment Design Section, PRD								
Formal peer reviewer name and area								
Formal peer reviewer name and area								

## **ATTACHMENT D: SUGGESTED TEMPLATE FOR INFORMAL COMMENTS**

For use in informal quality assurance processes; not a substitute for independent appraisal or formal peer review.

<b>Source</b>	<b>Issue/section/page</b>	<b>Change required/requested</b>	<b>DFAT response</b>

# ATTACHMENT E: DRAFT FORMAL PEER REVIEW AGENDA

## Formal peer review of [investment name] [date, time, location]

- 2:00 – 2:10**     **Welcome by Chair [name, position]**
- Quick self-introduction of participants around the table
  - Purpose of formal peer review
- 2:10 – 2:20**     **Brief background to [investment] and the design process**
- Short introduction of [investment] and DFAT’s strategic intent
  - Outline of process to date
- 2:20 – 2:30**     **Summary of key issues raised in appraisals/written comments from formal peer reviewers and planned responses**
- 2:30 – 3:40**     **Discussion of appraiser and formal peer reviewer scores and comments for each quality criterion as it relates to [investment], and their implications for implementation. Consensus on a single score reflecting the peer review’s collective opinion for each criterion:**
- Relevance
  - Effectiveness
  - Efficiency
  - Monitoring and Evaluation
  - Sustainability
  - Gender Equality and Cross-Cutting Issues
  - Risk Management and Safeguards
  - Innovation and private sector
- 3:45 – 4:00**     **Chair summary on agreed outcomes:**
- Is [investment] fit for purpose and suitable to fund?;
  - Consensus scores;
  - Further treatment of risks and management strategies;
  - Summary of any further improvements; and
  - If investment is recommended, summary of specific areas of management focus for DFAT during implementation, including DFAT resourcing for managing the program and policy dialogue with partners.
  - Provide approximate timeframe for circulating the Quality Assurance Summary (and if required, timeframe for recirculating the amended document)

## ATTACHMENT F: SAMPLE DESIGN QUALITY ASSURANCE TIMELINE

The below timeline is for a high value/high risk investment, where the concept was previously considered by AGB who requested it come back at design stage.

Goal	Date
Design document/summary provided to independent appraisers and formal peer reviewers	19 February
Appraisal reports and scores received from appraiser and provided to peer reviewers	26 February
Peer review meeting	6 March
Revised design and Quality Assurance Summary circulated to reviewers for review	12 March
Design and Quality Assurance Summary provided to AGB Secretariat	16 March
AGB meeting—design endorsed with no minimal changes	16 April
Revised final design presented to delegate for approval	20 April