

Investment Design Quality Assessment Tool and Scoring Matrix

Last revised: August 2025

This tool is used to assess and provide comments on the quality of the design document, drawing on the Scoring Matrix (see below).

This document should be read in conjunction with the [Investment Design Quality Assurance Guidance](#) (internal DFAT document). Please refer to the guidance for further details on the quality assurance process.

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

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
1. Relevance	
2. Effectiveness	
3. Efficiency	
4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)	
5. Sustainability and locally led development	
6. Gender equality	
7. Disability equity	
8. Climate change	
9. 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 actions 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-investment 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, Evaluation and Learning (MEL):** Are MEL arrangements appropriate for measuring progress towards expected outcomes?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
5. **Sustainability and locally led development:** Will expected benefits be long-lasting, and institutionalised through local partners and systems?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
6. **Gender equality:** How well does the design address gender equality?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
7. **Disability equity:** How well does the design address disability equity?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
8. **Climate change:** How well does the design address climate change?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:
9. **Risk management and safeguards:** Does the design address what could go wrong, and explain appropriate responses?
Score:
Comments:
Actions:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

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.

It builds on the [DFAT Design and Monitoring & Evaluation and Learning Standards](#) (Standard 4: Investment Design).

Investment design quality is scored on six-point scale (below). Each design quality criterion must be scored by each appraiser. When determining a score, reviewers should consider the available evidence on the design, normally restricted to the publicly available investment design document, regional or country development plans and policy statements or sectoral guidance 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; does not require amendment

5 – Good: satisfies criteria in almost all areas; may need minor work to improve in some areas

4 – Adequate: on balance satisfies criteria; does not fail in any major area, needs some work to improve

Unsatisfactory rating

3 – Less than adequate: on balance does not satisfy criteria and/or fails in at least one major area; needs work to be improved in core areas

2 – Poor: does not satisfy criteria in several major area; needs major work to improve

1 – Very poor: does not satisfy criteria in any major area; needs major overhaul

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 highly flexible, adaptive investments, design-implement arrangements, and those proposing innovative procurement approaches) may defer development of some elements of the design (such as a detailed program logic) to the early implementation stage. In these cases, this must be explained clearly in the design document, and responsibilities for preparation, quality assurance, and approval of these elements of the design must be identified. Please contact 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 intent and policy alignment
- Analysis and lessons
- Delivery model selection

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
DFAT's strategic intent for the investment is explicitly set out and reflects the priorities and objectives in the relevant development partnership plan (and sector strategies, where relevant). It is clear how the investment aligns with Australia's and the partner country's formal policy commitments. The investment's intersection with a broader range of Australian and partner country interests are described and analysed. Australia's comparative advantage and influence is leveraged.	There is reference to DFAT's strategic intent for the investment and it reflects the priorities and objectives in the relevant development partnership plan (and sector strategies, where relevant). Australia's and the partner country's formal policy commitments are set out, and alignment and linkages between them and the investment are demonstrated. Australia's comparative advantage and influence is considered.	DFAT's strategic intent is not identified and links to the relevant development partnership plan (and sector strategies, where relevant) are weak. 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.	There are cursory references to DFAT's formal and publicly stated policy commitments. There are cursory references to partners' plans and strategies.
Relevant analyses, including political economy or climate impact analysis and commissioned research are provided, along with details of consultation and feedback from local stakeholders, including from government, civil society, and the private sector. Lessons and recommendations from reviews and evaluations are explicitly addressed including how the findings and management responses have been integrated into the design.	Analyses from secondary sources are used to explain the rationale for the investment. There is evidence of consultation with and incorporation of feedback from key stakeholders (including local stakeholders). Lessons and recommendations from reviews and evaluations are considered. Plans for conducting further analysis and using the evidence collected are stated clearly.	Assertions about the design's relevance are based on limited analytical sources, with little reference to past lessons relevant to the investment. There is limited evidence of consultation with, or efforts to incorporate feedback from, key stakeholders. Plans for future analysis are not specific nor focused on use of evidence collected.	The rationale for Australia's investment is poorly explained, and the evidence is weak and based on earlier phases or similar interventions. There is no evidence of engagement with key stakeholders. There are no plans for future analysis.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
A range of delivery models to address the identified development challenges have been explored. The choice of delivery model(s) is informed by high quality analysis (for example, political economy analysis) and lessons from past practice. There is considered assessment of alternative delivery models (refer DFAT's International Development Programming Guide Chapter 4 for more detail on delivery models).	There is some discussion of alternative delivery models for addressing identified development challenges. There is a credible evidence-based explanation for why the chosen delivery model(s) is (are) appropriate for the context.	Alternative delivery models are not outlined. There is little explanation for the chosen delivery model.	Alternative delivery models are not outlined and there is no explanation for the chosen delivery model(s).

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 program logic
- Delivery model(s)
- Policy dialogue

Good, very good (rating 5-6)	Adequate (rating 4)	Less than adequate (rating 3)	Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)
Both end-of-investment and intermediate outcomes fulfil the requirements in the 'Adequate (rating 4)' column at right. There is evidence to support DFAT's assertions that these outcomes are achievable, and that available resources, context, including climate context, and relationships have been analysed to confirm this. There is evidence that outcomes have been developed in consultation with stakeholders (particularly the partner government if relevant). End-of-investment and/or intermediate outcomes integrate gender equality, climate change, and localisation intent.	Outcome statements identify changes that can reasonably be expected to occur as a result of the investment, and define: • An 'end state' when the outcome has been achieved • Who or what is expected to change • The type of change expected: knowledge (awareness of new ideas, techniques or strategies); action (behaviour change based upon new information/ideas); or condition (organisational or societal changes due to stakeholder actions) • When the changes are expected to be seen. DFAT's level of ambition for the investment is realistic, taking into account the human and financial resources available, development context, including climate context, and the nature Australia's bilateral/regional relationships. Outcomes are demonstrably acceptable to identified key stakeholders. End-of-investment outcomes and/or intermediate outcomes consider gender equality, climate change, and localisation intent.	It is not clear who or what will change as a result of the investment, in what way, and/or by when. Outcomes are overly or insufficiently ambitious, taking into account the human and financial resources, development context, and relationships. Stakeholder perspectives on outcomes are poorly explained. End-of-investment outcomes and/or intermediate outcomes fail to integrate or consider gender equality, climate change, and localisation intent.	Outcomes are set out as general statements of intent, or strategic goals, and fail to address gender equality, climate change, or localisation intent. Stakeholder perspectives are not defined.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
The 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-investment outcomes are expected to contribute to the investment's broader goals. It should also identify key assumptions and risks, such as climate- or disaster-related risks, of relevance to the program logic. The program logic is articulated in a graphic format and in plain English, with clear and specific language, and was developed through extensive consultation and stakeholder involvement. The program logic is supported by strong evidence and lessons from past practice and demonstrates analysis and testing of the program logic in the specific context, including explanations of assumptions and risks.	The program logic explains credible causal links between activities, outputs, and outcomes. The program logic also articulates some assumptions and risks. The program logic is expressed in a graphic format and in plain English, using language that can be understood by stakeholders. There may be little evidence or lessons from past practice, but there is an explanation of how the program logic will be tested and reviewed throughout implementation.	Links between activities, outputs and outcomes are tenuous, poorly defined, and/or depend on significant assumptions that pose high-level risks to the investment. The graphic or narrative explanation of the program logic is absent or unclear. Evidence to support the program logic is absent, with little to no reference to ongoing testing and review.	There is little evidence, or outline of causal linkages, to suggest that the investment will achieve the intended outcomes.
The delivery model(s) is clearly articulated and there is evidence it will be able to achieve the intended outcomes. Key stakeholders have been closely involved in developing the delivery model(s). The delivery model(s) provide(s) strong flexibility which allows for continued adaptation to context.	The delivery model(s) is clearly articulated and there is evidence that it is appropriate to the context and may be able to achieve the intended outcomes. Key stakeholders (such as the partner government) have agreed to the delivery model(s). The delivery model(s) provides some flexibility to adapt to context.	The delivery model(s) is not clearly explained and there is limited evidence it will achieve the intended outcomes. Key stakeholders have not been consulted on the delivery model(s). There is very limited ability to adapt the delivery model(s) to context once implementation begins.	The delivery model(s) is inappropriate, and/or there is no explanation. No flexibility is evident.

<i>Good/very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor/very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
Australia's expectations for leveraging the investment to strengthen policy dialogue are set out. Contributions to Australia's broader foreign policy objectives are clearly articulated. Roles, responsibilities, and opportunities for policy dialogue are outlined, with reference to DFAT, partner country and delivery partner (including Whole-of-Government) representatives at various levels. A policy dialogue matrix is included and comprehensive, including roles, responsibilities, and broader policy reform opportunities, and is coordinated across Australia's country/regional engagement (beyond a single investment).	Opportunities for policy dialogue are outlined. Roles and responsibilities are described for DFAT, partner country and delivery partners (including Whole-of-Government partners). A policy dialogue matrix is included, including roles, responsibilities, and possible reform opportunities. The matrix signals ambition for policy dialogue to be coordinated with other Australian country/regional engagement. There are clear plans to develop the matrix further during implementation.	Opportunities for policy dialogue are implicit or broadly stated. Roles and responsibilities are unclear or not described in detail. A policy dialogue matrix is included but is limited in detail/not completed.	References to potential for policy dialogue are absent or cursory. No policy dialogue matrix.

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 arrangements
- Management arrangements and capabilities
- Value for money
- Inputs and resources

Good, very good (rating 5-6)	Adequate (rating 4)	Less than adequate (rating 3)	Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)
Tailored governance arrangements will enable a wide range of representatives and stakeholders, including the partner government, to participate in decision-making. Gender equality and inclusive participation will be pursued explicitly. Governance and MEL arrangements are fully integrated.	Specific and workable governance arrangements for the investment are set out, reflecting formal agreements between Australia and key partners. Strategies to broaden participation and stakeholder engagement in decision-making are outlined. Links between governance and MEL arrangements are identified.	Standard governance arrangements between the key partners are outlined, with no or little adaptation for this investment. There are no, or few, opportunities for partner government, vulnerable groups, civil society, private sector, or other stakeholders to influence decision-making. Links between decision-making and performance data are not clearly set out.	Governance arrangements are poorly defined, and/or unlikely to achieve inclusive participation or support from key stakeholders. There are no, or cursory, references to the use of performance information for decision-making.
The management roles and responsibilities of DFAT, partner country and delivery partner representatives are clearly described, along with processes for their evolution and review over time. Accountability for delivery of outputs and outcomes is articulated. Australia, partner country and proposed delivery partners have the capabilities to deliver what is expected. DFAT's management role and human resources (FTE) are clearly outlined. For multi-country or regional investments, processes for engaging with relevant geographic teams (in Canberra and at posts) are clear in planning, ongoing communication, and reporting, including through country-level work plans.	The management roles and responsibilities of DFAT, partner country and delivery partner representatives are clearly described. If not defined, there are plans to negotiate and clarify accountability for the delivery of outputs and outcomes. There is evidence that Australia, partner country actors and proposed delivery partners will have the capability to deliver what is expected. DFAT's management role and human resources are outlined. For multi-country or regional programs there is consideration of engagement processes with relevant geographic teams (in Canberra and at posts).	Management roles and responsibilities are unclear or not fully described. There are no clear plans to define accountability for the delivery of outputs and outcomes. It is not clear whether Australia, partner country and/or proposed delivery partners will be capable of delivering what is expected.	Processes for defining management roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities are absent. Risks to implementation, related to capacity, personnel, and partnerships in the context are not explored. Australian, country partner and proposed delivery partners capabilities are not discussed. DFAT's management role and human resources are not discussed.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
Analysis of alternative delivery models provides a clear justification of the value for money of the selected delivery model(s), including selection and relative costs of proposed delivery partners. The justification for, or process for selection of, delivery partners will ensure sufficient they have sufficient capabilities and experience to deliver outputs and outcomes.	Value for money is justified through analysis of benefits and costs of the proposed delivery model, based on lessons learnt and prior experience, but may not include a detailed cost-benefit or efficiency analysis. There is a credible justification for, or process for selection of, delivery partners.	Value for money is implied through reference to previous experience and external benchmarks, but not explicitly justified in the investment design. The justification for, or process for selection of, delivery partner(s) is unclear or not credible.	Value for money is not clearly justified in the investment design. Proposed delivery partners and/or processes for selecting delivery partners are absent.
A detailed inputs and resource schedule is provided for major cost categories and funding allocations for DFAT, managing contractor, and other delivery partners, including implementation, policy dialogue, quality assurance, risk management and MEL. Note: The schedule may include indicative budget allocations only and/or provide a clear framework to allow ongoing flexibility and may be for internal DFAT use only.	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. Note: This schedule may include indicative budget allocations only and/or provide a clear framework to allow some flexibility and may be for internal DFAT use only.	A high-level inputs and resource schedule is provided which fails to include all the major cost categories and/or funding allocations which may be required.	The inputs and resource schedule is scant or not provided.

4. Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL)

Will MEL arrangements ensure that performance information is collected, and available to decision-makers throughout implementation?

Focus areas:

- MEL framework and standards
- Use of partner MEL systems
- Use of MEL information to inform decision-making
- Resources for MEL
- DFAT oversight of MEL and access to independent advice

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
All of DFAT's Design and MEL Standards (under MEL Standard 3 - Program Logic and MEL Standard 4 - Investment Design) are met. End-of-investment (EOIO) and intermediate outcomes (IO) are expressed using key performance indicators pitched at the right level for the scale and scope of the design. DFAT's Performance and Delivery Framework Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators are appropriately embedded in the MEL framework and reporting milestones. Cross-cutting priorities of gender equality, disability equity, climate change and locally led development are clearly considered. The MEL framework is attached as an annex and: - is linked to the program logic, - includes indicative indicators as appropriate for the design at EOIO, IO and output level, - includes key evaluation questions for EOIO, IO and output level. Note: consider whether an impact or real-time evaluation could be appropriate for this design.	Most of DFAT's Design and MEL Standards are met. Any shortcomings are described and justified. EOIOs and IOs are expressed using key performance indicators pitched at the right level. Reporting on Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators has been appropriately considered. If reporting against these indicators is not proposed, this is justified. Cross-cutting priorities of gender equality, disability equity, climate change and locally led development are briefly considered. The MEL framework is attached as an annex and: - is linked to the program logic, - includes indicative indicators as appropriate for the design, - includes key evaluation questions. Note: consider whether an impact or real-time evaluation could be appropriate for this design.	Key elements of DFAT's Design and MEL Standards are not met. EOIOs and IOs are not expressed using key performance indicators, or proposed key performance indicators are not pitched at a level commensurate with the scale and scope of the design. Tier 2 or Tier 3 indicators mentioned but not identified. Cross-cutting priorities of gender equality, disability equity, climate change and locally led development are not adequately considered in the MEL system. The MEL framework is attached as an annex and: - is not linked to the program logic, - included indicative indicators not realistic for the design, - has not included key evaluation questions.	DFAT's Design and MEL Standards have not been applied. EOIOs and IOs are not clear. Or appropriate level for the resources and time available. Reporting on Tier 2 and Tier 3 indicators not mentioned. Cross cutting priorities are not addressed. No MEL framework is attached as annex or not filled out.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
The design has considered use of partner systems for (and where appropriate feeds into) data collection and reporting, and supplements them where necessary. Australia's requirements are harmonised with other development partners. If partner systems are not available, the design explains how data will be collected and how partner systems will be strengthened over time (with Australian or other development partner support). If data system strengthening is proposed, it is appropriately resourced and included in the MEL framework.	The design has considered use of partner systems for (and where appropriate feeds into) data collection and reporting to some extent, including supplementing them where necessary. Australia's requirements are harmonised with other development partners. If partner systems are not available, the design explains how data will be collected.	The design has not considered, or has insufficiently addressed, the use of partner systems for data collection.	The MEL system will operate in parallel to partner systems without explanation or justification.
Expectations for use of MEL information, including for decision-making, are clearly set out. Timing of reporting of analysed data is aligned with key decision-making processes. Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops are articulated. It is clear which stakeholders will be involved in decision-making processes and when.	Expectations for use of MEL information are outlined, including when and how partners will use data for decision-making. Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops are articulated. It is clear who will be involved in decision-making processes and when.	Expectations for use of MEL information is unclear, including when and how partners will use data for decision-making. Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops are not clearly articulated. It has not been articulated who will be involved in decision-making.	Use of MEL information is not articulated. Roles and responsibilities in reporting and feedback loops have not been outlined. It is not clear how decisions will be made and by whom.
DFAT has a strong role in monitoring (site visits, reviewing data and reporting), which is clearly set out with appropriate resourcing. The design explains when and how independent expertise (such as through a technical advisory group) will be engaged, including timing and purpose of independent reviews/evaluations.	DFAT's role in monitoring (site visits, reviewing data and reporting) is set out but resourcing is unclear. The design explains when and how independent expertise (such as through a technical advisory group) will be engaged, including timing of independent reviews/ evaluations.	DFAT's role in monitoring (site visits, reviewing data and reporting) is mentioned but lacks sufficient detail. The design does not explain when and how independent expertise (such as through a technical advisory group) will be engaged. The design mentions independent reviews/ evaluations, but no timing is articulated.	DFAT's role in monitoring is not mentioned. No mention is made of either independent expertise nor independent reviews/ evaluations.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
Appropriate human and financial resources are identified for preparing and implementing the MEL system. Budget is defined and detailed (DFAT's MEL Standard suggests 4-7% of the investment budget). If strengthening of partner MEL systems is part of the design, this is allocation appropriate resources (either as part of and/or separately from the MEL budget). The MEL Plan and baseline are built into the Statement of Requirements or grant arrangement (as appropriate), with milestones at 6 and 12 months respectively.	Appropriate human and financial resources are identified for preparing and implementing the MEL system. 4-7% of the investment budget is dedicated to MEL resources. Strengthening of partner MEL systems is identified as part of the design, but no budget has been allocated. The MEL Plan and baseline are built into the Statement of Requirements or grant arrangement (as appropriate), with appropriate milestones.	Human and financial resources for the MEL system are included in implementation costing but not separately identified. Less than 4% of the investment budget is dedicated to MEL without clear justification. Need for strengthening partners' MEL systems is referred to but not addressed in the design. The MEL Plan and baseline are mentioned in the Statement of Requirements or grant arrangement (as appropriate), but milestones are not articulated.	There is neither allocated budget nor identified expertise for implementing the MEL system. There is no mention of partner MEL systems. There is no mention of the MEL Plan and baseline being due in early implementation.

5. Sustainability and Locally Led Development

Will the investment support local capabilities and reform efforts, leading to lasting change?

Focus areas:

- Supporting lasting change
- Localisation
- Leveraging resources

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
A definition and strategy for sustainability is clearly articulated in the design and 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 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 lasting change.	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.	Consideration of key sustainability issues is not reflected in the investment design.
Localisation is explicitly considered in the design, embedded in the program logic and outcomes, and an initial localisation strategy or plan is included (either as part of, or complementing, the sustainability strategy). Politically-economy analysis informs proposed approaches to supporting locally led development, including consideration of a diverse range of local actors across government, civil society and the private sector, and options for supporting local supply chains and capabilities. Refer DFAT Guidance Note: Locally Led Development for further information.	Localisation is considered in the design and a strategy or plan (either as part of, or complementing, the sustainability strategy) is expected to be delivered during early implementation. Politically-economy analysis informs proposed approaches to supporting locally led development, including consideration of a range of local actors.	Localisation is referenced in the design but there is no mention of specific strategies or plans. The design mentions working with local partners but there is limited consideration of politically informed approaches to supporting locally led development beyond that.	Localisation and approaches to supporting locally led development are not considered.
The design comprehensively describes resources available to support local capabilities and reform efforts beyond Australia's contribution, including from partner government, private sector and other development partner sources, and how these will be leveraged.	The design describes resources available to support local capabilities and reform efforts (beyond Australia's contribution), with some consideration of how these might be leveraged.	The design outlines available resources to support local capabilities and reform efforts (beyond Australia's contribution), but fails to adequately explain opportunities to leverage these resources.	The design fails to identify available resources to support local capabilities and reform efforts beyond Australia's contribution. All activities are entirely dependent on resources from Australia.

6. Gender Equality

Does the investment adequately address gender equality (including intersectionality)?

Focus areas:

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

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
A high-quality, intersectional gender analysis is included as a design annex. It highlights key enablers and barriers to women's participation, and these are addressed. The gender analysis has been used to inform the design and is reflected within the design narrative. It has informed specific actions which are planned to promote gender equality throughout implementation.	A gender analysis is included as a design annex.* Key enablers and barriers to gender equality and women's participation are identified, and these are addressed in the design narrative. The gender analysis has been used to inform the design including actions or further analysis throughout implementation. *Note a gender analysis and gender outcome are mandatory requirements. Overall score for Gender Equality must be a 3 if either is absent (unless the investment is exempt).	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. Plans for further analysis are set out, and a strategy to integrate gender equality throughout implementation is described.	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. There are no specific plans for further analysis or actions to promote gender equality throughout implementation.
The design includes one or more gender equality outcomes (end-of-investment outcome or intermediate outcome), which are logically integrated into the overall program logic / theory of change. These outcomes describe an intent to achieve gender transformative change. Governance and MEL arrangements (including collection of sex-disaggregated data) will ensure that gender equality is addressed throughout implementation.	The program logic includes at least one gender equality outcome (end-of-investment outcome or intermediate outcome).* The outcome describes an intent to proactively address power imbalances and/or harmful social norms to advance gender equality. A strategy for enhancing women's participation in governance and management of the program over time is described. MEL arrangements will ensure collection of sex-disaggregated data. *Note a gender analysis and gender outcome are mandatory requirements. Overall score for Gender Equality must be a 3 if either is absent (unless the investment is exempt).	Gender equality outcomes are treated as an 'add-on' and are not logically integrated into the program logic / theory of change. The program logic includes outcomes that employ gender-related terminology but doesn't describe an intent to proactively address power imbalances and/or harmful social norms to advance gender equality. Governance, MEL 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. MEL arrangements make cursory or vague mentions of gender.	Gender equality outcomes are missing from the design. There are cursory, if any, references to gender in the investment's governance, management, and MEL arrangements. There is no mention of sex-disaggregated data.

7. Disability Equity

Does the investment adequately address disability equity?

Focus areas:

- Were people with disability and/or organisations of people with disability (OPDs) consulted in the design process and benefit from the investment on an equal basis with others?

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
A high-quality, disability analysis (which may be part of GEDSI analysis) is included. It is informed by the experiences of diverse people with disability, highlights key barriers and opportunities for disability equity relevant to the investment, and ensures these are addressed in the design. The program logic and implementation arrangements reflect detailed analysis of opportunities and issues related to the disability equity policy priorities. For disability equity, this includes reference in a program outcome (which may be part of a GEDSI outcome), and commitment to developing a disability equity strategy or action plan (which may be part of a GEDSI strategy/action plan). Disability issues are integrated into MEL, including disability-disaggregated data and disability-related indicators and evaluative questions and the implementation plan includes specific plans for further analysis and independent reviews of progress and opportunities. The design integrates meaningful engagement of diverse people with disability and OPDs into the program logic, MEL, and governance structures. There is dedicated resourcing for progressing disability equity (which includes reasonable accommodation, accessibility measures and technical advice, and engagement with people with disability or OPDs).	Analysis of barriers and opportunities for people with disability relevant to the context and nature of the investment is included and informs the design. Key opportunities and barriers are included in the design's program logic and implementation arrangements. For disability equity, this could include reference in a program outcome (which may be part of a GEDSI outcome), and/or commitment to developing a disability equity strategy or action plan (which may be part of a GEDSI strategy/action plan). The MEL and implementation plans include plans for further analysis of disability issues (including relevant disability-related indicators and disability-disaggregated data), and independent review of progress and opportunities. The design integrates meaningful engagement of people with disability and/or OPDs into the program logic, MEL, and/or governance structures. There is dedicated resourcing for reasonable accommodation, accessibility measures, and technical advice on disability equity. *Note a disability analysis is mandatory. Overall score for Disability Equity must be a 3 if it is absent (unless the investment is exempt).	There is little analysis of barriers and opportunities for people with disability relevant to the context and nature of the investment. The relevance and importance of disability equity are implicit in the design, rather than specifically addressed. There are few if any references to relevant disability issues in the governance, implementation, and MEL arrangements of the investment. There is reference to engagement of people with disability and/or OPDs however no clear plans or strategies to facilitate their meaningful engagement in governance, program delivery, and MEL arrangements of the investment. MEL arrangements make cursory or vague mentions of disability equity. GEDSI resources are proposed, but no mention of dedicated resourcing for reasonable accommodation, accessibility measures and technical advice on disability equity.	Significant aspects of the context or nature of the design related to disability equity are missing or ignored in the investment design. There is no reference to disability equity in the analysis, or poor understanding of barriers and opportunities for people with disability relevant to the investment. Disability equity and meaningful engagement of people with disability and/or OPDs is not addressed in the program logic, governance, or MEL arrangements. There is no dedicated resourcing for reasonable accommodation, accessibility measures, and technical advice on disability equity.

8. Climate Change

Does the investment adequately address climate change?

Focus areas:

- Analysis of climate change risks and opportunities informs the investment
- Climate outcomes are included in the MEL framework and program logic
- Climate activities are adequately resourced and reflected in the investment's budget and resourcing

NOTE: for definitions of investments which have a primary or secondary climate change objective or are climate mainstreamed, see note at the end of this matrix; references to 'climate resilience' and 'resilience' broadly refer to '*inclusive climate and disaster resilience*'.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
Analysis of climate risks, impacts and opportunities is current and highly relevant (supported by strong evidence) to the country and investment context (including GEDSI-climate nexus), with a detailed annex (where appropriate). The analysis informs the narrative – and specific activities to enhance resilience and/or to mitigate climate change – throughout the design and in implementation. More in-depth analysis and resourcing of climate is proposed during early stages of implementation. Bilateral designs show strong and consistent alignment with partners' Nationally Determined Contributions and National Adaptation Plans.¹ The program logic/theory of change and MEL framework include relevant climate-related indicators and articulate the intent to collect and use climate-related data over the investment's lifetime².	Analysis of climate risks, impacts and opportunities is current and relevant to the country and investment context with a detailed annex (where appropriate). To varying degrees, the analysis informs the narrative – and specific activities to enhance resilience and/or to mitigate climate change – throughout the design. More in-depth analysis is proposed during early stages of implementation. Bilateral designs align with partners' Nationally Determined Contributions and National Adaptation Plans.¹	Weak evidence to support analysis of climate risks, impacts and opportunities and references to climate change in the narrative are cursory and/or vague. A more thorough analysis during implementation may or may not be proposed. Strategies/activities to enhance climate resilience and/or mitigate climate change are implied, not specific. For bilateral programs, there is no clear alignment with partners' Nationally Determined Contributions and National Adaptation Plans.¹	The design does not consider climate risks and opportunities nor propose an analysis of risks and opportunities during implementation. There is no evidence of specific plans to enhance climate resilience and/or to mitigate climate change. The bilateral design does not mention alignment with partners' Nationally Determined Contributions and National Adaptation Plans.¹ Climate change is absent from the program logic/theory of change and MEL framework². There is no consideration of climate change (including risks, opportunities, activities and technical assistance requirements) reflected in resourcing (including budget).

¹ In line with the *International Development Policy* commitment, bilateral investments must align with partners' Nationally Determined Contributions and National Adaptation Plans. Bilateral investments cannot score higher than 3 for climate change if this requirement is not met.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
Ongoing and systemic consideration of climate change (including risks, opportunities, activities and technical assistance requirements) is evident in resourcing (including budget). A clear commitment (including via a budget line, where there is a budget) to developing a climate change strategy in the early stages of implementation is evident. For climate change as a primary objective*: Well-articulated and highly relevant climate change end-of-investment outcome(s) (or equivalent in limited circumstances²) and corresponding intermediate outcome(s) logically integrated into the program logic/theory of change and MEL framework. For climate change as a secondary objective^: at least one well-articulated and highly relevant climate change end-of-investment outcome and/or intermediate outcome (or equivalent in limited circumstances²), logically integrated into the program logic/theory of change and MEL framework. At least one corresponding end-of-investment outcome is encouraged³.	The program logic/theory of change and/or MEL framework may include climate-related indicators or the intent for these to be further developed during early implementation². Consideration of climate change (including risks, opportunities, activities and technical assistance requirements) is reflected in resourcing plans (including budget), but with significant room for improvement. For climate change as a primary objective*: at least one clear and relevant climate change end-of-investment outcome (or equivalent in limited circumstances²) and one intermediate outcome is logically integrated into the program logic/theory of change and MEL framework. A clear commitment (including via a budget line, where there is a budget) to developing a climate change strategy in the early stages of implementation is evident. For climate change as a secondary objective^: at least one clear and relevant climate change intermediate outcome or equivalent³, logically integrated into the program logic/theory of change and MEL framework³.	The MEL framework does not include climate-related indicators or the intention for these to be developed during early implementation. Any references to climate change in the MEL framework are vague or treated as an 'add-on².' There is little to no consideration of climate change (including risks, opportunities, activities and technical assistance requirements) reflected in resourcing (including budget). For climate change as a primary objective*: no climate change end-of-investment outcome or corresponding intermediate outcome³. For climate change as a secondary objective^: no climate change intermediate outcome³. For climate mainstreaming#: There is little to no evidence of climate change informing the investment.	For climate change as a primary objective*: no climate change end-of-investment outcome(s) or corresponding intermediate outcome³. For climate change as a secondary objective^: no climate change intermediate outcome³. For climate change mainstreaming#: There is no evidence of climate change analysis.

² In limited circumstances, climate change may be the primary or secondary objective of an investment, but a climate change end-of-investment or intermediate outcome may not be possible, due to the unique nature of the investment. Contact climate.integration@dfat.gov.au if this applies to your investment.

³ A climate outcome (either end-of-investment or intermediate) is strongly encouraged to support the Government's commitment to increase its climate investments. Investments that do not have a climate change outcome should provide an explanation.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
For climate change mainstreaming: the design meets standards set out under the good/very good rating but does not meet the standards for having a primary or secondary climate change objective (i.e. having at least one end-of-investment or intermediate outcome respectively).	For climate change mainstreaming[#]: the design meets standards set out under the 'Adequate' rating but does not meet the standards for having a primary or secondary climate change objective (i.e. having at least one end-of-investment outcome or intermediate outcome respectively).		
NOTE: * Climate change as a primary objective: Where climate change is the primary objective of an investment, investment documentation must explicitly identify that addressing climate change (adaptation or mitigation) is the main objective of the investment and fundamental to its design (i.e. the investment would not have been funded but for that objective). Where climate change is the primary objective, it should have at least one end-of-investment dedicated to contributing to climate change outcomes. ^ Climate change as a secondary objective: Where action on climate change is not the main driver of the investment but is explicitly identified as one of its objectives, with some activities designed to address climate change adaptation or mitigation, then the investment will be assessed as having climate change as a secondary objective. The investment should have at least one intermediate outcome which contributes to climate change outcomes. Elements of the end-of-investment outcome(s) may also include climate change, although this will not be the main focus of the outcome(s). # Climate change mainstreaming: Mainstreaming climate change through our development program is the process of actively assessing and responding to climate change risks and opportunities throughout the investment lifecycle. To mainstream climate, an analysis or assessment of climate risks and opportunities should <i>inform</i> the investment. Investment documentation should outline <i>how</i> the investment has been, or will be, formulated or adjusted to address identified climate risks and opportunities. For more information see the Good Practice Note on Integrating Climate into Development Assistance			

9 Risk Management and Safeguards

Does the design identify all relevant risks (including safeguards risks) in detail, and set out plans to mitigate their effects?

Focus areas:

- Risk and safeguards analysis and governance arrangements
- Risk register

Good, very good (rating 5-6)	Adequate (rating 4)	Less than adequate (rating 3)	Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)
<i>Design document</i> The design discusses the risk context, including climate risk. It discusses the key risks and proposes effective mitigations. Risks linked to a range of key assumptions from the program logic are outlined with risk treatments and DFAT risk owners. 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. The design presents a considered and proportionate response to managing safeguard risks relating to people and the environment through the life of the investment. The design includes a good environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required. Due diligence of lead partners and subcontracted partners is considered, and assessment findings built into the design. 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.	<i>Design document</i> The design does not fully discuss the risk context. It discusses most of the key risks, including climate risks, identifies key assumptions and a range of fiduciary and safeguard risks, and mostly proposes effective mitigations. The design discusses governance arrangements, including internal DFAT risk oversight responsibilities, DFAT risk owners, and how delivery partners and stakeholders will be involved in the ongoing management of risks. The design generally presents a considered and proportionate response to managing safeguard risks relating to people and the environment. The design includes an adequate environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required. 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. Due diligence is considered, and assessment findings built into the design.	<i>Design document</i> 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. The design does not consider climate risk. 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. The design briefly refers to safeguarding but does not detail how the investment will manage safeguard risks relating to people and the environment. The design does not include an adequate environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required.	<i>Design document</i> The risk context has not been considered. The design discusses a limited number of key risks and/or does not propose effective mitigations. The design does not consider climate risk. 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. The design does not mention safeguards risks or environment and social impact assessment, management plan and/or framework, as required. The design has not considered the fraud risk context, key fraud risks, nor proposed effective mitigations. Governance arrangements to oversee fraud risks are not discussed.

<i>Good, very good (rating 5-6)</i>	<i>Adequate (rating 4)</i>	<i>Less than adequate (rating 3)</i>	<i>Poor, very poor (rating 1-2)</i>
		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 oversee fraud risks are not discussed sufficiently.	
<i>Risk Register</i> 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: (a) general risks that hinder DFAT's ability to achieve end of investment outcomes; and (b) five (5) specialised risk domains that have independent policies: 1. Child Protection 2. Counter-Terrorism Resourcing 3. Environment and Social Safeguards 4. Fraud Control 5. Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH).	<i>Risk Register</i> 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: (a) general risks that hinder DFAT's ability to achieve end of investment outcomes; and (b) five (5) specialised risk domains that have independent policies: 1. Child Protection 2. Counter-Terrorism Resourcing 3. Environment and Social Safeguards 4. Fraud Control 5. Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH).	<i>Risk Register</i> The risk register has not been fully completed in accordance with DFAT's Development Risk Management Policy and Practice Notes. Some of the specialised risk domains have been considered, but it is evident that one, which is relevant, has not been considered.	<i>Risk Register</i> The risk register has not been provided or it is missing much of the information required. Some of the specialised risk domains have been considered, but it is evident that more than one relevant risk domain has not been considered.