

***(Insert NGO Name)* - ADPlan April Performance Report 2007-08**

Australian NGO Contact Details Contact Officer Title Telephone Number Fax Number Email Address	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Project Summary Table:

Country	Project Name	Rating	Brief Justification
<i>Afghanistan</i>	<i>Mothers Health Project</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>Performance targets not being achieved, monitoring visit brought forward to establish reason for delays and find solutions.</i>
<i>Afghanistan</i>	<i>Water and Sanitation</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Majority of project activities progressing on schedule however planned IEC materials were not well received and will need to be redeveloped.</i>
<i>Fiji</i>	<i>Environment 2010</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>Existing government structures utilised successfully with full achievement of all targets.</i>

DECLARATION

The following declaration must be made by an appropriately Authorised Officer of the Non Government Organisation.

I declare:

- this report is as complete and accurate as possible given the information available at the time of writing;
- a detailed record of income and expenditure at an individual item level will be available with the ADPlan Report; and
- the funds allocated to Projects were used in accordance with Agreement #, Exchange of Letters #, and the ADPlan proposal, including any variations to the proposal approved by AusAID in writing.

Full Name: _____ Signature: _____

Position in NGO: _____ Date: _____

NGO QUALITY RATINGS GUIDE

The following rating scale is to be used for reporting on the achievement of objectives:

- Best Practice*(5)
- Fully Satisfactory*(4)
- Satisfactory Overall*(3)
- Marginally Satisfactory*(2)
- Weak*(1)
- Objectives dropped during implementation* (99)

In considering the ratings it is suggested that the following descriptors of **Best Practice/Weak** are used as a guide. Different ratings may be given for each objective, depending on the strength or weakness of the original design and variable performance against different objectives.

(5) Best Practice - This is a rare score that should not be given lightly. It represents a situation where something over and above normal good aid practice has occurred, particularly something innovative. The key feature is that this project/program is suitable for presenting to AusAID/NGO staff as a model to follow.

(4) Fully Satisfactory - This is normally as good as it gets. The project/program fully satisfies all AusAID/NGO requirements and there are only a few minor weaknesses in the project/program as a whole.

(3) Satisfactory Overall - This is the lowest score that satisfies AusAID/NGO requirements. For accrual reporting purposes a score of 3 represents satisfactory aid. However, this score usually means there can be weaknesses as well as strengths but that the weaknesses are not severe enough to threaten the project/program.

(2) Marginally Satisfactory - A score of 2 indicates that the project/program has serious weaknesses although other aspects may be satisfactory. The main difference between a 2 and a 3 is that a 2 indicates that the weaknesses require early action if the project/program is to continue to progress.

(1) Weak - This is a rare score which indicates that the project/program is seriously deficient with respect to quality requirements. It also usually indicates that the problems are widespread throughout the project/program and that immediate and decisive action is needed to address them.