

Partner Performance Assessment (PPA) Ratings Matrix

PPA Q1: Delivers the agreed outputs to the standard required

1-Very poor	2-Poor	3-Less than adequate	4-Adequate	5-Good	6-Very good
There is no evidence to demonstrate that the partner is delivering any of the agreed outputs to the standard required to achieve the intended outcomes	There is little evidence to demonstrate that the partner is delivering the agreed outputs to the standard required to achieve the intended outcomes	There is weak evidence to demonstrate that the partner is delivering the agreed outputs, or the outputs delivered are not to the standard required to achieve the intended outcomes	There is adequate evidence to demonstrate that the partner is delivering the agreed outputs at a standard adequate for achieving intended outcomes, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partner is delivering the agreed outputs to a high standard for achieving almost all of the intended outcomes	There is strong evidence that the partner is delivering the agreed outputs to a very high standard for achieving all of the intended outcomes
The evidence demonstrates that the partners' systems and processes are very poor , with reporting that is consistently late, or of very poor quality	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' systems and processes are poor , with reporting that is consistently late, or of poor quality	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' systems and processes are less than adequate , reporting is often late, or inaccurate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' systems and processes are adequate , with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' systems and processes are good, most activities occur as planned, results are well documented, reporting is timely and accurate	There is strong evidence that the partners' systems and processes are very good, all activities occur as planned, results are very well documented, reporting is timely and of high quality
There is no evidence to demonstrate that the partner has M&E arrangements in place	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' M&E system is poor , or the arrangements in place do not meet DFAT's M&E Standards	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' M&E system is weak , or the information produced is not adequate for decision making, or for achieving the intended development outcomes	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' M&E system is adequate , it produces information used for decision making, it supports the achievement of some of the intended development outcomes with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' M&E system is good , it produces quality information used for decision making, it supports the achievement of almost all of the intended development outcomes	There is strong evidence that the partners' M&E system is very good , it produces high quality, accurate, timely information used for decision making and the achievement all of the intended development outcomes
There is no evidence to demonstrate that the partner addresses sustainability	There is little evidence to demonstrate that the partner has a coherent strategy, or plan, or there are major gaps in the partners' approach to sustainability.	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' strategy, or plan are inadequate , or there are gaps in the approach to sustainability, which threaten the enduring nature of the benefits	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' sustainability strategy, or plan is adequate with minor gaps, which may threaten the enduring nature of some of the benefits, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' sustainability strategy, or plan is good and is being implemented to ensure the enduring nature of benefits for almost all of the intended development outcomes	There is strong evidence that the partners' sustainability strategy, or plan is very good and is being implemented to ensure the enduring nature of benefits of all of the intended development outcomes

PPA Q2: Delivers value for money through ethical, efficient, economical use of funds

1-Very poor	2-Poor	3-Less than adequate	4-Adequate	5-Good	6-Very good
There is no evidence to demonstrate that the partner considers value for money, or the partners' considerations are very poor	There is little evidence to demonstrate that the partners' value for money considerations align with DFATs value for money (VfM) principles, or the partners' VfM considerations are poor	There is weak evidence to demonstrate that the partner considers VfM, or the partner applies VfM principles inconsistently and less than adequate	There is adequate evidence to demonstrate that the partner has some VfM principles embedded, adequate for delivering some value for money, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence to demonstrate that the partner has good VfM principles embedded and is delivering good value for money almost all of the time	There is strong evidence that the partner has very-good VfM principles embedded and is delivering very-good value for money all of the time
There is no evidence to demonstrate that the partner is seeking to improve operational efficiencies	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' approach to improving operational efficiency is poor , ad hoc, variable, or uncoordinated	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' approach to improving operational efficiency is inconsistent, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' approach to improving operational efficiency is adequate , delivering some efficiencies, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' approach to operational efficiency is good , delivering significant efficiencies across several areas of operations	There is strong evidence that the partners' approach to operational efficiency is very good , delivering extensive efficiencies across many areas of operations
The evidence demonstrates that the partners' budget management is very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' budget management is poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' budget management is weak , or not adequate for delivering VfM	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' budget management is adequate and delivering some VfM, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' budget management is good , coordinated and delivering VfM	There is strong evidence that the partners' budget management is very good , very detailed and well-coordinated and is delivering very good VfM

PPA Q3: Works collaboratively and communicates effectively

1-Very poor	2-Poor	3-Less than adequate	4-Adequate	5-Good	6-Very good
The evidence demonstrates that the partner does not work collaboratively with DFAT, or other partners, or collaboration is very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partner seldom collaborates with DFAT, or other partners, or collaboration is poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' collaboration with DFAT, or other partners is ad hoc, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partner adequately collaborates with DFAT and partners on key development and emerging issues, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partner regularly collaborates and consults with DFAT and partners on key development and emerging issues	There is strong evidence that the partner always collaborates and consults with DFAT and partners on all key development and emerging issues
The evidence demonstrates that the partners' communication is very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' communication is poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' communication is weak, or insufficient, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' communication is adequate, with room for improvement	The strong evidence that the partners' communication is good and communicates well	The strong evidence that the partners' communication is very good and communicates very well
The evidence demonstrates that the partner is not flexible at all, or responsive to adapting to new, or changing priorities is very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' flexibility, or responsiveness to adapting to new, or changing priorities is poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' flexibility, or responsiveness to adapting to new, or changing priorities is variable, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' flexibility and responsiveness in adapting to new, or changing priorities is adequate , with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' flexibility and responsiveness in adapting to new or changing priorities is good	There is strong evidence that the partner is very flexible and very responsive in adapting to new or changing priorities

PPA Q4: Complies with DFAT policies and effectively manages risk

1-Very poor	2-Poor	3-Less than adequate	4-Adequate	5-Good	6-Very good
There is no evidence to demonstrate that the partner has key operating policies	The evidence demonstrates that the partners’ policies, or operations, align poorly with DFATs key policies	The evidence demonstrates that the partners’ policies, or operations are inconsistent with DFATs key policies, variable, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners’ policies, or operations are mostly consistent with DFATs policies, adequate with some room for improvement	There is strong evidence of good alignment of the partners’ policies, or operations with DFATs key policies	There is strong evidence of very good alignment of the partners’ policies and operations being completely consistent with DFATs key policies
The evidence demonstrates that the partners’ support for in-country teams to ensure operations align with DFAT policies is very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners’ support for in-country teams to ensure operations align with DFAT policies is poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners’ support for in-country teams to ensure operations align with DFAT policies is weak, ad-hoc, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners’ support for in-country teams to ensure operations align with DFAT policies is adequate , with room for improvement	There is strong evidence for the partners’ support for in-country teams to ensure operations align with DFAT policies is good , including all appropriate compliance mechanisms	There is strong evidence for the partners’ support for in-country teams to ensure operations align with DFAT policies is very good , including all appropriate compliance mechanisms
<p>There is no evidence to demonstrate that the partner has identified the risks that may hinder the achievement of the end of investment outcomes and communicated them to DFAT.</p> <p>The partner has lacking or very weak practices in place to manage risks that may negatively impact on the environment, people and resources. Specifically, five (5) key risk domains of: Child Protection; Counter-Terrorism Resourcing; Environment and Social Safeguards; Fraud Control; and, Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment.</p>	<p>There is little evidence to demonstrate that the partner has identified the risks that may hinder the achievement of the end of investment outcomes and communicated them to DFAT.</p> <p>The partner has poor practices in place to manage risks that may negatively impact on the environment, people and resources. Specifically, five (5) key risk domains of: Child Protection; Counter-Terrorism Resourcing; Environment and Social Safeguards; Fraud Control; and, Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment.</p>	<p>There is weak evidence to demonstrate that the partner has identified the risks that may hinder the achievement of the end of investment outcomes and communicated them to DFAT.</p> <p>The partner has less than adequate practices in place to manage risks that may negatively impact on the environment, people and resources. Specifically, five (5) key risk domains of: Child Protection; Counter-Terrorism Resourcing; Environment and Social Safeguards; Fraud Control; and, Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment.</p>	<p>There is adequate evidence to demonstrate that the partner has identified the risks that may hinder the achievement of the end of investment outcomes and communicated them to DFAT.</p> <p>The partner has adequate practices in place to manage risks that may negatively impact on the environment, people and resources. Specifically, five (5) key risk domains of: Child Protection; Counter-Terrorism Resourcing; Environment and Social Safeguards; Fraud Control; and, Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment.</p>	<p>There is strong evidence to demonstrate that the partner has identified the risks that may hinder the achievement of the end of investment outcomes and communicated them to DFAT.</p> <p>The partner has good practices in place to manage risks that may negatively impact on the environment, people and resources. Specifically, five (5) key risk domains of: Child Protection; Counter-Terrorism Resourcing; Environment and Social Safeguards; Fraud Control; and, Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment.</p>	<p>There is strong evidence to demonstrate that the partner has identified the risks that may hinder the achievement of the end of investment outcomes and communicated them to DFAT.</p> <p>The partner has very good practices in place to manage risks that may negatively impact on the environment, people and resources. Specifically, five (5) key risk domains of: Child Protection; Counter-Terrorism Resourcing; Environment and Social Safeguards; Fraud Control; and, Preventing Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment.</p>

PPA Q4: Complies with DFAT policies and effectively manages risk (cont'd)

1-Very poor	2-Poor	3-Less than adequate	4-Adequate	5-Good	6-Very good
The evidence demonstrates that the partner does not consider branding of Australian aid at all, or is very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' branding of Australian aid is poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' branding for Australian aid is weak, ad-hoc, variable, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' branding for Australian aid is adequate, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partner displays appropriate branding for almost all Australian aid activities, where appropriate	There is strong evidence that the partner displays appropriate branding for all Australian aid activities, where appropriate
The evidence demonstrates that the partner does not consider innovation, or its approach to innovation is very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' approach to innovation is poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' approach to innovation is weak, ad-hoc, variable or ineffective	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' approach to innovation includes some new approaches trialled, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partner frequently trials new approaches and looks to trials new approaches, where appropriate	There is strong evidence that the partners is constantly trialling new approaches, where appropriate, and actively engages in domestic and global dialogue related to innovation

PPA Q5: Personnel demonstrate effective leadership, management and subject knowledge, achieve results and receive effective support and oversight from the Head/Regional Office

1-Very poor	2-Poor	3-Less than adequate	4-Adequate	5-Good	6-Very good
The evidence demonstrates that the partners' staff is very poorly skilled, or very poorly managed	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' staff is poorly skilled, or poorly managed	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' staff have skills and experience not adequate for their roles and responsibilities, or staff management is weak, variable, less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' staff have adequate skills and experience for their roles and responsibilities, and staff management is adequate with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' staff have good skills and experience that align well with their roles and responsibilities, and staff management is good	There is strong evidence that the partners' staff have very good skills and experience that align very well with their roles and responsibilities, and staff management is very good
The evidence demonstrates that the partners' senior personnel are not effective in their role	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' senior personnel provide poor leadership , or are not sufficiently focused on achieving the intended outcomes	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' senior personnel provide leadership that is less than adequate for achieving the intended outcomes	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' senior personnel provide adequate leadership for achieving the intended outcomes, with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' senior personnel provide good leadership for achieving the intended outcomes, are flexible and responsive in dealing with changing contexts and are good at maintaining important relationships	There is strong evidence that the partners' senior personnel provide very good leadership for achieving the intended outcomes, are very flexible and responsive in dealing with changing contexts and are very good at maintaining important relationships
The evidence demonstrates that the partners' oversight and support to its in-country team is non-existent, or very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' oversight and support to its in-country team is poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' oversight and support to its in-country team is weak, variable, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' oversight and support to its in-country team is adequate , with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partner provides good oversight to its in-country team and its level of support is appropriate and timely	There is strong evidence that the partner provides very good oversight to its in-country team and its level of support is always appropriate and very timely
The evidence demonstrates that the partners' recruitment processes are very poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' recruitment processes are poor	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' recruitment processes are weak, ad-hoc, variable, or less than adequate	The evidence demonstrates that the partners' recruitment processes are adequate , with room for improvement	There is strong evidence that the partners' recruitment processes are good , DFAT is kept informed of personnel changes and good quality staff are appointed quickly to fill vacancies	There is strong evidence that the partners' recruitment processes are very good , DFAT is kept informed of personnel changes and high-quality staff are appointed very quickly to fill vacancies