

2018 PPA Review: Management Response

Response to each finding	
(i) Strengthening PPA tool	DFAT response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFAT should consider requiring the assessors to write a minimum of four specific 'defendable' pieces of evidence (for each criterion, to support their rating) in the written PPA report. This is because the DFAT staff say that they use plenty of evidence (agreed by MCs), however the written PPA reports reflect only a slightly more than 'satisfactory' amount of evidence. 	<p>Agreed. Templates for 2019 were locked in from late 2018. DFAT will incorporate this suggestion into the 2019 guidance material and seek to incorporate into templates for 2019/20 reporting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFAT could consider making sure there is a stronger correlation between the PPA ratings and the performance payment clauses in individual contracts. 	<p>Noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFAT should redefine the ratings between a '5' and a '6' to ensure a greater separation between the two. Currently, there is not a large distinction. 	<p>Agreed. Templates for 2019 were locked in from late 2018. DFAT will incorporate this suggestion into the 2019 guidance material and seek to incorporate into templates for 2019/20 reporting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFAT should share the highly valued 'Partner Performance Assessment Ratings Matrix' with MCs. MCs will then feel that the PPA process is fairer because they will have a deeper understanding of what they are being scored on. 	<p>Agreed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PPA tool would benefit from having a performance follow-up section, so that the key issues identified can be actioned throughout the year. 	<p>Agreed. Templates for 2019 were locked in from late 2018. DFAT will incorporate this suggestion into the 2019 guidance material and seek to incorporate into templates for 2019/20 reporting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider strengthening Q. 4- policy alignment, risk management and innovation. It was felt by many that these are quite separate issues but are being "lumped" together. 	<p>Agreed. Templates for 2019 were locked in from late 2018. DFAT will incorporate this suggestion into the 2019 guidance material and seek to incorporate into templates for 2019/20 reporting.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider strengthening Q. 4 (a) and how these policies are being implemented. Just because an MC has the relevant policies doesn't mean they are being successfully applied to their projects. Eg. GESDI. 	<p>Agreed. Templates for 2019 were locked in from late 2018. DFAT will incorporate this suggestion into the 2019 guidance material and seek to incorporate into templates for 2019/20 reporting.</p>

(ii) Communication and stakeholder involvement	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 'Diplomacy' aspect of performance was commonly mentioned by DFAT staff, as what is missing in the assessment. i.e. how activity performance affects the all-important Partner Government relations. This could be added to the Matrix. 	Agreed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner Government involvement and viewpoints are currently inadequately recorded in the PPA and should be increased. 	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PPA process does not adequately recognise that DFAT has some responsibility for the MC's performance. MCs are called 'partners', but there was a widespread feeling that the PPA process does not reflect a partnership approach. A 360-degree system was mentioned (unsolicited) as a fairer system by more than 50% of the MCs and also by some DFAT staff. 	Noted. DFAT will assess how above recommendations affect satisfaction with process in 2020 when considering a review.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An independent moderator would be beneficial in some cases. 	Noted. DFAT will assess how above recommendations affect satisfaction with process in 2020 when considering a review.