**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 evidenc**e 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 l**ess 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 responsiv**e in adapting to new or changing priorities  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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  |
| 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. 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. | 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.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. | 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. 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. | 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. 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. | 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. 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. | 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. 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. |

**PPA Q4: Complies with DFAT policies and effectively manages risk**

**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 |