

Degree of GP's Commitment

(Performance Indicators 1.1-1.3)

Performance Indicator 1.1

Degree of GPs commitment to RCA Governance

► Target Criteria

1. All the GPs deposit Instruments of Acceptance for the 2017 RCA (Very Good)
(20 of 22 has already deposited IOA)
2. No GPs absent for 2 subsequent NR meetings (Good)
(last two virtual meetings, participation rate is rather high, but does every GP have good connection?)

► Suggestions by PAC

- Possible Indicators : The percentage of GPs that have established the necessary internal organizations including appointment of National Thematic Sector Coordinator (GOR Section 1.1 (h)) and the percentage of NRs who hold consultations with NPCs prior to NRMs and GCMs (GOR Section 1.1 (r))

We may stick to the current Criteria, but may start collecting some data at NRMs/GCMs through online questionnaires with a view to using them for the future review criteria

Performance Indicators 1.2

Degree of GP's commitment to implementation of their allotted portions of the RCA projects

► Target Criteria

1. Percentage completion of planned project activities (Very Good ~ Excellent)
2. Percentage of relevant project reports submitted by GPs by specified deadlines (Adequate)
3. Percentage of NPCs or ANPCs that attend relevant project meetings (Very good)
4. Nominations for RTCs are members from National Project Teams (Not evaluated)

► Findings, suggestions and comments

- For the target criteria 1, achievement judged by the number of events implemented

What do the “planned project activities” mean, how it should be evaluated? New report format will work?

- Mismatches between the Work Plans and the activities reported.
- The target criteria in the MTSC refer to percentage of project reports submitted by GPs, while the Quantitative Result is based on the PPARs
- No data available for T.C.4. Should we omit the criteria? Is there any way to collate data?

Some updates to the Guideline are necessary!

Performance Indicators 1.3

Efforts made by GPs to provide additional support to RCA programme through EB or IK contributions

► Target Criteria

1. Percentage of GPs making EB contributions (Inadequate)
2. Percentage of GPs making IK contributions (Adequate (based on the average 3 years))

► Findings

- Updated calculation method for IK contributions works well! (All GPs make IK contributions)

► Suggestions

- Mark suggested to approach Industry Partners. Good Idea, but not to be considered as a GP's ownership.... (-> I would like to suggest a new section for EB contributions in the GOR)