

The background features abstract green geometric shapes, including triangles and polygons, in various shades of green, some overlapping. A thin grey line extends from the bottom right towards the center.

# 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)