Section 2 - Table 3 – Specific suggestions for improving these areas of the Investment Plan

Areas of the investment plan	Suggestions to strengthen this aspect of the Investment Plan	TPM comments
Demonstrating greater impact for high needs whānau	• The Investment Plan speaks about priority whānau, however it is unclear what makes certain whānau a priority. The Investment Plan speaks about a deprived population / deprived areas, however there is no description of these. In general there is little description of the highest needs whānau in Te Ika-a-Māui • We suggest that you could better identify and describe in the Investment Plan, the highest needs whānau in Te Ika-a-Māui – who they are, where they are, and what their needs are. Te Pou Matakana works with whānau with a spectrum of needs, but who is in most need of positive change? • It is also unclear in the Investment Plan how you are working with providers and navigators to reach the highest needs whānau. The only reference to targeting hard to reach whānau appears in the description of the objectives of whakapakiri tinana navigators • We suggest that you could better describe how your understanding of high needs whānau factors into your strategic investment decisions, and how you work with providers and navigators to ensure that Whānau Direct, Collective Impact, Kaiārahi, and the Innovation Fund, are all targeting and having impact for whānau with the greatest need	We would welcome more kōrero with TPK about this section to ensure that there is a clear understanding of the TPM commissioning for outcomes approach. • In relation to bullet point 1, please refer to the priority whānau description at footnote 3 on page 6 of the draft Invesment Plan. • In relation to bullet point 2, we do not dictate to our Whānau Ora partners the whānau they should be working with. They are aware of whanau within their communities with the most pressing needs . Any fixed defintion of high needs may not apply equally to all regions, as there is heterogenity with the needs of population across the North Island. However we know from analysis and evaluation of programmes to date, that our Whānau Ora partners are reaching whānau who are defined by the government as "high needs" (see Whānau Direct evaluations/outcomes report) which are reported to TPK. • In relation to bullet point 3 and 4, we can improve some of the narrative in the IP to identify clearly how we are extending our reach to whānau through our Whānau Ora partners.
Making the Te Pou Matakana Outcomes Framework more visible in the Investment Plan	• As context for the Outcomes Framework it would be useful to provide some additional context and background on the challenges facing whānau in Te-ika-a-Māui. A section could be included near the start describing the challenges facing whānau in this region. This might include challenges faced across your outcome domains. It may be useful to include some additional demographic and socioeconomic statistics on whānau in the region • The Investment Plan states that you currently target six of the seven Whānau Ora outcomes (referred to as outcome domains). However, the Investment Plan doesn't provide a sense of which outcome domains are a priority for whānau in Te Ika-a-Māui. After three years of whānau engagement are you seeing any trends in terms of the outcome domains most important to whānau in the region? If you are targeting some of the six outcome domains more so than others then this needs to be clear in the Investment Plan • You may achieve a more compelling Investment Plan by identifying and describing a sub-set of outcomes that are known to be particularly important, and that are specifically targeted through your commissioning activities and initiatives. This could complement a description of the wider outcomes achieved for whānau • The Investment Plan does identify 18 needs and aspirations across your six outcome domains, identified through whānau engagement to date. We assume that these needs and aspirations are the primary things that you will be targeting in the future, and if this is the case then this needs to be made more explicit in the Investment Plan. You might consider incorporating these into your Outcomes Framework as a second level below the top-level outcome domains • The increasing demands on Whānau Ora to be able to articulate impact for whānau means that you are going to need to be more specific about the short-term and medium-term outcomes it aims to achieve for whānau. We understand that sustainable positive change for whānau takes time to achieve, however there is a need to be more specific about the short and medium term achievements expected on the way to achieving this longer term change • In order to do so we strongly recommend that you further develop the Milestone Indicator Framework to include more meaningful short-term and medium-term outcomes. This is an area where the Minister for Whānau Ora is asking for further development • At our meeting on Thursday 4 May you mentioned that you are conducting an exercise to code actual short-term and medium-term outcomes information collected from whānau to your Outcomes Framework. This may be of use in further developing the Milestone Indicator Framework • It is also important that the Investment Plan describes how short and medium-term achievements contribute to and drive longer-term changes for whānau. This may feature as part of a description of the Outcomes and Milestone Indicator Frameworks • We ask that you clarify in the Investment Plan the purpose of the Commissioning Logic and Organisational Logic Models. What is the Commissioning Logic model intended to communicate? It currently seems to be a mix between an outcomes framework and a model describing how maturity in the provider sector is achieved over time. An Organisational Logic model is referred to in the caption of the Commissioning Logic Model diagram but we are not sure where in the Investment Plan the Organisational Logic Model is or what it describes	We would welcome more kōrero with TPK about this section to ensure that there is a clear understanding of the TPM commissioning for outcomes approach. • In relation to bullet point 1, this information is currently captured in section 3 and 4 of the draft Investment Plan. More detail of the demographics and socioeconomic statistics is provided in quarterly reporting. • In relation to bullet points 2-4, the 13 Collective Impact initiatives specifically prioritise outcomes for whānau across Te-Ika-A-Māui – this is the common agenda and focus for the cohort of priority whānau. We can add in a specific column that identifies what these outcomes are to ensure this is clear moving forward. Again across Kaiārahi and Whānau Direct, whānau determine their own priority outcomes depending on where they are at, and we do not dictate to whānau what they should target These whānau prioritised outcomes do feature the full range of outcome domains but there are regional differences and similarities we could highlight. Reporting on the outcomes identified and achieved by whānau will be done quarterly. • In relation to the bullet points 5-8, this could be done as part of the ongoing refinement of the TPM roadmap. We are not explicitly funded for this work. Happy to discuss further. • In relation to the last bullet point, we can add information about the purpose of the logic model. The Commissioning Logic model is iterative and will be refined over time.

Areas of the investment plan	Suggestions to strengthen this aspect of the Investment Plan	TPM comments
Demonstrating alignment with Government priorities	• The Investment Plan states that in your reporting to Te Pūni Kokiri, you will highlight where achievement of goals is considered to align with wide Government priorities. However, there is no description of the Government priorities that your commissioning activities and initiatives align with • You could strengthen this aspect of the investment Plan by describing how your vision and commissioning activities and initiatives align with Government priorities, including for example the Better Public Service (BPS) result areas, as well as social and justice sector policies around supporting vulnerable and disadvantage people and reducing crime	• In relation to this section, our programmes can link to the BPS target areas. We can link our current Collective Impact initiatives to priority outcome areas and links to BPS target areas by including a column that describes this however we cannot measure how they are contributing to these BPS areas as we report against the achievement of outcomes not these specific targets.
Enhancing the description of intervention logic behind commissioning activities and other initiatives	• The Investment Plan describes the purpose and approach of your various commissioning activities and initiatives, including Whānau Direct, Collective Impact, Kaiārahi, and the Innovation Fund. However, the logic behind how these initiatives individually and collectively deliver short, medium, and long-term outcomes for whānau is not explicit • For example at the meeting in Auckland on Thursday you described one of the major purposes of the Whānau Direct initiative (in addition to helping whānau through moments of crisis) as being linking whānau to Whānau Ora partners and other community organisations where they can receive ongoing support and work towards longer-term goals. In the Investment Plan this currently only receives a minor mention • As another example the description of the Collective Impact and Kaiārahi initiatives is very brief. We believe it must be possible to better articulate how these initiatives work to deliver short, medium, and long-term outcomes for whānau. For example with Collective Impact it would be useful to have a clear answer to the following questions: What kinds of providers are you wanting to contract with and why? What kinds of services will these providers offer? What impact will these services have and how will this help whānau to realise goals specific short, medium, and long-term goals? • For clarity we are not suggesting that you list the intervention logic behind the services offered by each and every Whānau Direct or Collective impact partner, just the initiatives themselves e.g. Whānau Direct, Collective Impact, Kaiārahi, and the Innovation Fund	We would welcome more kōrero with TPK about this section to ensure that we are clear as to the expectation of what is required in addition to what has been provided in the draft IP. . We note in relation to the first and last bullet point that as part of the refinement of the TPM Roadmap we intend to develop logic models for each of our programmes over time. • We can provide some additional information regarding our investment approach through the lead Whānau Ora partners. • In relation to bullet points 2-3, we can expand on the CI model and approach in the CI information table (as discussed above) which already provides the partners that are linked to the different CI initiatives.

Areas of the investment plan	Suggestions to strengthen this aspect of the Investment Plan	TPM comments
Documenting improved performance metrics and targets in the Investment Plan	• The Investment Plan documents a large number of performance metrics and targets across the Whānau Direct, Collective Impact, and Kaiārahi initiatives. The approach is similar to that used in past years, with similar "how much", "how well", and "better off" metrics. We have a number of suggestions for how these metrics and targets might be improved to enable better performance measurement and reporting and to support alignment with key stakeholder expectations • Importantly, you need to include improved "better off" metrics that reflect specific and meaningful short, medium, and long-term outcomes achieved for whānau. Progress against the Milestone Indicator Framework as it currently stands doesn't tell us much about what is actually being achieved. For example, instead of "x% of whānau experience a positive shift to Milestone 4 on the Milestone Indicator Framework" a better measure might be "x% of whānau members who were previously unemployed now have jobs" • It is not clear from your current engagement targets how much of the target will be attributable to new whānau who will be engaged for the first time in the year ahead, and how much will be attributable to whānau receiving continuing support from previous years. It is important to be able to make this differentiation, and we suggest that you look at documenting in the Investment Plan separate "how much" metrics and targets for new whānau, as well as total whānau to be engaged in the year ahead (including those remaining engaged from previous years). This continues to be an area of focus for Whānau Ora's Government stakeholders • Along similar lines you might explore how you can report on the progress of whānau who may no longer be engaged with you or your partners, but who may nonetheless be realising continued change and improvement as a result of Whānau Ora intervention • It would be good to track the progress of separate cohorts of whānau over time, based on when they entered the programme. All of the whānau first engaged in a particular year of the programme would be considered one cohort, and all of those in the following year would be considered another cohort etc. The cumulative progress of different cohorts could be separately tracked and reported on year-on-year, with baselines for each year being established by progress made in the previous year. While we acknowledge that this may create additional requirements for information collection, it would provide a much clearer picture of the impact of your commissioning activities and initiatives over time. This is something Government stakeholders are continuing to ask for • By doing the above you may also be able to better see the proportion of whānau achieving longer-term "better off' outcomes increasing over time, without this being diluted by new entrants to your Whānau Ora ecosystem • We also suggest that the performance frameworks are developed to allow for separate reporting on the highest needs whānau, wherever possible • You could also simplify the approach to setting targets for "how well" and "better off" measures. Assuming a target for whānau engagement or "how much" is defined, then "how well" and "better off" targets can be set as a proportion or a percentage of this engagement. Also a description of the sampling approach used to measure achievement of this would be better described separately in the context of a discussion on data analysis and reporting	We would welcome kōrero with TPK around the milestone indicator framework to ensure that there is clarity on the way that TPM report. • In relation to the second bullet point, we are unable to define in advance what whānau may want to prioritise in terms of specific outcome areas over others and the framework is set up to allow whānau to determine what they want to achieve. We can only report after the fact what whānau have chosen as their priority outcome, so targets cannot be set against these actual whānau prioritised outcomes. • In relation to bullet points 3 and 4, the framework is also flexible enough to allow us to record whānau outcomes as determined by whānau. TPM reports whānau data by outcome domains and outcome areas. • In relation to bullet points 4, 5, and 6, we cannot provide this information. This is best done as a longitudinal research project for which we would require separate and distinct funding. In addition, this research project will require an all of government approach, such as linking our Whānau Ora data to the IDI • In relation to bullet point 7, we are not set up to report in this way. • In relation to bullet point 8, we report on engagement targets currently under the 'how well' and 'better off' targets. Please clarify what is required in addition.
Better articulating data collection processes, systems, and tools	• Firstly, we acknowledge that you have made substantial progress embedding the Whānau Tahi system. This system may provide a platform for continuous improvement in data collection and reporting over time. Our comments below mainly relate to seeking further explanation and clarification of certain things in the Investment Plan • You have provided a good description of data collection tools, including: surveys of whānau and partners, and outcomes assessment tools. However, it is not clear how these tools align with or are integrated with the Whānau Tahi system. We ask that you clarify the data collected through each method, including Whānau Tahi, and the reasons why each method is needed • You could also better articulate how often these information collection mechanisms are deployed and to who, as well as how this frequency and sampling approach supports robust performance measurement and reporting • Some of the recommendations made earlier in this section around performance reporting are likely to create additional requirements for information and analysis to be collected from Whānau Ora partners and whānau. The Investment Plan should describe your intentions and strategies regarding collection of any additional information for this purpose	We would like to provide a presentation and walkthrough of Whānau Tahi. • In relation to bullet points 1, 2, and 3, TPM can provide this additional information. • In relation to bullet point 4, this is not relevant because TPM is not looking at reporting on information outside the TPM outcomes framework.

Section 3 - Table 4 – Specific requests to check or provide additional detail around annual financial information

<table>
<tr><th>Areas of the investment plan</th><th>Suggestions to check or provide additional detail around financial information for FY18</th><th>TPM comments</th></tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.3 Commissioning activity FY17/18 payment schedule</td>
<td>1. You have updated this table, however there are a few potential errors, including:
• The total funding in Period 3 is incorrect. This appears to be a simple miscalculation of the total;
• the Operating Funding line does not align with the Outcome Agreement; and
• the total of General Commissioning Funding and Contracted Funding also does not align with the Outcome Agreement
2. In addition we understand that you intend to exit all of its contracts with existing providers transferred from MSD in FY17. We suggest labelling this as general commissioning funding from FY18
3. We have provided a table (Error! Reference source not found.) on the following page for you to insert into the Investment Plan in replacement of the existing Table 1.3 Commissioning activity FY17/18 payment schedule. This table aligns with the Outcome Agreement and combines funding previously labelled as contracted funding into the General Commissioning Funding line
4. The figures included in the table are subject to change. They make no assumption about the outcome of proposed Budget initiatives for Budget ‘18, nor the impact of any forecast underspend by Te Pou Matakana during FY17</td>
<td>Noting the period 3 is to be updated.

We can replace the payment schedule in aligning with now signed outcome agreement, with understanding
• actual allocation of the funding will follow TPM commission approach
• operation fund will not exceed 20% of total fund available for commission
With General commissioning funding being increased, would like to check if it will impact on incentive amount i.e. $1,718,539.09 = 18903930- (18903930/1.1)
That is fine as long as it is aligned with Outcome Agreement

Noting the amount is subject to change due to budget announcement BUT payment schedule shall not be impacted by money rolled from FY17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected overspend – comparison of table 1.3 with the total of tables 1.1 and 1.2</td>
<td>5. We note that in the plan there is currently a projected overspend when comparing the forecast Commissioning Activity Budget and Operating Budget with the Commissioning Funds to be received from Te Puni Kōkiri (including the incentive payment)
6. We understand that you may be including other sources of funding here, and ask for clarification of the reasons for this projected overspend as it appears in the Investment Plan</td>
<td>It is the money rolled from FY17 upon TPM commission programme
<table>
<tr><th>Commissioning Funding</th><th>Total</th><th>Total Budget</th><th>End of Year Variance</th><th>Comments</th></tr>
<tr><td>Whānau Direct</td><td>2,365,000</td><td>2,500,000</td><td>(135,000)</td><td>Un-committed fund will be rolled to FY17/18 budget</td></tr>
<tr><td>Collective Impact</td><td>5,755,000</td><td>7,613,416</td><td>(1,858,416)</td><td>Un-committed fund will be rolled to FY17/18 budget</td></tr>
<tr><td>Kaiarahi (incl. Pou Hākinakina and Data Analyst</td><td>16,505,250</td><td>16,877,000</td><td>(371,750)</td><td>Un-committed fund will be rolled to FY17/18 budget</td></tr>
<tr><td>Research and Evaluation</td><td>1,200,000</td><td>1,200,000</td><td>-</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>MSD Transfer - Committed Contracts</td><td>4,766,660</td><td>4,766,660</td><td>-</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>MSD Transfer - Innovation Fund</td><td>780,000</td><td>1,560,000</td><td>(780,000)</td><td>Un-committed fund will be rolled to FY17/18 budget</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>31,371,910</td><td>34,517,076</td><td>(3,145,166)</td><td></td></tr>
</table></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning and navigator funds -detail and phasing</td>
<td>7. We ask that you provide greater detail on your Commissioning Activity Budget than you have in previous years, in order to promote transparency around spend. In particular, we request the inclusion of a breakdown of funding forecast to be allocated to each Collective Impact provider
8. Kaiārahi funding is mainly FTE, and the FTE split between regions is shown. Funding figures for Kaiārahi should also be broken down by region
9. The Commissioning Budget should, wherever possible, reflect the phasing of your activities provided. At the moment this is just split evenly across the four quarters</td>
<td>Upon TPM commissioning approach, commission fund allocation will and has been based on populations as below:
<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">North Island Māori Descent Population</th></tr>
<tr><th>TPM Region</th><th>Total</th><th>%</th></tr>
<tr><td>Ikaroa-Rāwhiti</td><td>106,344</td><td>19%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Te Tai Hauāuru</td><td>97,788</td><td>17%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Te Tai Tokerau</td><td>96,273</td><td>17%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Hauraki-Waikato</td><td>94,539</td><td>17%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Tāmaki Makaurau</td><td>89,160</td><td>16%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Waiariki</td><td>83,361</td><td>15%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>567,465</td><td>100%</td></tr>
</table>
BUT as you are aware, TPM activities are hugely depending on capacity and capability of its providers and collectives. TPM is yet to receive Q4 report to assess the phase of each provider for contracting process for FY18.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Areas of the investment plan	Suggestions to check or provide additional detail around financial information for FY18	TPM comments
Operating costs – detail and phasing	10. We ask that you provide greater detail on your Operating Budget than you have in previous years, in order to promote transparency around spend. This is particularly true for professional services which makes up a significant proportion of the operating spend 11. We are not asking for a massive increase in the level of detail provided, however we would like to have a view of the major items of spend 12. The Operating Budget should, wherever possible, reflect the phasing of your spending profile. At the moment this is just split evenly across the four quarters	Apart from Whanau Ora conference, TPM operation has been planned steadily over 12 months hence it is split evenly across four quarter. However, TPM activities are hugely dependent on capacity and capability of its Whānau Ora partners, therefore there are variations from time to time which has been reported on quarterly reportage to TPK.
Presentation of financial information	13. We ask that you include a summary table of operating and commissioning funding, showing the forecast proportion of funding going to each 14. We ask that you include statements of cash flows and financial performance in order to highlight projected over / underspend in any quarter as well as any funding brought forward from previous years and any cash balances available to manage any forecast quarterly deficits	This is provided in quarterly reportage as opposed to the AIP Please note that on a monthly basis, commission fund will only be recognised in the book when it is ready to be paid. An audited statement of cash flows has been included in our annual accounts when it is produced on accrued basis and in accordance with GAAP.