



THE PRESIDENCY  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

**A FRAMEWORK  
FOR STRENGTHENING  
CITIZEN-GOVERNMENT  
PARTNERSHIPS FOR  
MONITORING FRONTLINE  
SERVICE DELIVERY**

11 June 2013

## CONTENTS

List of Acronyms.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
Part A – The Context for Citizen-Based Monitoring.....	1
1. Rationale.....	1
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Why is it important to engage citizens in monitoring government performance?.....	2
1.3 Citizen-based monitoring and existing public participation structures and processes.....	2
1.4 The problem statement.....	3
1.5 Aims of this framework .....	4
1.6 Legal and policy basis for this framework .....	5
2. What is citizen-based monitoring? .....	7
2.1 Defining citizen-based monitoring.....	7
2.2 Citizen-based monitoring instruments.....	9
2.3 Current practices in South Africa .....	11
Part B – Strengthening Citizen-Based Monitoring in South Africa .....	17
3. Principles .....	17
4. Essential elements for CBM practices in government .....	20
4.1 At the service site level.....	20
4.2 At the district/regional/provincial oversight and support level.....	20
4.3 At programme planning and policy level .....	21
5. Roles and responsibilities .....	21
5.1 Government institutions.....	21
5.2 Civil society .....	22
6. Risks and mitigation strategies.....	23
7. Implementing the framework .....	25
7.1 Capacity and support needs.....	25
7.2 Piloting CBM in selected departments .....	26
7.3 Three year timeline for implementing the framework .....	28

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

CBM – Citizen-based monitoring

CMAP – Community Monitoring and Advocacy Project

CPF – Community Policing Forum

CSO – Civil Society Organisation

DHA – Department of Home Affairs

DoH – Department of Health

DPME – Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation

DPSA – Department of Public Service and Administration

DSD – Department of Social Development

M&E – Monitoring and evaluation

NGO – Non Governmental Organisation

OGP – Open Government Partnership

PALAMA – Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy

PSC – Public Service Commission

SAPS – South African Police Services

SASSA – South African Social Services Agency

SDIP - Service Delivery Improvement Plan

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) was established on the principle that the systematic use of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) evidence in policy, planning and implementation is essential for continuous performance improvement. To date, the focus has been on putting in place the internal architecture of government's performance monitoring system – the delivery agreements, progress reporting against the delivery agreements, the Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT), frontline services delivery monitoring etc. These systems are now in place and are supporting the uptake of monitoring and evaluation as a required practice in government. What remains largely missing from government's monitoring system however, is the citizens' experience of government services and the systematic use of this evidence to improve performance.

The need for this is however well established in law and policy. Section 195 (1) (e) of the Constitution states that people's needs must be responded to ... and (f) that public administration must be accountable. Numerous laws, policies and guidelines further elaborate on the principle of citizen participation in accountability. Most recently, the National Development Plan, approved by Cabinet in September 2012, highlights that strengthening delegation, accountability and oversight is key for achieving a capable and developmental state, through harnessing the energy and experience of citizens at the level at which services are delivered<sup>1</sup>.

There are existing examples of citizen–government monitoring partnerships. However studies by the Office of Public Service Commission<sup>2</sup> highlight that existing practices are uneven and there is a need for i) guidelines (ii) for practices to be institutionalized (iii) for strengthening the use of findings in decision making and for (iv) training of officials on how to plan for and manage citizen participation.<sup>3</sup>

This framework therefore aims to address this gap in government's current monitoring approach by setting out to:

- Provide a common understanding of citizen-based monitoring and its importance to government service delivery
- Provide guidance to government departments on how to strengthen the involvement of citizens in monitoring

---

<sup>1</sup> National Development Plan (2012:427)

<sup>2</sup> State of the Public Service Reports, Report on the Assessment of Public Participation Practices in the Public Service

<sup>3</sup> Assessment of Public Participation Practices in the Public Service (2008:34)

- Provide a set of principles, essential elements and set out roles and responsibilities
- Examine risks and mitigation strategies
- Present an action plan for strengthening citizen-government partnerships for monitoring frontline service delivery.

### ***What is citizen-based monitoring (CBM)?***

For the purpose of this framework, Citizen-based monitoring (CBM) is an approach to monitoring government performance that focuses on the experiences of ordinary citizens in order to strengthen public accountability and drive service delivery improvements. It places citizens as active participants in shaping what is monitored, how the monitoring is done and what interpretations and actions are derived from the data. CBM is about routine mechanisms to bring the voice of the citizen into the service delivery process. There are a range of instruments and approaches that have been developed and used around the world, as well as in South Africa. These include citizen report cards, social audits, community monitoring and public hearings. Citizen-based monitoring can be initiated by government, done through partnerships between civil society and government, or be undertaken independently of government. Many of the instruments and methodologies have emerged from civil society-led initiatives that draw on a rich tradition of participatory methodologies.

Currently much of government monitoring sees information sent upwards to central national collection points. This information is then analyzed and presented to top level decision makers who adjust policy and programmes in an effort to influence outcomes on the ground. Citizen-based monitoring shifts the emphasis to focusing on building local level accountability through the co-production of monitoring information by citizens and frontline officials. It is not designed to replace, but rather enhance, government's existing monitoring systems.

### ***Why is it needed?***

The experiences of citizens – the intended beneficiaries of government services – are a critical component of measuring the performance of government and for the delivery of appropriate and quality services. Currently the emphasis of government's monitoring is on internal government processes and the voice of the citizen is largely absent. This is a risk as the picture is not complete. It is therefore necessary to support the uptake of systematic ways to bring the experiences of citizens into the monitoring of services. CBM does not duplicate or replace existing public participation structures or processes (e.g. Community Development Workers, Ward Committees etc.), but rather offers the potential to strengthen the monitoring capacity of these, providing tools and methodologies to strengthen public

participation in monitoring. Citizen-based monitoring activities may also take place outside of existing public participation structures.

The National Development Plan emphasizes the importance of fostering active citizens and building a capable and developmental state. Citizen-based monitoring supports this through the production of, and engagement around, evidence of government performance.

## **Principles**

The framework provides a set of principles, together with explanations, to guide government departments in the implementation of citizen-based monitoring. These principles are as follows:

- As a democratic nation, the voice of citizens is integral to building a capable, developmental state in South Africa
- Government monitoring systems need to include the views and experiences of citizens
- Government departments must encourage independent monitoring by civil society
- Citizen-based monitoring is not a once-off event, but an on-going process of relationship building and performance improvement
- Citizen participation in planning strengthens citizen participation in monitoring
- Citizen-based monitoring must form an integral part of service delivery improvement plans and management decision-making processes
- Monitoring mechanisms should be workable and suit the context in which they are applied
- Monitoring findings and planned improvements need to be communicated to citizens timeously
- Communication strategies must be informed by the target audience

## **Roles and responsibilities**

Roles and responsibilities are described for DPME, the Department of Public Service Administration (DPSA), the Public Service Commission (PSC), sector departments, local government and civil society.

## **Implementing the framework**

The implementation of this CBM framework will be based on lessons learnt from a pilot with a selected number of service delivery departments. This pilot will be designed and implemented through partnerships with the Departments of Safety and Security (SAPS), Social Development and Health, as well as civil society organisations. The pilot will focus on

the facilities of these departments (police stations, clinics, hospitals, SASSA paypoints and service sites and welfare offices) in approximately 10 communities across South Africa.

The pilot sites will offer a diversity of socio-economic and geographic conditions, including urban, rural, mining communities etc., as well as communities with high and low social cohesion indicators. The pilot will run from September 2013 to March 2015.

### **Preliminary model for piloting**

The model that will be tested has four equally important focus areas: (i) Tools that are used to gather monitoring data, (ii) processes to analyse this data, (iii) the selection and implementation of actions to respond to the analysis and (iv) feedback to various stakeholders, including citizens, facility officials and the performance monitoring system. The model is focused at the facility (service site) level.

The pilot will be supported by research and support activities to enable broader uptake of field-tested CBM methodologies. Learning and knowledge sharing activities will be an important part of this process.

Regular updates will be sent to Cabinet and a detailed policy recommendations report will be submitted in 2015.

### 1. RATIONALE

#### **1.1 Introduction**

The Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) is the policy custodian for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in government. As such, it is responsible for:

- Developing policy to strengthen M&E within government
- Providing guidelines, norms and standards, and tools to support departments, provinces and municipalities to implement good M&E practices
- Providing technical support and advice to departments in their application of these policies and guidelines, to ensure that M&E practices in government are enhanced

This support and guidance applies to the whole value chain of M&E: from planning for M&E, data collection methods, quality assurance, analysis, to using M&E findings for decision making to improve the performance of government.

In line with this mandate, DPME supports government departments, provinces and municipalities to strengthen M&E to improve the monitoring and management of performance. A gap in terms of citizen-based monitoring of frontline service delivery has been identified in the existing suite of monitoring tools supported by DPME. This government-wide framework for strengthening citizen participation in monitoring service delivery responds to this gap.

The framework emerges out of (i) legislative and policy requirements, (ii) the experiences of the Presidential Outcomes monitoring process, (iii) the findings from the unannounced frontline service delivery monitoring being conducted by DPME and Offices of the Premier since 2011, (iv) findings from studies done by the Public Service Commission (PSC) assessing public participation practices in government and (v) recommendations in the National Development Plan.

DPME, as per its M&E mandate, acts as custodian of this framework and will establish a programme to support government and civil society in strengthening the voice of citizens in monitoring frontline service delivery.

## ***1.2 Why is it important to engage citizens in monitoring government performance?***

The experiences of citizens – the intended beneficiaries of government services – are a critical component in measuring the performance of government and for the delivery of appropriate and quality services. Currently the emphasis of government’s monitoring is on internal government processes and the voice of the citizen is largely absent. This presents a risk, as the picture is not complete. It is therefore necessary to support the uptake of systematic ways to bring the experiences of citizens into the monitoring of services. This will provide a measure of the gap between the perceived and the actual experiences of service delivery, for both user and provider.

Citizens cannot be passive recipients if government is to deliver services that address real needs. The process of citizens working jointly with government to produce information on service delivery fosters active citizenry and contributes to building a capable and developmental state.

## ***1.3 Citizen-based monitoring and existing public participation structures and processes***

Strengthening the involvement of citizens in monitoring service delivery does not imply the creation of new public participation structures. Instead it offers an opportunity to strengthen existing platforms and processes, through providing tools and methodologies to strengthen their value to both citizens and government. Sector departments may well choose to use existing structures (such as community development workers, ward committees, community policing forums, school governing bodies, clinic committees etc.) to implement citizen-based monitoring. This would depend on the instruments and the objectives. Equally citizen-based monitoring activities may take place outside of existing public participation structures, either through direct engagement with citizens, or through engagement with the findings from independently conducted monitoring by civil society and community organisations. The Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) has drafted a *Guide to Public Participation in the Public Service* to guide departments on how best to undertake public participation. This guide should be used to support the implementation of citizen-based monitoring through public participation structures. The PSC has also produced a number of useful guides to strengthening public participation, notably the Guide to Citizen Forums.

Organised civil society has an important role to play in supporting citizen-based monitoring, through its active and meaningful participation in capacitating citizens to articulate their needs and experiences and through providing additional capacity, resources and independent perspectives.

Engaging citizens and civil society in monitoring government performance can be expected to result in the following benefits:

- Enhance and complement government's performance monitoring systems
- Improve service-delivery
- Improve program effectiveness
- Improve public expenditure efficiency
- Strengthen institutions, processes and systems
- Greater trust in government and public confidence

#### **1.4 The problem statement**

The overall problem statement that this framework seeks to address is:

The participation of citizens in monitoring government service delivery is ad hoc and in many sectors not present. It is currently not valued as a way to enhance the efficiency and productiveness of service delivery.

- **Monitoring systems and practices of sector departments are largely dependent on government monitoring itself.** In 2010 Government adopted an evidence-based performance monitoring approach to support the achievement of the 12 Presidential Outcomes. This saw the signing of delivery agreements by government departments and an intensified focus on building capacity in government to monitor and report on performance. There are a number of targets in the delivery agreements that relate to service delivery. Currently these targets are being monitored by the responsible government department and reported to Cabinet. However the absence of mechanisms to systematically collect and analyse the views of the intended beneficiaries is a risk to government, since the credibility of the internal government monitoring information is not verified through an external check.
- **Weak or absent citizen-government monitoring mechanisms at service delivery site level:** The more than 250 unannounced monitoring visits conducted at frontline service sites by DPME, together with the Offices of the Premier in the period June 2011 to September 2012 revealed the widespread absence of citizen-government monitoring mechanisms as well as a “compliance approach” by officials to the use of tools such as complaint systems. Whilst satisfaction surveys, complaints boxes and call centres may have been present, the accountability and responsiveness to citizens was weak and the systematic use of information from these tools for improvements was poor. These findings are supported by monitoring and research undertaken by the Public Service Commission.

- ***This lack of responsiveness at the service delivery level*** means that citizens bypass local complaints and participation systems and appeal to senior political leadership for assistance. This overloads mechanisms of last resort such as the Presidential Hotline, as increasingly citizens use these as a first line of appeal. Alternatively some citizens turn to violent protest to attract the attention of government. The Public Service Commission has made several findings on the weak and ad-hoc nature of public participation in the public service and recommended that policy and standards setting were needed.
- ***Low levels of trust*** currently exist between organised civil society and government around service delivery monitoring. This results in a confrontational climate and lost opportunities to harness the capacity of civil society to partner constructively with government to improve service delivery. The National Development Plan highlights the need to make citizen engagement more meaningful to build an active citizenry and a capable and developmental state. Recommendations to do this include focusing more on routine accountability and engaging with citizens in their own spaces.

### ***1.5 Aims of this framework***

The overall aim of this framework is to institutionalise citizen-based monitoring in the monitoring and performance management of government in order to support on-going improvements to what, how and why services are delivered to our people.

The framework further aims to:

- Highlight that the views of citizens are critical to getting a full picture of government performance
- Lay the foundation for a programme, championed by The Presidency, to strengthen the voice of citizens in monitoring that will promote structured approaches for building citizen-government monitoring partnerships focused on services that directly affect quality of life
- Clarify the role of government in promoting citizen-based monitoring (CBM): Government will create enabling conditions for this and take this feedback into account in the planning and implementation of service delivery programmes

## **1.6 Legal and policy basis for this framework**

South Africa's democracy is founded on principles of accountable governance and public participation. Section 195 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996) outlines the principles to which the public administration must adhere. These include:

- a) A high standard of professional ethics must be promoted and maintained.
- b) Efficient, economic and effective use of resources must be promoted.
- c) Public administration must be development-oriented.
- d) Services must be provided impartially, fairly, equitably and without bias.
- e) *People's needs must be responded to, and the public must be encouraged to participate in policy-making.*
- f) *Public administration must be accountable.*
- g) *Transparency must be fostered by providing the public with timely, accessible and accurate information.*

Monitoring the state's adherence to these constitutional principles requires approaches that are able to assess the reality of government services, as they are experienced by citizens.

One of the founding policy documents of the new South Africa - The Reconstruction and Development White Paper (1995) - sets a context for participatory governance in a democratic South Africa:

*"Irrespective of race or sex or age, or whether they are rural or urban, rich or poor, the people of South Africa must together shape their own future. Development is not about the delivery of goods to a passive citizenry. It is about involvement and growing empowerment .... The Government therefore commits itself to maximum transparency and inclusivity."* (1995:8)

The White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery (Batho Pele White Paper) (1997) provides a policy framework for a people-centred transformation of public service delivery and commits government to actively understanding and effectively responding to the needs of the people it serves.

*"Improving service delivery also calls for a shift away from inward-looking, bureaucratic systems, processes and attitudes, and a search for new ways of working which put the needs of the public first, is better, faster and more responsive to the citizens' needs. (1997:8)*

The White Paper on Local Government (1998), a policy document that laid the foundation of future developmental local government legislation, signals a clear intention of active citizen participation in local government and specifically service delivery and makes reference to the role of citizens in monitoring.

*“Municipalities should develop mechanisms to ensure citizen participation in policy initiation and formulation, and the monitoring and evaluation of decision-making and implementation. (1998:34)*

The Municipal Systems Act (2000) (Section 16(1) obliges municipalities to *“develop a culture of municipal governance that complements formal representative governance with a system of participatory governance and must for this purpose a) encourage, and create conditions for, the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality, including in (ii) the performance management system”*.

The 2001 Public Service Regulations (Part III C.1.) require executing authorities to *“establish and sustain a service delivery improvement programme for her or his department ... (b) containing consultation arrangements with the department’s actual and potential customers”*.

Similarly numerous sector specific policies and legislation establish the requirement for community participation and create structures and opportunities for citizen-based monitoring to be developed.

The Promotion of Access to Information Act (2000) and the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (2000) provide citizens with the legal right to access information held by government as well as to explanations before and after administrative decisions.

As a signatory to the Open Government Partnership (OGP) (2011), the South African government is further committed to supporting transparency and increasing civic participation in governance. The country action plan includes measures to strengthen *“mechanisms for meaningful citizen engagement in service delivery improvements and policy development processes”*. This framework contributes realising South Africa’s commitments under this partnership. Equally the African Union’s Peer Review Mechanism requires an active role for citizens in monitoring government performance.

Similarly the DPSA is developing a Guide to Public Participation in the Public Service, as referenced earlier. This guide takes forward the 2008 recommendations by the Public Service Commission on the need for government departments *“to take public participation seriously and to develop their own sector-specific guides on public participation”*.<sup>4</sup>

The National Development Plan (2012) highlights the need to improve state-citizen relations at the point of service delivery and positions this in terms of routine accountability, arguing for the delegation of authority to frontline managers to enable this.

---

<sup>4</sup> Guide to Public Participation in the Public Service (Undated:2)

*“Delegation presents an opportunity to strengthen mechanisms of routine accountability, enabling the state to be more responsive to public concerns. Service delivery protests stem from citizens’ frustration that the state is not responsive to their grievances. This is unfortunate, as citizens are often best placed to advise on the standard of public services in their communities and to suggest possible interventions.” (2012:427)*

Monitoring and evaluation, in terms of policy, is informed by the Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (2007), The Outcomes Approach (2010), the National Evaluation Policy Framework (2012), as well as M&E frameworks developed by National Treasury and other government departments.

## **2. WHAT IS CITIZEN-BASED MONITORING?**

### **2.1 Defining citizen-based monitoring**

Citizen-based monitoring (CBM) is an approach to monitoring government performance that focuses on the experiences of ordinary citizens in order to strengthen public accountability and drive service delivery improvements. It requires citizens to be active participants in shaping what is monitored, how the monitoring is done and what interpretations and actions are derived from the data.

Many definitions of citizen-based monitoring are possible and citizen-based monitoring can be applied to a range of contexts – from frontline service delivery monitoring for improvements and public accountability; to assessing the impact and relevance of policy and legislation. The framework acknowledges that many of the approaches are shaped by a participatory research and learning tradition that reaches back to the 1970s; drawing on various international methods, including Participatory Action Research (Paolo Freire, Fals-Borda and others) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (Robert Chambers and others)<sup>5</sup>. Citizen-based monitoring also draws on the customer satisfaction approaches used by the private sector. It is shaped by a body of international and local experience and there are numerous established citizen-based monitoring methodologies and instruments. These range from client satisfaction surveys, grievance mechanisms (ombudsman, hotlines etc.), citizen report cards, web and SMS-based reporting tools, to facility level monitoring by

---

<sup>5</sup> Who Counts Reality” Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A Literature Review. Marisol Estrella and John Gaventa. IDS Working Paper 70: 1997

community members. What is common to all these approaches is that the citizen is central to the monitoring process.

Citizen-based monitoring can employ collective and/ or individual-driven accountability mechanisms. Some of the tools for monitoring and citizen feedback are targeted to individuals (surveys, call centres, complaints systems) while other instruments are more collective-oriented (social audits, public hearings). Different approaches suit different contexts and require different capacities and resources.

The impetus for involving citizens in monitoring comes from both the state and civil society. In terms of the state, public participation is established in law and policy as a cornerstone of democracy and numerous public participation and oversight mechanisms have been established at all levels of government. These include parliamentary oversight committees, various commissions, stakeholder forums, ward committees, clinic committees, community police forums, school governing bodies, community liaison officers etc. Initiatives such as Izimbizo, site visits and public hearings bring the state into contact with citizens around the performance of government. Many government departments undertake client satisfaction surveys, and hotlines and complaints mechanisms have been set up at various levels of government. All these mechanisms are aimed at strengthening the voice of citizens in the work of government, whether they are focused on the consultation or monitoring end of the public participation continuum. Public participation in monitoring service delivery and the performance of government however remains an important, yet underdeveloped aspect of public participation.

South Africa's civil society sector provides examples of independent monitoring of government performance. These range from national advocacy campaigns, public accountability institutes, research organisations, to community level organisations monitoring local service delivery issues.

This framework recognises that citizen-based monitoring can be driven by government departments (engaging directly with individual citizens); through partnerships with organised civil society; and undertaken as independent civil society initiatives.

Although CBM can refer to the broad range of tools and approaches for obtaining the views of citizens, this framework aims to strengthen the voice of ordinary people in their day to day engagements with service providers, particularly at the facility level where the service is delivered. The National Development Plan describes this as routine, or bottom up accountability (as opposed to hierarchical accountability) where the users of a service are

able to influence how that service is delivered by inputting and engaging directly at the point of delivery. Citizen-based monitoring mechanisms are an important way to drive and strengthen routine accountability. Where customer care systems are in place, citizen-based monitoring can support the strengthening and accountability of these. Where they do not exist, citizen-based monitoring can create a demand for the establishment of customer care systems.

**Note:** The term citizen, as used in this framework, does not refer only to South African citizens. It refers to all people in South Africa who have a right to receive services, regardless of whether they hold South African citizenship or not.

## 2.2 Citizen-based monitoring instruments

The table that follows sets out a range of citizen-based monitoring methodologies that have been used both internationally and locally.

Instrument	Description of Instrument
<b>Citizen journalism</b>	Citizens collect, report, analyse and disseminate news and information. New media technologies such as media sharing websites and social networks have enabled citizen journalists to provide alternative news sources to conventional mainstream media. Citizen journalism can contribute to accountable service delivery.
<b>Citizen report card</b>	Citizen report card methodology uses surveys to enable citizens to assess the quality of public services and to use the information to advocate for improvements.
<b>Community monitoring</b>	Community members are trained to act as monitors of local services. The information is used to engage with government on improving problem areas.
<b>Community scorecards</b>	Community scorecard is based on identifying issues through facilitated focus group discussions with community members. This information is then analysed and used by citizens then engage with government service providers to address problems.
<b>Grievance redress mechanisms</b>	Complaints mechanisms, such as hotlines, customer feedback websites etc., aim to resolve problems with service delivery through providing an opportunity for citizens to report problems, channel this information to the responsible authority and track resolution.
<b>Independent budget analysis</b>	A process where civil society stakeholders research, monitor and disseminate information about public expenditure to influence the allocation of public resources and hold government accountable.

<b>Mobile Phone Surveys</b>	Mobile phone technology, linked to on-line platforms, offers a number of opportunities for surveying, reporting and communicating - significantly improving data processing, turnaround time and reach for monitoring government services.
<b>Mystery client/guest surveys</b>	A way to monitor frontline service delivery using an unannounced surveyor posing as a client in order to identify both good customer service as well as areas that require improvement.
<b>Ombudsman</b>	An independent oversight and recourse body set up to arbitrate disputes in a particular sector.
<b>Participatory budgeting</b>	A process through which citizens participate directly in budget formulation, decision-making, and monitoring of budget execution.
<b>Public Hearings</b>	Formal meetings at community level that centre around budgets and strategic planning and are a tool for citizen accountability.
<b>Quantitative Service Delivery Surveys</b>	These surveys examine the efficacy of spending and the relationship between those who contract for a service and those who deliver it.
<b>Social audit</b>	A monitoring process through which organizational or project information is collected, analysed and shared publicly, and investigative findings are shared and discussed publicly.
<b>Transparency Portals</b>	These are websites that publish public financial information, thereby increasing transparency by conveying large amounts of information to those with internet access.

## 2.3 Current practices in South Africa

This section presents a selection of brief case studies which illustrate various approaches to involving citizens in monitoring in South Africa. These range from client surveys aimed at determining national trends, local platforms aimed at improving communication for resolving local service delivery challenges, to trained community monitors. They show the range of approaches that can be used for citizen-based monitoring.

### 2.3.1 Community monitoring – CMAP

<p><b>How is the monitoring done?</b></p>	<p>The Community Monitoring Advocacy programme (CMAP) was initiated by the Black Sash, a national NGO, together with the Social Change Assistance Trust. Working with over 300 community organisations, the project trained community monitors to monitor basic services in their communities, using standard questionnaires to record the experiences of citizens on a range of indicators. This information is analysed centrally and compiled into reports, which are then used for advocacy and engagement with stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>What are the mechanisms for citizen/government interaction?</b></p>	<p>A range of mechanisms emerged as the project developed. The most successful was with SASSA, where supportive relationships were built at a number of levels, from site level, up to the CEO's office. For example when provincial reports were submitted, meetings were convened with SASSA, the Black Sash, SCAT and community monitors. This resulted, at times, in detailed improvement plans being developed by SASSA, based on the recommendations. At the national level there has been regular interaction with SASSA officials. Similarly at the site and district levels working partnerships developed to tackle problems.</p>
<p><b>How are the findings communicated back to citizens?</b></p>	<p>Communicating the finding of the monitoring back to the citizens is the responsibility of the monitors. This has been varying in success, as the monitors need to create the opportunities for this in a resource constrained environment. The Black Sash has provided field support to monitors to improve this aspect of the project. The findings of the monitoring are made available on the Black Sash's website and through the media.</p>
<p><b>How is the data used to influence service delivery improvements?</b></p>	<p>At the site level real time improvements are effected as the monitors engage with officials and immediately follow up on problems.</p> <p>The data produced though the monitoring is used as evidence by Black Sash to engage with government at a strategic level around service delivery improvements. The monitors have had big impact in educating citizens on their rights and in so doing increase their power to demand better services and to know what the opportunities for recourse are.</p>

<b>Challenges and Limitations</b>	Whilst primary health care facilities; Home Affairs offices, and municipal services were also monitored, formal permission to monitor was not attained, and outcomes were less significant because of limited engagement with government officials, other than SASSA. The impact of the monitoring on service delivery can be limited if the buy-in from government departments is not achieved. A lack of funding to cover out of pocket expenses of the monitors can be a major limitation, particularly in poor communities.
-----------------------------------	---

### 2.3.2 Citizen journalists monitor and report on clinics – Our Health

<b>How is the monitoring done?</b>	The Our Health citizen journalism project creates a platform for ordinary people to share their experiences of public health and creates a distribution network for these stories through the media. The project, which is in its piloting stage, trains community members in basic journalism skills to report on local health services and issues. The project utilises smart phones for recording and reporting stories which are sent to a web portal for further editing and distribution by Health-e News, a non-profit health news agency.
<b>What are the mechanisms for citizen/government interaction?</b>	The project enables engagement between citizens and officials at a health facility level and increases citizen power in this interaction through access to the mainstream media. The health minister praised the project, describing it as being able to provide eyes and ears for the soon to be established Health Ombudsman.
<b>How are the findings communicated back to citizens?</b>	The project views itself as building an information platform. Stories and issues will be available through a range of technologies – from a website to a Mixit platform. The project does not aim to provide routine feedback to citizens at the clinic level, except where deemed necessary.
<b>How does the monitoring support service delivery improvements?</b>	The citizen journalists are empowered to look for issues that require attention or improvement and to make these known. This increases the power of citizens to hold service providers to account. The ability to alert oversight bodies, such as the Health Ombudsman, to problems, as well the media, provides an incentive to find solutions to problems that might otherwise be tolerated by passive users and unmotivated staff. The project moves from the premise that both praise and criticism of officials through the media drive service delivery improvements.
<b>Limitations and challenges</b>	The project is still in its infancy so limitations and challenges are yet to emerge. Initial challenges relate to securing project funding and achieving a widespread coverage of clinics.

## 2.2.4 SAPS perception survey – Victims of Crime Survey

<b>How is the monitoring done?</b>	The survey interviewed approximately 30,000 households across South Africa on a wide range of issues relating to perceptions and experiences of crime and policing. The survey was conducted on behalf of the South African Police Service by Statistics South Africa.
<b>What are the mechanisms for citizen/government interaction?</b>	The satisfaction survey methodology is focused on getting information from citizens for the purpose of analysing trends. Apart from the interaction between the field researcher and the respondent there are no other mechanisms created for interaction between the citizens and SAPS as part of the survey.
<b>How are the findings communicated back to citizens?</b>	The findings are presented to citizens through the media and in a publically available report. The raw data will be made available to researchers who want to do further analysis.
<b>How is the data used to influence service delivery improvements?</b>	The information from the survey is used for planning and budgeting processes. It is not focused on addressing or providing redress on specific issues reported during the interviews. The impact on service delivery will therefore be felt through policy changes, budgeting and other top down processes. There is no mechanism for following up on specific issues uncovered through the interviews.
<b>Limitations and challenges</b>	There is no mechanism for following up on specific issues uncovered through the interviews. The potential for the findings not having an impact on service delivery is high, if the findings do not find their way into service delivery decision-making processes.

## 2.2.5 User forums for local water services – Raising Citizens Voice

<b>How is the monitoring done?</b>	The Raising Citizens Voice initiative focuses on the establishment of user platforms made up of community volunteers and municipal officials. These platforms meet on a monthly basis to raise, report on and discuss issues regarding water service delivery in the area. The community members are trained to understand water service delivery and to monitor issues such as leaks etc. The project has been rolled out in the Cape Town, eThekweni, Ekurhuleni and Msunduzi metros and supported by the Department of Water Affairs.
<b>What are the mechanisms for citizen/government interaction?</b>	The methodology explicitly focuses on creating the opportunity for citizens to engage with government officials through the establishment of user platforms. This creates the opportunity for communication, accountability and shared problem solving.
<b>How are the findings communicated back to citizens?</b>	The project's main focus is to provide a platform for communication between citizens and officials on issues and resolutions relating to water services. This is done through the user platforms.

<b>How is the data used to influence service delivery improvements?</b>	The approach supports improved service delivery through empowering citizens to monitor water services and hold officials accountable. At the same time community members are educated through the project to understand their part in efficient water services delivery. This includes reporting leaks and paying for services. The opportunity is created for on-going reporting to officials and to monitor responses to problems.
<b>Limitations and challenges</b>	In a number of instances the forums have not succeeded because they have not been supported by local politicians, who have perceived them as a threat. Without an active champion and dedicated resources to support the process, the forums are prone to collapse.

## 2.2.6 Public hearings - Public Service Commission

<b>How is the monitoring done?</b>	The Public Service Commission (PSC) identifies key issues confronting public administration through internal debate processes. Public hearings are then convened in different provinces where stakeholders, both citizens and government, come together to discuss specific experiences around the selected issue. The process has so far tackled the issue of 30 day payment of invoices to suppliers. The PSC advertises the public hearings through newspapers, banners and posters in government offices. It also does targeted inviting. The format is a two day meeting. The first day focuses on surfacing the issues from all sides. The second day creates an opportunity for resolution of specific issues.
<b>What are the mechanisms for citizen/government interaction?</b>	The Public Hearings are a mechanism for citizen/government interaction where government and citizens can raise problems and hear each other around important issues.
<b>How are the findings communicated back to citizens?</b>	A report, with recommendations, is compiled based on the Public Hearings and tabled in parliament. It is also made available on the Public Service Commission's website. The issue of feedback to citizens is however identified as an area that requires more attention
<b>How is the data used to influence service delivery improvements?</b>	The Public Hearings allow for an in-depth engagement on an issue that is affecting service delivery. The issue is understood from both government and citizens' perspective. Recommendations for resolution of issues are tabled in parliament and the PSC engages with the executive as well as relevant departments.
<b>Challenges and limitations</b>	Accessibility is limited due to a limited number of hearings. Improvements depend on PSC recommendations being followed. PSC cannot enforce their recommendations. Specific issues may not be resolved.

### 2.2.7 Grievance mechanism – Presidential Hotline

<b>How is the monitoring done?</b>	The Presidential Hotline is a call centre that is set up to receive complaints from citizens who have not been able to get resolution at a local level. The complaints are forwarded to the relevant departments for resolution and tracked by staff at the Hotline.
<b>What are the mechanisms for citizen/government interaction?</b>	The Presidential Hotline enables citizens to seek redress via the Presidency when other redress mechanisms are either not available or are not providing resolution.
<b>How are the findings communicated back to citizens?</b>	Citizens are kept informed of progress in resolving their issue until the issue has been resolved.
<b>How is the data used to influence service delivery improvements?</b>	The Hotline enables the resolution of specific problems through delegation to the responsible government department. The complaints are analysed for trends and issues and regular performance reports are presented to Cabinet. This provides useful performance management data to drive service delivery improvements.
<b>Challenges and limitations</b>	High call volumes can result in not all callers being able to access the service. Time taken to resolve cases is dependent on responsiveness of sector departments.

### 2.2.8 SMS reporting system – Impilo!

<b>How is the monitoring done?</b>	The Impilo! system uses free cell phone messaging (USSD - Unstructured Supplementary Service Data) to enable people to complete online surveys about services they receive at a particular facility, as well as get referrals about services. The system has been developed through a partnership between University of KwaZulu-Natal, the Clear (Centre for Learning, Evaluation and Research (Wits)), Black Sash and a Wireless Access Service Provider (ATT). Black Sash has adopted Impilo! to supplement paper surveys for its community monitoring.
<b>What are the mechanisms for citizen/government interaction?</b>	This depends on who is using the system. The system provides an efficient mechanism for receiving, processing and communicating information. In the case of the Black Sash the system allowed for a major reduction in time taken to generate reports. The system is used by community monitors in place of paper surveys. Using a cell phone and an online database to collect data means that the information is simultaneously available to a range of audiences.

<b>How are the findings communicated back to citizens?</b>	The system is designed to use the feedback to rate facilities. When a referral is requested a user rating accompanies the message. It is possible for citizens to access the findings via a website. The system could also be configured to send back a response when data is entered
<b>How is the data used to influence service delivery improvements?</b>	This again depends on how the system is being used. Potentially the system offers the possibility of the data being used at a number of levels in a system, from the frontline facility to national policy department.
<b>Challenges and limitations</b>	It is necessary for new users to receive training on the purpose, benefits and specifics of using the system. This training will require resources and management. This investment will be higher at the start-up phase until a critical mass of users is familiar with and interested in using the system. Technological expertise is required to run the back end of the system and as such is dependent on the right skills being available when required. Given the high levels of cell phone penetration in South Africa, access to the technology from a user perspective is not a limitation.

These case studies provide South African examples of citizen-based monitoring, initiated by both government and civil society. They present a range of approaches. Some, like the Presidential Hotline and Impilo!, engage citizens as individuals. Others, like the Public Hearings and Raising Citizens Voice, work with groups of citizens.

The implementation of this framework, which forms the focus of Part B, will draw on the approaches and lessons learnt from these and other projects.

## PART B – STRENGTHENING CITIZEN-BASED MONITORING IN SOUTH AFRICA

The aim of this framework is to promote citizen-based monitoring as an essential component of monitoring for improved government performance. This second part of the framework is focused on supporting citizen-based monitoring as a practice in South Africa. It sets out principles, essential elements, considers roles and responsibilities, risks, models for piloting, and finally describes a three year timeline of activities to support the emergence of CBM as a practice.

### 3. PRINCIPLES

#### ***3.1 As a democratic nation, the voice of citizens is integral to building a capable, developmental state in South Africa***

This first principle is derived from the Constitution which requires that people's needs must be responded to; the public must be encouraged to participate in policy-making; public administration must be accountable and transparency must be fostered by providing the public with timely, accessible and accurate information.

#### ***3.2 Government monitoring systems need to include the views and experiences of citizens***

Government monitoring systems are regarded as incomplete without mechanisms to incorporate the views of citizens on service delivery - mechanisms that will enable the verification of internally produced monitoring findings. In assessing the quality of information used for performance monitoring, departments should also assess whether the information has been verified using independent citizen monitoring mechanisms. These mechanisms need to be methodologically sound, ensure independence and relevance and be agreed to by stakeholders.

#### ***3.3 Government departments must encourage independent monitoring by civil society***

Citizens have a right and a responsibility to monitor government, even when this is a cause for discomfort within government. It is a necessary check and balance and is required for healthy democracy. Government institutions should know the civil society monitoring initiatives that are operating in their sectors and create platforms to regularly engage on findings and approaches. This engagement should be at an appropriate level and include government decision makers to ensure that research findings influence service delivery

improvements where problems are identified. The risk that civil society organisations can be used to pursue party political agendas needs to be wisely managed, without losing sight of the valuable role played by civil society in a democratic society.

### ***3.4 Citizen-based monitoring is not simply about data collection, it is an on-going process of relationship building and performance improvement***

Citizen-based monitoring is about building a relationship of trust between citizens and government around the improvement of government services. Citizen-based monitoring mechanisms should provide predictable and systematised opportunities for citizens to provide feedback on issues that are relevant to them, not only to provide insights into service delivery but also to improve services at a local level. Citizen-based monitoring must be accountable, credible and locally driven.

### ***3.5 Citizen participation in planning strengthens citizen participation in monitoring***

The involvement of citizens in monitoring is influenced by the extent to which they have participated in, and are informed of, the programmes planned for implementation, the resources committed and expected deliverables. This means that the process should start with consultations, mobilization and dialogues which will inform the development of plans and establish the basis for effective citizen involvement in monitoring of services. It also follows that citizen involvement in monitoring will strengthen citizen involvement in the next cycle of planning. It is important that monitoring is linked to planning processes.

### ***3.6 Citizen-based monitoring must form an integral part of service delivery improvement plans and management decision-making processes***

Citizen-based monitoring must form part of the business processes of service delivery and improvement plans. Information produced through CBM should be regarded as a core component of the service delivery value chain and should be used by managers and planners in planning and budgeting processes, both at the frontline level as well as higher up in the system. CBM needs to be institutionalized through training and should form part of performance expectations of staff to ensure that findings feed into decision-making.

In terms of development of Service Delivery Improvement Plans (SDIP), all national and provincial levels of government responsible for the implementation of the Public Service Act and Regulations are expected to display their service charter and standards to make it easier for stakeholders to monitor performance. Mechanisms should be in place to monitor compliance to SDIPs and charters.

### ***3.7 Monitoring mechanisms should be workable and suit the context in which they are applied***

Citizen participation in monitoring is a core requirement of effective service delivery. It is not a nice-to-have. This means that mechanisms must be workable, funded and integrated in core business processes. As such the mechanisms should not be overly complicated and ambitious. They should be appropriate to the context in which they are deployed and sustainable in terms of the available resources and skills. This requires investment in the design and testing of mechanisms before going to scale, as well as change management strategies, and monitoring and evaluation of implementation.

### ***3.8 Monitoring findings and planned improvements need to be communicated to citizens timeously***

Citizens need to be part of a feedback loop. It is essential that the system for compiling and distributing reports is efficient and has a quick turn-around. Accountability and feedback about how the information is used for decision-making by departments can help build trust between citizens and government. Feedback should include details of corrective actions to be taken, timeframes and who is responsible.

### ***3.9 Communication strategies must be informed by the target audience***

Communication should be appropriate to the people it is aimed at. Websites are useful for users who have access to computers and the internet, but not for people who do not use these media. The choice of language is also a factor to be considered, as well as levels of literacy and communications norms. Where appropriate, community radio should also be considered, as it remains a powerful means of communication and information dissemination. The key is to include the users in the design of the feedback system in order to understand what works for them. Each citizen-based monitoring plan should explicitly consider the communication requirements for success. This includes communicating about the service delivery programme, planned improvements, a timeline for improvements and opportunities for citizens to monitor. Communication should also demonstrate how the department and facility will receive information and how it will use the information; how it will ensure that the data gets to decision makers; how it will communicate the monitoring results back to users; and how it will share lessons, experiences and successes.

## **4. ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS FOR CBM PRACTICES IN GOVERNMENT**

For citizen-based monitoring practices to be mainstreamed into the business processes of government, these elements should be present:

### ***4.1 At the service site level***

Citizen-based monitoring at service site (facility) level requires the following elements:

- 1) Citizens know and understand what service levels they can expect at the facility
- 2) Citizens are able to provide routine feedback on service delivery problems
- 3) Managers are empowered to take decisions and access resources to respond to issues revealed through monitoring
- 4) This information is regularly analysed and acted on by managers and decision-makers
- 5) Citizens are regularly informed of the monitoring findings and changes that are taking place as a result
- 6) Citizens have access to a recourse and complaints mechanism if agreed actions to improve the situation are not implemented

### ***4.2 At the district/regional/provincial oversight and support level***

Offices responsible for oversight, budgeting and support of frontline service delivery need to have the following elements in place:

- 1) Routine mechanisms for obtaining views from citizens at service sites
- 2) Clarity on the methods for collecting, recording and storing information
- 3) Mechanisms for analysing and using CBM data for policy and systems improvements (e.g. comparison of how actual services delivered compare with local plans – such as Integrated Development Plans or District Health Plans; assessments of Annual Performance Plans against citizen-based monitoring findings)
- 4) Mechanisms for ensuring that frontline managers are able to respond timeously and effectively to problems identified through monitoring
- 5) Mechanisms to use CBM findings for planning and resourcing at the site level
- 6) Mechanisms for getting citizen input on what indicators are being monitored
- 7) Plans for regular monitoring of the CBM systems and evaluation of the impact of citizens' involvement in monitoring
- 8) Assessment of the unintended consequences and risks; and plans for how these are mitigated
- 9) Phasing plan for introducing CBM at site level

10) Assessment of level of readiness of each facility

### **4.3 At programme planning and policy level**

Policy makers, planners and programme managers should:

- 1) Review M&E frameworks to include citizen-based monitoring (service delivery departments)
- 2) Incorporate evidence from citizen monitoring in planning
- 3) Incorporate citizen-based monitoring feedback mechanisms in programme design, implementation and impact assessment phases
- 4) Use citizen-based monitoring mechanisms to identify systemic problems that require policy interventions
- 5) Assess the effectiveness of existing policy instruments against the experiences of citizens, identify gaps in policy instruments and make recommendations to address these
- 6) Highlight the benefits of implementing CBM

## **5. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **5.1 Government institutions**

**The Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation** acts as custodian of this framework and will provide advisory and technical support to government departments in adjusting their M&E practices. It will provide technical and funding support to a small number of service delivery departments to incorporate CBM approaches into the service delivery value chain. DPME will focus on strengthening government's ability to engage with civil society to achieve constructive partnerships around monitoring for service delivery improvements. DPME will also provide a knowledge and learning hub for good practices in CBM and assist the PALAMA (Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy) and other training entities, if required, to build capacity to provide appropriate training and incorporate good practices into training materials..

**Offices of the Premier** should introduce citizen-based monitoring into their M&E strategies and practices and support the uptake of CBM by provincial departments and local government.

**Sector Departments** which deliver services directly to the public have the responsibility to incorporate citizen-based monitoring into their performance monitoring and management and ensure that:

- M&E frameworks are updated to include facilitating citizen monitoring and using the information for decision-making
- Management actively encourages independent data sources as a necessary management strategy and budgets for this
- Relevant staff are trained in CBM approaches and on how to use this as a source of evidence in decision-making
- Results of CBM are used to inform planning and decision-making
- All CBM systems and tools have feedback mechanisms to ensure that information is not only received from citizens but that there is accountability and responsiveness to citizens

**The Department of Public Service and Administration** should, through the monitoring of Service Delivery Improvement Plans and other public service administration oversight activities, ensure that tools such as complaint systems and surveys are implemented in a manner that strengthens government's responsiveness and accountability to users.

**The Public Service Commission** should continue its independent oversight function and continue to do occasional studies to assess the quality of CBM practices in government.

**Local Government and supporting institutions** should work with civil society organisations to give effect to the requirements of the Municipal Systems Act to create mechanisms for citizen participation in monitoring of decision-making and implementation.

## **5.2 Civil society**

Civil society is made up of a variety of actors - multi-stakeholder coalitions, specialist professional formations, community organisations, faith-based organisations, advocacy groups, issue-based campaigns, non-governmental organisations and trade unions. Depending on their orientation, focus, resources and skills these formations can perform a range of roles in 1) raising awareness of what citizens should expect in terms of government services, 2) the mechanisms through which to raise issues, 3) compiling and analysing citizen feedback, 4) supporting the incorporation of CBM findings into decision-making on service delivery 5) enabling the communication of CBM findings back to the service users and 6) monitoring the implementation of improvement plans and commitments. Organised civil society in South Africa possesses a wealth of skills and knowledge. Civil society can play a role in supporting the capacitation of citizens and the state as well as build the

capacities of other stakeholders such as community media to understand how they can amplify the voice of the communities in service delivery.

Civil society is encouraged to develop, implement and test citizen-based monitoring approaches and engage government at all three spheres to promote uptake of viable models. It is further encouraged to review successes and experiences of implemented models, participate in setting benchmarks, analysing data and publishing findings.

## 6. RISKS AND MITIGATION STRATEGIES

The table below sets out risks and mitigation strategies identified for implementing citizen-based monitoring in South Africa. This is not an exhaustive risk analysis and a risk assessment will be required for each specific context.

Risk	Mitigation
<b>Monitoring results in data, but no improvement in performance</b>	Systematic incorporation of citizens' feedback (e.g. on service-delivery, etc.) and continuous monitoring to assess performance, ideally even ex-post evaluations would be helpful to maximize the benefits of the chosen approach. Careful change management – investment in early pilots to investigate cost effective change management approaches. M&E of the implementation progress and rapid adjustment to changes can help maximize the impact of citizen-based monitoring.
<b>Instruments chosen for implementing citizen-based monitoring do not suit the South African reality</b>	The framework sets out a phased approach to strengthening citizen-based monitoring, working with a limited group of sector departments to develop, test and refine mechanisms and approaches, before moving to upscale and expand. A gradual approach, starting with certain sectors, specific services, or specific geographic areas is expected to be more cost-effective and ensure closer tailoring to both government and citizens' needs.
<b>Poor co-ordination results in obstacles to implementation</b>	A cross-sectoral technical working group, to oversee the design and implementation of the pilot project, will be established to help bring greater buy-in across sectors or at different levels in a sector. Effective coordination with civil society implies designing the instruments, not for civil society and citizens, but with them and engaging with them at all stages of the process through a participatory process. Effective inter-governmental coordination across sectors, as well as effective coordination with civil society and other actors will be key to building alliances, enhancing implementation success and sustainability.

<p><b>No uptake or interest in using citizen-based monitoring instruments by citizens and/or officials.</b></p>	<p>Specific incentives for the use of the instruments for sectors, as well as civil society and citizens, will be investigated as well as possible disincentives for non-use. The use of mobile phones and other new technologies can further expand access, add additional incentives, and help reduce time and costs. Working with the media can multiply awareness of the instruments and further encourage their use.</p>
<p><b>Unrealistic expectations result in frustration</b></p>	<p>The implementation of CBM needs to manage expectations in a realistic way. The approach should be to start small and scale up gradually. Expectations need to be managed from the start. CBM mechanisms are not magic instruments, but require careful design and implementation to be effective.</p>
<p><b>Political rivalry and local power struggles threaten the viability of citizen-based monitoring</b></p>	<p>Introducing the concept, how it is introduced, and by whom needs careful consideration since it may heighten suspicions and increase tensions in politically contested communities. A stakeholder analysis should be conducted before introducing a CBM process to understand and militate against these risks, both through community processes and the selection of the monitoring instrument/approach.</p>
<p><b>Tensions around what should/should not be monitored</b></p>	<p>Indicators need to be established through participatory processes that involve all relevant stakeholders. These processes need to provide transparency on what indicators will be measured, why they are being measured and how the measurement will be done.</p>
<p><b>Cultural, social and physical barriers prevent citizens from making negative experiences known</b></p>	<p>The design and choice of CBM instruments and the way they are introduced need take into account social, cultural and physical barriers that may prevent people (particularly vulnerable sectors of a community - elderly, women, disabled, youth, illiterate, immigrants etc.) from being comfortable or able to giving their real views on service delivery. These perspectives may be overlooked unless conscious provision is made to seek them out in ways that are most suited to the marginalised voices.</p>
<p><b>Lack of political and bureaucratic support and commitment for CBM, with findings interpreted as criticism</b></p>	<p>The risk of fluctuations in the commitment of decision-makers for CBM, particularly if the findings are interpreted as criticism as well shuffling of government officials and politicians (CBM champions) during election periods etc. needs to be managed. The establishment of multi-stakeholder forums involving senior stakeholders can provide continuity and together with on-going communication and profile building, can mitigate against this risk. Demonstrating and communicating improvements in service delivery can assist where there may be a disconnect between strong political will from the top and resistance from middle-level bureaucrats.</p>

## 7. IMPLEMENTING THE FRAMEWORK

The implementation of this CBM framework will be based on lessons learnt from a selected number of pilots. The pilots will be designed and implemented through partnerships with the Departments of Safety and Security (SAPS), Social Development and Health, as well as civil society organisations. This will be supported by research and additional support activities to enable broader uptake of field-tested CBM methodologies.

It is acknowledged that the work to mainstream citizen-based monitoring in South Africa will need to extend beyond the three year programme described in this framework. The plan is presented as the beginning of a longer journey.

### **7.1 Capacity and support needs**

Implementing this framework requires an understanding of the capacity and support needs for strengthening citizen participation in monitoring. The following focus areas are identified:

**Training** – Training approaches and materials will be developed and refined, based on an action learning approach. Training agencies, such as PALAMA and others, will be approached to upscale and mainstream training for CBM.

**Partnerships** - Building partnerships and strengthening collaboration between government, advocacy-oriented civil society organizations, think tanks and universities is required. A space for dialogue and trust among these various actors will be needed as much as technical capacity building on monitoring issues.

**Change management** - Effecting changes to how departments do their work, based on feedback from citizens will require change management. This will require skilled expertise. The approach to focus on limited piloting will allow for needs to be quantified and responded to. A change management strategy will be designed for the pilots to support the roll-out of the chosen instrument and will inform the development of replicable approaches for up-scaling of this support.

**Indicators and tools** – Generic indicators and tools appropriate for specific sectors and situations will be developed. These indicators and tools will need to be adapted through participatory processes, to ensure that local priorities are responded.

**Political support** – Political champions, both local and national, will need to be identified and enrolled to support the strengthening of citizen involvement in monitoring. Cabinet approval for this framework is the starting point for this political buy-in.

**Communication and media** - In order to amplify success and build consensus around the importance of citizen involvement in monitoring, a communication strategy will be developed for the three year programme described in this framework.

## ***7.2 Piloting CBM in selected departments***

Building on emerging practices, the key service delivery departments of Health, Safety and Security and Social Development will collaborate with DPME to incorporate CBM into their M&E systems and to strengthen the routine use of CBM information for performance improvements. This will be done through a piloting approach, starting with a small number of facilities and an intensive effort to test and refine approaches (Phase 1), before up-scaling to a bigger pilot (Phase 2) to test the replicability of models evolved in Phase 1. Phase 2 will focus on mainstreaming citizen-based monitoring approaches in SAPS and the Departments of Health and Social Development, as well as expanding to other departments and functions.

Approximately 10 sites around South Africa will be chosen for the pilot, which will run from September 2013 to March 2015. The selection of these sites will be based on criteria developed by DPME, the participating departments and selected civil society organisations. These sites will offer a diverse set of socio-economic and geographic conditions, including urban, rural, mining communities etc., as well as communities with high and low social cohesion indicators.

### **7.2.1 Preliminary model for piloting**

The model that will be tested has four equally important focus areas: (i) Tools that are used to gather monitoring data, (ii) processes to analyse this data, (iii) the selection and implementation of actions to respond to the analysis and (iv) feedback to various stakeholders, including citizens, facility officials and the performance monitoring system. The model is focused at the facility (service site) level.

The piloting process will test various approaches to implementing the model at facilities in the three sectors. The piloting in each sector will be guided by a steering committee made up of sector department officials, DPME and civil society expertise. This will be a key learning platform for the pilots. Broader stakeholder gatherings will also be convened to guide the implementation and refinement of the framework. These meetings will provide a platform for knowledge sharing. In addition case studies will be developed and distributed and other learning opportunities will be developed.

The assumption underpinning the model is that if opportunities are created for citizens to routinely give input on services, and platforms for engagement on this data with responsible officials are created, this will drive on-going improvements to how services are delivered.

This will also contribute to the emergence of constructive partnerships between citizens, civil society and government. It is also assumed that evidence-based feedback from the frontline will support the unblocking of problems higher up in the value chain. The pilot will provide an opportunity to test these assumptions, using different methods and tools.

The table below briefly outlines possible approaches for each of the target sectors:

Sector	Existing Participation Platforms/Mechanisms	Proposed Focus for Pilot Project
Safety and Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Police Forums (CPF)</li> <li>• CPF Clusters Forums</li> <li>• Provincial Boards</li> </ul>	Use citizen-based monitoring to strengthen monitoring of certain SAPS performance indicators, as well as identify community perceptions on policing and crime.
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clinic Committees</li> <li>• Hospital Boards</li> <li>• District Health Councils</li> </ul>	Develop citizen-based monitoring tools and methods to support the work of the Office of Health Standards Compliance.
Social Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complaints lines</li> <li>• Satisfaction Surveys</li> <li>• Pension committees</li> <li>• CMAP</li> </ul>	Piloting CBM at SASSA service and pay points to build and strengthen existing experiences with CBM. An additional pilot process will focus on ways to use CBM to monitor the provision of welfare services.

### 7.3 Three year timeline for implementing the framework

A series of activities will be undertaken under three interlinked focus areas over a three year period. The anticipated outputs and activities for each focus area are set out below:

	<b>CBM Policy Process</b>	<b>Pilot Projects</b>	<b>Knowledge Sharing</b>
Completed to date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Research into citizen-based monitoring practices</li> <li>✓ Consultation with key departments and CSOs</li> <li>✓ Draft framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Scoping meetings with selected departments, leading to commitments from DGs</li> <li>✓ CSO's in target sectors identified</li> <li>✓ Draft concepts developed for pilots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Workshop on existing practices</li> </ul>
2013/14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Research into funding mechanisms and opportunities for CBM</li> <li>- Analysis of existing M&amp;E frameworks and practices in target departments for inclusion of CBM</li> <li>- Work with PALAMA and other training providers on training for CBM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project steering committees for pilots established</li> <li>- Stakeholder analysis for pilots</li> <li>- Detailed participatory planning for each sector pilot</li> <li>- Baseline studies</li> <li>- Start-up activities for pilots</li> <li>- Pilots (Phase 1) implemented as per project plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring, evaluation and learning plan for pilots</li> <li>- CBM workshop on piloting approaches</li> <li>- Baseline case studies produced on pilot sites</li> </ul>
2014/15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised M&amp;E frameworks for targeted departments to include citizen-based monitoring</li> <li>- Progress reporting to Cabinet</li> <li>- Research findings and policy recommendations work-shopped with stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phase 1 pilots completed</li> <li>- Phase 2 pilots planned (roll out of refined models in larger sample of facilities)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact evaluations conducted on Phase 1 pilot projects</li> <li>- Close out case studies on Phase 1 pilots</li> <li>- Lesson sharing workshop and other lessons sharing activities</li> </ul>
2015/16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy recommendations report submitted to Cabinet</li> <li>- Amplification of findings from pilots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Phase 2 pilots implemented and reviewed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work with government departments to upscale workable CBM mechanisms emerging from piloting</li> </ul>