

# Presidential Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring

## FSD Mini-Case Study<sup>1</sup>

<b>Document Author</b>	Author Name: Dineo Mmako Organisation: DPME Telephone: 012 312 0328 Email: <a href="mailto:dineo@po-dpme.gov.za">dineo@po-dpme.gov.za</a> Co- Author Name: Rudzani Mudau Organisation: DPME Telephone: 012 312 Email: Rudzani.Mudau@po-dpme.gov.za	<b>Creation Date</b>	22 July 2013
<b>Document Owner</b>	DPME: FSDM		

**Case Study Title:** Provincial improvement and innovation in the implementation of FSDM programme, in the Free State Province

**Purpose:** The purpose of the study is to share with other FSDM stakeholders the beneficial innovative alternative in the implementation of the FSDM programme. It includes but not limited to effective and efficient management of the annual visits schedule, bridging the gap between facility management and top management as well as the support to other governmental programmes such as MPAT.

**Target Audience:** Department of the Premier, National Sector Departments, Provincial Sector Department and DPME

**Glossary:**

FSDM Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring  
 DPME Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation  
 FS Free State  
 DoP Department of the Premier  
 M&E Monitoring and Evaluation  
 MPAT Management Performance Assessment Tool  
 OBP Outcome Based Priorities

## 1 Basic Information

<b>Institution Name</b>	Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Unit, Department of the Premier: Free State
<b>Town</b>	Bloemfontein
<b>Municipality</b>	Mangaung Metro Municipality
<b>Province</b>	Free State
<b>Contact</b>	Name: Anton Hurter Department: Department of the Premier; Free State Tel: 051-405 4685 Cell: 079 499 0661

	Email: <a href="mailto:hurtera@premier.fs.gov.za">hurtera@premier.fs.gov.za</a> Name: Danster Duimpies Department: Department of the Premier; Free State Tel: 051-405 5498 Email: <a href="mailto:duimpiesd@premier.fs.gov.za">duimpiesd@premier.fs.gov.za</a>
Key Themes	<h1>Improvement and innovation</h1>

## 2 The Case Study Story

Background / Context:	<p>The Department of the Premier in Free State is carrying-out an innovative approach to the national approach for the implementation of the Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring. This case study is based on the positive impact that the approach has made in driving the improvement of service delivery at frontline facilities.</p>
Problem statement	<p>The FSDM programme is implemented in 9 provinces. DPME noticed the alternative approaches that some provinces are using to implement the programme for the same results if not more. It is important to share the impact that these approaches are having on the improvement of service delivery.</p>
Improvement and innovation	<p>DPME conducted an interview session with the Department of the Premier in FS to understand the thinking behind their approach. Below are the summarised findings:</p> <p><b>1. What prompted the Department of the Premier in Free State to implement the innovative approach, in support to the one suggested by DPME?</b></p> <p>The response was as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 They took their lead from DPME policy documents (Mandate, Strategy and Framework) as the baseline for innovations and improvements.</li> <li>1.2 They realised they needed to add value to the implementation of the FSDM programme, this is largely because most officials at the facilities have lost trust in the government monitoring systems, due to lack of report back or feedback after initial visits by monitors.</li> <li>1.3 They were given the opportunity to be one of the first provinces</li> </ol>

	<p>to pilot the FSDM programme. During implementation of the programme, they started seeing the gaps in the questionnaires that was used. They then started asking the “so what” questions as would any M&amp;E specialist, hence the initiative to review the questionnaire.</p> <p>1.4 Some of the innovations were practically identified by means of brain storming sessions. The initiative took by the officials in realising that cost containment measures at that time was not part of the process when unannounced visits were conducted. Two trips to the same frontline office (unannounced visit and the feedback visit) could have resulted fruitless expenditure and waste of government resources. So they did the baseline visit and a preliminary feedback with the facility management on the same day. Given the response they got back during the preliminary feedback they never looked back, hence their approach currently.</p> <p><b>2. The *Value-add*</b></p> <p>2.1 The sector specific standards that they have added to the questionnaires for example for schools, hospitals and licensing testing centres bear fruit. The inclusion of sector specific standards has ensured that the service delivery issues that are core to the facilities are addressed. Although not all sector specific standards but the few that they are monitoring have brought about change. For example in the DLTC’s they are asking about official visibility and since the initial findings, the traffic officials’ visibility has improved including road blocks.</p> <p>2.2 The introduction of the Sector Forums, (the Sector Forums for SASSA, Justice, Education, Health and Traffic are operational. For MCCC they are in consultation with COGTA to set up a Sector Forum for municipalities. For SAPS work is in progress to convene the first Sector Forum). The main purpose of the Sector Forums is to ensure sign-off and implementation of agreements of the intervention plan (improvement plans) with Point Managers mostly DDG or CD of the Sectors in the province, and this approach has;</p> <p>2.2.1 Introduced one sector meeting to address all the improvement plans of the facilities visited.</p> <p>2.2.2 Introduced a bridge for the gap that has always existed between facility management and top management.</p> <p>2.2.3 Ensured availability and involvement of sector representation to address and commit to the findings of all facilities visited not one facility at a time.</p> <p>2.2.4 Allowed for the improvement findings to be implemented at all facilities across the provinces. This ensures service delivery improvement across visited facilities and facilities not visited.</p>
--	---



Pic: Education sector forum meeting

2.3 Minimal resources (time and cost) used for visiting facilities as formal feedback is given at the Sector Forum meetings.

2.4 Group interview of citizens led to practical implementation of solutions. The said method has helped them in understanding the frustrations of the community not only citizens that are at a facility. For all complaints raised by citizens they asked them what can be done differently and amazingly so, they had the answers. For example queue management procedure – assign a number to service users (each citizen) when they visit a clinic and call them by the number to get the required service.

### 3. Drivers of improvement and innovations in the Free State

There is a team of two officials in the Department of the Premier namely Mr Anton Hurter and Mr Danster Duimpies, they are the drivers of this approach, under supervision of Mr Khorai Khorai.



From left: Mr Duimpies (FS coordinator), Ms Connie Mathlabe (FS coordinator), Ms Motsepe (DPME FS coordinator), Mr Hurter (FS coordinator).

### 4. Processes and procedure in implementing the improvements and innovations.

Refer to the attached process maps



Visio-Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Version 3 (2).pdf

	<p><b>5. When did implementation of the approach start?</b></p> <p>July 2012</p> <p><b>6. Views about this approach.</b></p> <p>Like with any change, there was resistance, but because we knew that the benefits outweigh the costs, we remained persistent. We are pleased that we did not give up, given the improvement that this approach as yielded.</p> <p><b>7. Visible improvements through the implementation of the FSDM programme in FS.</b></p> <p>7.1 Behavioural change (positive attitude) amongst the officials at frontline sites (the spirit of service delivery at frontline sites has ignited)</p> <p>7.2 Continuous engagement between, top management, facility management and frontline officers.</p>
<p><b>Positive Results</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reduction in time and cost associated with travelling logistics</li> <li>2. Fast tracking the implementation of the improvement plans</li> <li>3. Affording the facility manager an opportunity to respond to the findings at an early stage, before the finding are presented to regional managers</li> <li>4. Bridging the gap between top management and facility management</li> <li>5. Commitments to the improvement by top management</li> <li>6. Roll-out of the positive changes ( improvements) to all facilities</li> <li>7. Supporting the evidence of the Management Assessment Performance Tool (MPAT) programme and the Outcome Based Priorities (OBP)</li> <li>8. Finalising recommendation at sites (eliminating exchanges of opinion between DPME, Site Manager and DoP), before they finalise the summary report.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Challenges</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DPME representation during the sector forum meetings. The sector forum meetings are chaired by top management in the province, and will add value if the DPME can be present at the Sector Forums.</li> <li>2. Changes in monitors (Once-off monitors). The casual monitors are trained on how to use the tools, yet they have less understanding of what FSDM is and what it is all about. This is a challenge given the pre planning that is required for the success of the FSDM approach. Attach pre planning template.</li> <li>3. Monitoring the implementation of the signed improvement plans is now becoming a performance management issue that force the Executive Management of a Department to carefully strategizing on frontline service delivery activities.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Requirements to</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pre-planning (per unannounced pack) about the facility to be</li> </ol>

<p><b>replicate the solution</b></p>	<p>visited. This allows for hassle free preliminary feedback meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Research about the facility to be visited is critical to the approach.</li> <li>b. Understanding the facility budget, mandate, surroundings, plans, management (fact sheet) and organisational culture about is critical.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Buying-in by Heads of Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Units in other provinces.</li> <li>3. The involvement and participation of National Sector Department at Provincial Sector Forums</li> <li>4. The innovative approach to be aligned with the DPME approach</li> <li>5. Training of monitors to include the mandate of the programme, process mapping and its strategic objective.</li> <li>6. Mobile printers to be provided for monitors when visiting frontline offices for the printing of draft intervention Plans.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Lesson Learned</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Benefits of conducting baseline and feedback visits as one visit</li> <li>2. The importance of sharing findings with facilities supervisors, on the day of unannounced visit. This improves the relation between monitors and facility managers and creates ownership of improvement plans.</li> <li>3. Coordination and effective facilitation by officials in the FSDM Unit (Department of the Premier) in the implementation of the FSDM programme ensures practical implementation of Intervention plans at frontline offices.</li> <li>4. The importance of facilitating changes (developmental approach) in facilities by the FSDM Unit ensures continuity.</li> <li>5. Understanding the policies, strategies, Annual Performance plans and Acts that govern the frontline service delivery sites</li> <li>6. The importance of research and pre planning for unannounced visits</li> <li>7. The developmental approach by the FSDM Unit ensures positive attitude towards service delivery improvements at frontline offices</li> <li>8. The involvement of Executive Management (decisions makers) in signing-off of the improvement plans ensures accountability with the implementation of Intervention Plans.</li> <li>9. FSDM programme supports as baseline to other national and provincial priorities through coordination and integration objectives</li> </ol>

### 3 References

<p><b>Project Contacts:</b></p>	<p>Name: Mr Anton Hurter          Department: Department of the Premier: Free State          Tel: 051-405 4685          Email: <a href="mailto:hurtera@premier.fs.gov.za">hurtera@premier.fs.gov.za</a></p> <p>Name: Mr Danster Duimpies</p>
---------------------------------	--

	<p>Department: Department of the Premier: Free State  Tel: 051-405 5498  Email: <a href="mailto:duimpiesd@premier.fs.gov.za">duimpiesd@premier.fs.gov.za</a></p> <p>Author Name: Dineo Mmako  Department: DPME  Telephone: 012 – 312 0328  Email: <a href="mailto:dineo@po-dpme.gov.za">dineo@po-dpme.gov.za</a></p> <p>Co-Author's Name: Rudzani Mudau  Department: DPME  Telephone: 012 – 312 0340  Email: <a href="mailto:Rudzani.Mudau@po-dpme.gov.za">Rudzani.Mudau@po-dpme.gov.za</a></p>
<p><b>Further Reading:</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Department of the Premier: FS Process maps.</li> <li>2. Free State Provincial Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Strategy.</li> <li>3. Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring (FS): Defining Performance Areas.</li> <li>4. FSDM Programme Framework Plan 2012</li> </ol>

END

---