



THE PRESIDENCY  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

---

**REGIONAL WORKSHOP  
ON  
PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

**REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**

South Africa  
February 17 – 19, 2014

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction -----	4
2.	Objectives -----	5
3.	Participating Countries -----	5
4.	Opening by Organizers -----	5
5.	Welcoming and Opening Remarks-----	5
6.	Expectations -----	6
7.	Summary of Proceedings-----	7
8.	Topic 1: Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT) -----	7
9.	Topic 2: Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Programmes -----	9
	9.1 Facility-level monitoring of the quality of service delivery -----	9
	9.2 The Presidential Hotline -----	10
	9.3 Community-based monitoring (CBM)-----	11
10.	Topic 3: South Africa’s National Evaluation System -----	13
11.	Topic 3: Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation -----	14
	11.1 Outcomes Monitoring System -----	15
	11.2 Mid-Term Review-----	15
	11.3 Evaluations -----	15
	11.4 Development Indicators-----	15
	11.5 Twenty-Year Review -----	15
	11.6 Municipal Performance Assessment -----	16
	11.7 Siyahlola Presidential Projects-----	16
12.	Free State Provincial Presentation -----	16
13.	Negotiating Demand M&E: A commentary on the DPME systems-----	19
14.	Lessons on M&E in Africa -----	19

15.	Presentations by other African Countries-----	19
15.1	Mauritius -----	19
15.2	Mozambique -----	19
15.3	Botswana -----	20
15.4	Seychelles -----	21
15.5	Kenya -----	22
16.	Study Tours by Kenyan Delegation-----	24
11.1	Gauteng Office of the Premier-----	24
11.2	North West Office of the Premier -----	25
17.	Closing Remarks -----	26

**APPENDICES**

Annexure 1: Regional Workshop Agenda

Annexure 2: List of Delegates

## **1. Introduction**

Knowledge sharing is an important means for developing capacity and strategies on public sector monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to contribute to performance improvement. DPME values the use of evidence from research, evaluations, good practice M&E case studies, conferences, study-tours, stakeholder engagements that continually strengthen M&E systems. There is a growing interest among African Countries to learn from peer countries on the African Continent who have gained experience in implementing various M&E programs; as well as to benefit from global experiences.

It is against this background that the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME), in partnership with the World Bank co-hosted a Regional Workshop. The purpose of the Regional Workshop was to share South Africa's experiences of their M&E systems. In addition, the workshop was a platform to stimulate exchange of information between the respective African countries on their M&E systems and to use knowledge shared to strengthen countries' interest in and commitment to M&E.

## **2. Objectives**

The workshop had the following aims and objectives:

- 2.1 Share experiences in relation to performance monitoring and evaluation systems, focusing specifically on the implementation of South Africa's Outcomes Monitoring System; Management Performance Assessment Tool; National Evaluation System; Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring; Citizen-Based Monitoring; Presidential Hotline and M&E Capacity Building Programs.
- 2.2 Stimulate the exchange of information between the participating African countries on their M&E systems.
- 2.3 Promote regional and global knowledge-sharing.
- 2.4 Use of knowledge shared to strengthen interest in, and commitment to M&E.

2.5 Take forward lessons learnt in a practical way.

### **3. Participating Countries**

The Regional workshop was attended by representatives from the following countries:

- Mauritius;
- Seychelles;
- Kenya;
- Namibia;
- Botswana;
- Mozambique; and
- Lesotho

The World Bank and South Africa partnered with DPME in organizing the workshop.

### **4. Opening by Organizers**

Ms. Tumi Mketi, Deputy Director General of DPME; and Ms. Katherine Plangemann, Lead Public Sector Governance Specialist and Cluster Leader for 15 Southern African Countries – The World Bank gave a joint welcome to guests and participants. They expressed the hope that the workshop would contribute to strengthening the performance of various governments by enhancing their performance monitoring and evaluation systems.

### **5. Welcoming and Opening Remarks**

Mr. Asad Alam, Country Director: The World Bank gave the opening address. He emphasized the importance of performance monitoring and evaluation in assuring citizens of proper utilization of funds and of how people's lives are transformed through initiatives of governments.

Mr. Alam then mentioned how South Africa has incorporated international experiences in M&E as they figured out what would best serve the needs of the country. This was also made possible by institutionalizing M&E systems, and by having these endorsed and supported by the Head of State and other senior government officials.

Mr. Alam encouraged the workshop participants to learn from the successes of each other, and to share how barriers that came in the way of implementing efficient M&E systems were overcome. He ended his address by wishing all a productive workshop as each country strengthens its M&E systems.

## **6. Expectations**

The workshop expectations were solicited from each participating country. These are listed below:

- Where do the respective countries stand on M&E?
- Management of the change process, perceptions, attitudes.
- Management of public reform fatigue
- Efficient coordination of M&E

The critical question on the optimal institutional arrangement for the location of the M&E function was also raised. This related to whether it should be in planning or within the Ministry of Finance.

All countries stressed the need to develop a National M&E Policy Framework, and expressed the concern of monitoring being done at the expense of evaluation.

The other critical question posed to DPME is whether or not DPME gives due notice to the work or reports of the Auditor General and the Public Sector Commission. Also, clarification was sought over the correlation of DPME MPAT assessments with other reports.

## **7. Summary of Proceedings**

When set against its stated aims and objectives, the regional workshop which was well attended, was a success. Below is a summary of the workshop conclusions and recommendations that came out of the proceedings:

Countries such as Namibia; Mauritius; Seychelles indicated that their M&E function is at an early stage of development. Each country has an M&E system in the traditional sectors of Education; Finance; Health and Agriculture. The M&E status of some of the countries is explained below:

- Lesotho has planned to develop a country-wide M&E system. They intend to learn from experienced countries how to develop a Government-Wide M&E system. Their M&E framework is in the process of being approved by Cabinet.
- Kenya is grappling with how to create linkages between M&E processes, and between planning and budgeting processes. They are keen on developing an evaluation framework and on changing the perception of M&E from a policing function to the use of M&E as a policy tool.
- Seychelles is focusing on public sector reform. They currently have different players in the field of M&E and thus need to remove duplication and synergise all M&E efforts in government. They are also concerned with how to get citizens feedback.

The success of M&E systems is the commitment of officials.

## **8. TOPIC 1: Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT)**

*Presenter: Mr. Henk Serfontein, DPME*

The presentation which was well received focussed on drawing attention to the rationale for assessing the performance of management practices in government. Several key factors were that lead to poor service delivery listed, which include: weak administration in areas of financial management, supply chain management, human resource management, planning, and facilities

management. The initiative sought to develop a culture of continuous improvement, as well as linking institutional performance to the individual assessment of the management practices of Heads of Departments.

The four key performance areas were presented as: (i) Strategic management; (ii) Governance and Accountability; (iii) Human resource management; (iv) Financial management. The 4 ratings of the management performance areas were explained. These range from non-compliance, partial compliance, full-compliance to legal/regulatory requirements. The use of different standards for each performance area was also clarified. The phases of the MPAT process which consists of (i) self-assessment validation; (ii) external moderation and feedback; (iii) improvement and monitoring of results was described.

A successes and challenges of the MPAT implementation journey, which began with MPAT 1.1; MPAT 1.2; MPAT 1.3 were shared, and comparisons of the different cycles were made. Lastly, Mr. Serfontein mentioned that the DPME will be conducting design and impact evaluation of MPAT as part of improving the tool.

## 8.1 Discussions

The issues raised by delegates are summarized below:

- (i) Standards - concerns were raised about the time needed to assess the 31 standards in 156 departments, where each department is expected to produce evidence. They were interested in knowing how it is done, and who does it. A concern was raised that the number of standards could be reduced so as to make the process comprehensive and simple.
- (ii) Who measures the impact of cross-cutting standards.
- (iii) Rewards – are there any rewards for departments that perform exceptionally and obtain the maximum score. What implications are in place if there are no rewards?

- (iv) Who assesses DPME?
- (v) The other critical question posed to DPME is whether or not DPME gives due notice to the work or reports of the Auditor General and the Public Sector Commission. Also, clarification was sought over the correlation of DPME MPAT assessments with other reports.
- (vi) Kenya shared their experience by highlighting that the M&E department links management processes to the achievement of results. In other words, they assess how managers manage government processes, and whether they are getting expected results. He then introduced the concept of a management contract between officers and seniors.

## **9. TOPIC 2: The Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Programmes**

*Presenter: Ms Bernadette Leon, DPME*

This was a very informative presentation in which Ms. Leon gave a detailed description of the three frontline service delivery programmes that DPME monitors:

- (i) Facility-level monitoring of the quality of service delivery;
- (ii) The Presidential hotline;
- (iii) Strengthening citizen-government service delivery monitoring.

Ms. Leon pointed out the M&E weaknesses that FSDM projects respond to, which include the absence of on-site verification of reported outputs and impacts; user views not being valued as important source of M&E; weaknesses in using M&E information to improve performance. She proceeded to describe the three programmes, which are summarized below.

### **9.1 Facility-level monitoring of the quality of service delivery**

The roles played by the different the partnering institutions, i.e. DPME and Offices of the Premier in implementing the FSDM program in respective provinces was outlined. This was followed by an explanation of the various steps of the programme which include: (i) assessment of the quality of

service delivery improvement programmes at facility-level; (ii) communicating feedback on the monitoring findings; (iii) assessment of improvements and reporting on findings.

The presentation listed the FSDM performance areas as: accessibility; dignified treatment; safety; visibility and signage; opening and closing times; queue management and waiting times; cleanliness and comfort; and complaints and complements system. The type of frontline delivery sites that are monitored include: South African Social Services Agent (SASSA); drivers licence testing centres; hospitals and clinics; schools; courts; police stations; municipal customer care centres.

Ms. Leon presented the different types of score cards that measure facility-level information; improvement plan that facilitate problem-solving and tracks agreed improvements; evidence in the form of photographs to support findings.

The use of data by various stakeholders was given. Examples include the respective performance areas where government is either achieving or not achieving its intended outcomes; provinces and departments are provided with insights into performance at facility level. Ms Leon also presented the longitudinal assessments of a facility, which are yearly assessments of the same facility to assess (i) if agreed improvements are being implemented; (ii) if the facility is having the desired positive impact; and if the views of citizens are improving.

Lastly, the presentation indicated that the findings are presented to senior management of the responsible department; to President Coordinating Committee; and to Cabinet.

## 9.2 The Presidential Hotline

Ms. Leon shared with the delegates how the Presidential hotline originated, which was in response to President Jacob Zuma's 2009 State of the Nation address that stressed the importance of a government that is responsive, interactive and effective. The role of DPME in managing the

Presidential hotline was explained. This included monitoring the responsiveness of government, i.e. the resolution rates; supporting departments to improve complaints management and resolution; presenting reports to Cabinet.

A presentation was made on how the entire hotline process functions. It was stressed that DPME works closely with the State Information Technology Agency (SITA).

Ms. Leon placed emphasis on the different score cards used to measure the minimum performance resolution rate of 80%; and the quality of complaints resolution, which includes assessing the satisfaction of citizens. It was also stressed that complaints information generated from the Presidential hotline is used in planning and budgeting. The findings are presented to Cabinet clusters.

### 9.3 Community-based monitoring (CBM)

Ms. Leon mentioned that the CBM programme was motivated by the ad-hoc participation of citizens in monitoring of government service delivery which often led to citizens of influencing planning and performance improvements. The various kinds of risks associated with this weakness were listed as credibility risks; unresponsiveness; frustration and unsustainable violent protests.

The presenter pointed out the objectives of the CBM programme that include developing methods for the continuous flow of evidence of citizen experience; creating frontline partnerships between citizens and frontline staff to implement improvement strategies; creating a demand for improved government systems; preventing the distortion or concealment of local realities; and strengthening best practice in government systems.

The piloting model for facility focused citizen-based monitoring was explained as involving the South African Police Services; Department of Social Development; Department of Health; and South African Social Services Agency. Lastly, the CBM cycle was presented.

#### 9.4 Discussion

Delegates indicated that they tried to project FSDM into their own countries. They commented that for it to succeed, they would have to obtain commitment from different ministries. They were also interested in understanding the type of questions asked on the Presidential hotline.

Seychelles shared with the workshop that the President made promises to address the needs of citizens. In response, the President received numerous complaints that were addressed to responsible departments, which were addressed. The delegate mentioned that they expected that a similar arrangement to the South African Presidential hotline would be set-up in the department of Public Administration, but the President left the door open for more complaints.

Mozambique was interested in knowing whether improvements of public servants have been registered, and whether there are any changes in the management of the public service. The delegate shared that the country has annual plans which are affected when targets are not met. He was also interested in knowing how planning and budgeting systems are affected by the FSDM programme.

Kenya mentioned that the registration of complaints has not happened in that country due to the divergent nature of complaints. The country has no standards of complaint resolution in terms of time.

## **10. TOPIC 3: South Africa's National Evaluation System**

*Presenter: Dr. Ian Goldman, DPME*

Dr. Goldman presented on the South African National Evaluation System. He shared a sample of evaluation questions asked by different evaluations that have been conducted, and gave examples such as the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) evaluation which asks the following questions: Is the CRDP achieving its goals? How effectively are institutional arrangements supporting implementation? Is CRPD value for money? The benefits of evaluations were shared, which include: (i) providing opportunities to understand why progress is the way it is; (ii) revealing that programmes are poorly designed. In addition, Dr. Goldman stressed that departments are using evaluation results to inform planning, policy-making and budgeting

The timeline around evaluations was shared with the delegates, with emphasis being placed on the November 2011 approval of the National Evaluation Policy Framework by Cabinet. The various phases of an evaluation cycle, which began in 2012/13, leading up to the current 38 evaluations were mentioned.

Dr. Goldman highlighted some insights on ensuring the use of evaluation results. These include issues of ownership by departments and broadly by government. The incentives for evaluations which focus on rewards and learning were explained, using the analogy of carrots, sticks, and sermons. These are briefly described below:

- Carrots - part-funding the evaluations; providing training; exposure to conferences
- Sticks - evaluation results go to Cabinet, Parliamentary Portfolio Committees and made public
- Sermons - cabinet endorsing Policy and Plans; PM&E Minister supporting; emphasis on learning.

The National Evaluation Plan allows the country to focus on strategic priorities in ways that will enable the evaluation system to emerge and improve. These priority interventions are linked to the

outcomes; to the National Development Plan and are of significant interest to broader South African citizens. Communication around the evaluation system is done through the evaluation repository on the DPME website, briefings with media and parliamentary committees.

## **11. TOPIC 4: Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation**

*Presenter: Ms. Mhlagi Mokgohloa, DPME*

### 11.1 Outcomes Monitoring System

Ms. Mokgohloa presented the origins of the outcomes system, outlining its aims as the improvement of coordination across spheres of government through delivery agreements that are linked to key outcomes. The system seeks to develop a culture of continuous improvement. She listed the 14 outcomes and how the system works, starting with the management tool in the form of performance agreements between the President and all Ministers; then the 5 year results-based inter-departmental and inter-governmental delivery agreements for key cross-cutting outcomes. Quarterly progress reporting is made to Cabinet to assess progress with the achievement of the key priorities of government.

Ms. Mokgohloa presented the Programme of Action (PoA), which is a publicly accessible website that monitors the implementation of the existing 12 delivery agreements. The challenges of outcomes monitoring were presented. These include, amongst other the lack of management culture of continuous improvement in government which results from a culture of reporting on progress for compliance reasons, rather than analysing progress against key indicators and identifying ways to improve.

Two case studies on outcomes monitoring were presented: (i) environmental assets and natural resources; (ii) education and skills.

## 11.2 Mid-Term Review

Ms. Mokgohloa pointed out that the mid-term review of government performance was produced in March 2012. This review provides a comprehensive assessment of government's progress with service delivery and key challenges.

## 11.3 Evaluations

Dr. Ian Goldman shared with the delegates on why the country instituted a structured evaluation system. He mentioned that previously, evaluations were sporadic, and did not inform planning, policy-making and budgeting. In response to this challenge, the country has institutionalized a national evaluation system which has, amongst other achievements, produced a National Evaluation Policy Framework which draws on international best practice. The system requires that departments propose evaluations for inclusion in the National Evaluation Plan. DPME provides technical support to departments and quality control of evaluations. DPME also develops evaluation guidelines and standards. The results of evaluations are presented to Cabinet and made public.

## 11.4 Development Indicators

DPME is responsible for the production of development indicators that assist government to measure the impact of its policies. Ms. Mokgohloa mentioned that to date, there are 85 indicators that are grouped into 10 themes.

## 11.5 Twenty Year Review

Ms Mokgohloa pointed out that the purpose of the twenty year review was to reflect on and celebrate the 20 years of democracy and the progress that South Africa has made as a society since the onset of democracy in 1994. The review also highlights existing challenges, and explored ways to best address these.

## 11.6 Municipal Performance Assessment

The municipal performance assessment sets out the criteria that need to be progressively met in order to move to an ideal state. It is based on the understanding that a clear link exists between management practice and workplace capabilities and quality of service delivery and productivity.

Ms. Mokgohloa outlined the objectives of MAT as measuring, monitoring and supporting management in municipalities for quality service delivery and increased productivity.

## 11.7 Siyahlola Presidential Projects

Ms. Mokgohloa explained that Siyahlola Presidential Projects are random visits by the President to communities which are conducted with the specific aim of monitoring the delivery of government programmes. The visits are undertaken together with Ministers, who in turn make commitments to address challenges faced by these communities. A list of the various Presidential Priority Programmes that describe the specific community concerns was shared with the delegates.

## **12. Free State Provincial presentation**

The Free State Office of the Premier presentation highlighted how the province responded to the new outcomes based approach that emphasizes results, partnerships, coordination and accountability. They acknowledged that the approach had not been fully institutionalized into the province's existing planning function, which was more output oriented. To prepare for this new outcomes approach, the province reviewed the pre-requisites required for its successful implementation, and prioritized initiatives that would move from being inward looking to rather include other stakeholders. As a result, the province adopted a joint approach in implementing the country's Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) and the Provincial Development Growth Strategy (PGDS). It also aligned departmental strategic plans to annual performance plans.

Performance Management Units in departments and in the Office of Premier perform the monitoring and evaluation functions.

The Free State Office of the Premier also shared how the province institutionalized their frontline service delivery strategy. Through this initiative, the OTP is expected to stimulate service delivery in ways that will add value through the citizen's report card and recognize good practice and provide feedback to citizens. Its implementation includes the annual visiting schedule and a schedule of unannounced visits. The results of the FLSD initiative are reported to the provincial EXCO and to Cabinet. The baseline planning of the FLSD intervention requires that sectors should identify the list of sites for the department that will be incorporated in the annual visiting schedule. During the practical implementation of FLSD, the following processes are followed: unannounced visits; sector meetings during which the intervention plan is approved; improvement visits; rescoring visits; and meetings of the Forum Head of Department/EXCO.

### **13. Negotiating Demand M&E: A commentary on the DPME systems**

*Presenter: Mr. Stephen Porter - CLEAR*

Mr. Porter explained CLEAR as the Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results, whose goal is to establish development that is anchored in evidence, learning and mutual accountability.

The presenter pointed out that the demand for M&E arises when decision makers want to use evidence to assist them in making decisions. Demand for M&E is essentially a political act that responds to different kinds of political questions e.g. logistical; technical; contextual; social; political and/ or ideological.

Mr. Porter pointed out that in spite of demand certain challenges remain in the politics of M&E. He mentioned that tensions exist between the need to decentralise accountability for results with the political desire for oversight; the existence of multiple spheres which means that policy goals are

not shared and can become distorted as a result; there is a large degree of autonomy across departments. The paradox to current demand is that a central government ministry is used to support the development of a results-based public service. This capitalizes on current demand and elicits further demand. South Africa has successfully managed the paradox by (i) developing a frontline service delivery toolset that responds to the immediate demands for information; (ii) adapting the outcomes approach to fit with the national development plan; and (iii) spreading practices across all spheres of government.

In closing, CLEAR mentioned that there is an active demand for M&E in South Africa which the country has been able to respond to through DPME. Vertical and horizontal complexities do however exist.

#### **14. Lessons on M&E in Africa**

*Presenter: Mr. Stephen Porter - CLEAR*

Mr. Porter's presentation focused on the current state of M&E in the following 5 African countries: South Africa; Uganda; Kenya; Ghana; and Senegal. It specifically focussed on the location of the M&E function and existing coordination structures in each country. The presentation also reviewed how each country uses M&E systems to engage its citizens. With regard to evaluations, the level of maturity of each country's national evaluation system, and the type of evaluation, i.e. sector or program/projects, was presented.

The presenter summarized lessons about demand and supply of these countries by stating that there is more latent and potential demand rather than demand. Supply is more limited than expected, meaning that an expansion in demand can have a limited response. Mr. Porter pointed out that the demand for high quality M&E normally comes through development partners than government, which means that they are less likely to be used in policy.

## **15. Presentations by other African Countries**

Delegates representing the various African countries presented performance monitoring and evaluations systems of their respective countries. The key points emanating from these are described below.

### **15.1 Mauritius**

The delegate from Mauritius mentioned main stakeholders responsible for designing and implementing M&E systems in Mauritius. The country is committed to designing a government-wide M&E system for improved efficiency and effectiveness of public policies and programmes. Currently, they have a programme-based budget which has clearly defined outcomes and outcome indicators by programme; outputs and service standards. A 10 year Economic and Social Transformation Plan is being finalised.

Challenges faced by Mauritius were cited as (i) institutional and implementation arrangements; (ii) prioritising outcomes to achieve the national vision of a high-income country; (iii) capacity issues and resource constraints; and (iv) incentive framework.

The way forward for Mauritius includes diagnosing the status quo through readiness assessments; strengthening the M&E strategy and action plan; designing systems, tools and guidelines; and initiating pilot evaluations.

### **15.2 Mozambique**

The Ministry of Planning and Development in Mozambique (MPD) is responsible for coordinating Performance Monitoring and Evaluation of government programmes. The country is piloting as new M&E system that will organize performance information. Currently, different institutions produce monitoring data in an un-systematized way. Performance information is important to (i) parliament;

(ii) government who regularly requests it from sectors and provinces; (iii) business institutions who often request information on economic performance; (iv) worker's unions; (v) donors who often need information to assess the performance of their interventions. The country conducts evaluations after every 5-years to assess the 5-year plan of government. With regard to the use of M&E findings, the Mozambican delegate indicated that the link between M&E information and the planning process is a challenge.

The way forward for Mozambique included (i) consolidation of the implementation of its M&E system; (ii) enhancing the capacity of officials responsible for M&E; (iii) increasing the awareness of the importance of M&E among implementers and decision makers.

### 15.3 Botswana

The delegate from Botswana shared with the workshop that the government realizes that M&E is at the centre of sound governance arrangements that lead to prudent public sector management. To achieve the above goals, government has realized the need to integrate all its efforts and resources towards the effective and efficient achievement of focused results. A presentation was made of the 4 key Thematic Working Groups that report to Cabinet. These are (i) economy & employment; (ii) governance, safety & security; (iii) social upliftment; and (iv) sustainable environment.

Botswana is currently engaged in a process of developing an M&E Framework that will guide the country's national performance measurement of all government policies, programmes, projects as set out in the National Development Plan. The goal is to diagnose in order to raise awareness and agreement on National M&E priorities.

The country has instituted Ministerial Performance Reviews that seeks to create a culture of continuous measurement for improvement by providing ministries with a system-wide diagnosis of successes, and of areas of improvement.

The delegate listed the five critical assessment elements of the Government's performance review framework as (i) organizational core mandate; (ii) public financial management; (iii) human resource management; (iv) anti-corruption initiatives; (v) His Excellency's initiatives. The three pronged approach incorporates self-assessments, where ministries self-assess and self-rate themselves; inspections/verification of ministries by review teams; and feedback sessions.

Lastly, the Botswana delegate shared the following M&E challenges faced by government (i) few ministries who have institutionalized M&E; (ii) no nationally defined M&E plan to inform the measurement of performance, i.e. no indicators; (iii) reporting is done at a low level; (iv) evaluation culture is not yet embedded.

#### 15.4 Seychelles

The delegate from Seychelles shared the purposes for putting in place M&E systems in government as: to establish whether service delivery has resulted in improved economic and social circumstances of the Seychellois. The performance results are measured to determine the real outcome and impact of policy implementation, the performance of public bodies and funding.

Seychelles indicated that it has approved the introduction of a Results-Based Management Policy (RBM) which aims to bind performance management to the planning and budget process to improve result delivery. The objectives of this M&E system are to support national and sector planning and budgeting decision-making; strengthen accountability and transparency; and assist sector ministries in managing continuous improvements. The three major components of the RBM are (i) strategic planning by way of the Medium Term National Development strategy (MTNDS)

2015-2019; (ii) programme performance-based budgeting which structures budget information and decisions according to the objectives of government; and (iii) monitoring and evaluation, which will be established by the National Bureau of Statistics, together with the Department of Information Communication & Technology.

Seychelles listed several challenges it needs to overcome as: maximising the use of resources in the face of on-going reforms; ensuring buy-in and ownership; dealing with reform fatigue; change in attitudes/mind-set; capacity building and setting up partnerships with citizens.

As a way forward, the Seychelles government is strengthening what exists which includes staff empowerment and ensuring transparency and accountability.

#### 15.5 Kenya

Kenya stated that it has been involved in development planning which it conducts through performance measures that are critical to the country's development plans. The execution of such has however remained elusive because of weak or non-existent M&E systems. In 2003, the government developed the Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) which acknowledged the role of M&E in addressing governance issues and proposed the formation of a comprehensive M&E system to address this. This led, in 2004, to the establishment of the current-day National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES), which tracks the implementation of two Medium Term Development plans – the ERS 2003-2007; and the Medium Term Plan (MTP) of the Kenya Vision 2030 (2008-2012).

The delegate shared the key objectives of NIMES as: to build an M&E system for reporting at both National government and at the lower district level; to promote a culture and practice of M&E at all levels of government and civil society; to provide timely and reliable feedback to the budgetary

preparation process and reliable reporting on the effectiveness of government programmes; and to ensure effective participation of civil society in the national M&E system.

The delegate presented the Kenyan Institutional structures that ensure the coordination of M&E. These were listed as: (i) Ministry of Devolution and Planning (MoDP); M&E Directorate within MoDP that is responsible for implementing and overseeing the NIMES Framework; (ii) 5 Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs) that act as the NIMES Secretariat; (iii) Technical Oversight Committee (TOC) that sets the conceptual direction for the development and implementation of NIMES; (iv) National Steering Committee (NSC) that provides overall policy direction of NIMES; (v) Ministerial Monitoring and Evaluation Committees (MMECs) that provide guidance on operationalizing NIMES and M&E function; (vi) County Monitoring and Evaluation Committees (CoMECs) that offer technical and professional guidance to Counties.

Several Kenyan NIMES products were presented as: annual progress reports; public expenditure review; public expenditure tracking surveys; quarterly ministerial and county M&E; project analytic reports; national indicators; M&E policy; communications strategy; methodological and operational guidelines; projects M&E guidelines; NIMES master plan 2013-2017.

Challenges that affect performance were presented to include the inadequate capacities for performance tracking; insufficient culture for performance and M&E; insufficient resources for performance tracking; weak linkages with other reform programmes; and undefined National and County government linkages.

As a way forward, the Kenyan government has begun the implementation of a Capacity Development Programme and is finalizing its M&E Policy.

## **16. Study Tours by Kenyan Delegation**

The Kenyan delegation conducted two study tours to the Gauteng Offices of the Premier and to the North West Offices of the Premier. These are summarized below:

### **16.1 Gauteng Office of the Premier**

The Kenyan delegation extended their visit to the Office of the Premier in Gauteng. The delegation was welcomed by Ms. Annette Griessel, the Deputy Director General: Policy and Governance as well as Mr. Khululekile Mase, the Deputy Director General: Gauteng Development Planning Commission.

Ms. Griessel presented on the Gauteng Intergovernmental Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. She summarized the key imperatives as:

- Effective delivery on electoral mandate to achieve country political and development outcomes
- Broad agreement on the importance of IGR and cooperative governance across spheres but weak on detail and coherent implementation
- Performance information critical for effective governance, decision-making and intervention at political and management levels across spheres to improve performance
- Plethora of legislation and policy, evolving national/provincial framework, existing local government frameworks
- Streamlining, to minimize duplication and excessive reporting
- Contribute to clean audits and the Auditor General's requirements.

Mr. Mase presented the Gauteng Vision 2055, which is a long term vision for the Gauteng City-Region (GCR) that envisions a better future for the province. He indicated that the Gauteng 2055 will guide all stakeholders to ensure that the GCR is prepared to face the challenges presented by urbanisation, migration, poverty, unemployment and climate change. Gauteng Vision 2055 adopts

a long-term timeframe that eradicates these challenges with a coherent integrated and complementary roadmap for development.

The Kenyan delegation presented their National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System, which is used to track performance both at national government and at the lower district levels. The system aims to promote a culture and practice of M&E at all levels of government and civil society by institutionalizing the application and use of M&E. The presenter also pointed out that NIMES provides regular, timely and reliable reporting on the effectiveness of government programmes.

The Kenyan presentation and demonstration of their on-line performance tool was well received by the colleagues in Gauteng.

#### 16.2 North West Office of the Premier

The Kenyan delegation also conducted a study tour of the North West Office of the Premier. The meeting was attended by the Head of Department and senior managers in M&E from different sectors. The Office of the Premier presented on the state of M&E system in the Province.

The Kenyan delegation presented their Kenyan National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES), which was similar to the Gauteng Offices of the Premier. They also demonstrated their on-line performance tool.

The presentation was well received by the North West Office of the Premier, who indicated that they have a similar system in the Province. This system has, most unfortunately remained dormant for a while due to some challenges. As such, the North West team expressed an interest in undertaking a study tour to Kenya to learn more about NIMES.

## **17. Closing Remarks**

The platform that has been created by these Regional workshops to stimulate the exchange of information between the respective African countries on their M&E systems and to use knowledge shared to strengthened countries' interest in and commitments to M&E. The countries that participated in this knowledge-sharing event have seen it as an important means of developing capacity and strategies on public sector monitoring and evaluation to contribute to performance improvement. They expressed an interest in increasing their understanding of the South African M&E systems, especially with regard to their experiences in implementing various M&E programs. The interest to promote more regional and global knowledge-sharing amongst the participating countries had been strongly expressed. This they believe will strengthen interest in, and commitment to M&E.

**ANNEXURE 1**

**THE REGIONAL WORKSHOP PROGRAMME IS ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT.**

**ANNEXURE 2**

**THE ATTENDANCE REGISTER IS ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT**