



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
DEPARTMENT: PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

INTERNATIONAL KNOWLEDGE SHARING WORKSHOP

ON

NATIONAL PLANNING IN GOVERNMENT
&
MONITORING AND EVALUATION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

Cape Town, South Africa
March 11 – 13, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction -----	4
2.	Outcomes -----	4
3.	Participating Countries -----	5
4.	Key Note Address by Honorable Mr J. Radebe -----	5
5.	Overview of the South African National Development Plan -----	7
6.	The Role of M&E in implementing the South African National Development Plan -----	10
7.	Translating the Medium Term Strategic Framework Into Strategic Plans of government departments -----	11
8.	Linking Planning, Monitoring, Reporting and Budgeting -----	13
9.	Panel discussion on South African Planning Systems -----	15
10.	Linking national planning to programme planning: South Africa Case Study -----	13
11.	Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT) -----	20
12.	Local Government Performance Assessment (LGMIM) -----	23
13.	The Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Programmes -----	25
14.	Evaluation and Research -----	28
15.	Overview of National Development Planning: Lessons from international experiences -----	30
16.	Country reflections on presentations -----	32
17.	Responses to issues raised -----	35
18.	M&E Systems – Western Cape Province -----	38
19.	Country presentations -----	40

20.	Concluding remarks	-----	42
21.	Way Forward	-----	43
22.	Closing Remarks	-----	43

APPENDICES

Annexure 1: 3rd International Knowledge Sharing Workshop Agenda

Annexure 2: List of Delegates

1. Introduction

Knowledge sharing and peer learning is seen as a way of promoting mutual capacity development. It strengthens strategies on public sector monitoring and evaluation (M&E) as a way of contributing to performance improvement, and enables countries to learn from each other, and establish networks for strengthening knowledge and capabilities from a variety of contexts. South Africa, in partnership with the World Bank has since acknowledged that countries benefit more if knowledge is shared from the experiences of counterpart African countries and from global communities. They have realised that multi-stakeholder conversations enrich insights into M&E work, and all stakeholders learn and appreciate each other's particular circumstances, contexts and rationale for the strategic choices made. Similarly, there is growing interest among African Countries to learn from peer countries on the African Continent who have gained experience in implementing various M&E programs

It is against this background that the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME), in partnership with the World Bank co-hosted the 3rd International Knowledge Sharing Workshop. The purpose of the Workshop was to share knowledge from respective countries of how national planning can contribute towards driving radical socio-economic transformation and sustainable development. In addition, the workshop was a platform to stimulate the exchange of information between the respective African countries on their national plans and M&E systems; and to use knowledge shared to strengthen countries' interest in and commitment to national planning and M&E.

2. Outcomes

The workshop had the following outcomes:

- 2.1 Enhance understanding of national planning mechanisms, focusing on long-term and medium term plans;
- 2.2 Engage in discussions on how to cascade high-level NDP planning to strategic planning mechanisms across the chain;

- 2.3 Explore M&E instruments to track implementation;
- 2.4 Exchange information between participating African peer countries on national planning; and share international experiences and lessons learned.

3. Participating Countries

The 3rd International Knowledge Sharing Workshop was attended by representatives from the following countries:

- Comores;
- Lesotho;
- Madagascar;
- Malawi;
- Namibia;
- Nigeria;
- Swaziland; and
- Zimbabwe

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

4. Key Note Address by Honorable Mr J. Radebe

Minister in the Presidency for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

The Honourable Minister, Mr J. Radebe opened the workshop by extending a word of welcome to the dignitaries in attendance. He expressed the gratitude to the World Bank for their support in ensuring that the workshop is conducted.

The Minister spoke about the challenge of world poverty that the African continent continues to experience, and the radical transformation that would bring hope that Africa will never be 'the skink of the world' that former President Mandela referred to during his inauguration.

He set the tone of the workshop by looking at the wide range of plans, and their varied roles which governments produce. These range from the high level and long-term detailed day-to-day operational planning. The varied roles include tapping into the conscience of the nation, its ambitions and aspirations to fulfil the visionary, strategic, adaptive and technocratic roles which inspire nations, and provide the required details to drive implementation.

The Minister presented the different types of planning were summarized to include the following:

- (i) Visionary Planning which provides a long-term perspective and a common vision that uses different scenarios and projections to focus attention on the likely future consequences of policy decisions.
- (ii) Strategic planning that grounds high-level vision in specific choices and trade-offs.
- (iii) Adaptive Planning focuses on specific problems and challenges in order to ensure effective implementation. This kind of planning focuses on the dynamic and iterative interaction between planning and implementation, and arises from the complexity of many government activities where effective implementation depends upon the experiences gained from implementation.
- (iv) Technocratic Planning provides details of how implementation will take place.

The history of the South African long term – the National Development Plan and Vision 2030 was given. This was followed by an explanation of the strategic role of the MTSP 2014-2019 and the 14 priority outcomes which form the strategic agenda for government that contributes to the achievement of the country's developmental goals.

The different kinds of plans and processes which government follows include the development of: (i) delivery agreements for each of government's 12 outcomes; (ii) provincial development plans that outline detailed provincial priorities; (iii) integrated

development plans which are the main statutory planning instrument at municipal level; (iv) strategic plans which outline a department's core objectives; (v) programme planning which emphasise the importance of the logic approach of an implementation programme; (vi) service delivery improvement plan from each department that publishes its commitments on service standards. The Minister highlighted the progress made in improving the lives of South Africans in various sectors within the twenty years of democracy. He also pointed out to the need to particularly improve the quality of basic service, and to unblock blockages that impede economic growth and socio-economic development. To facilitate the implementation of these initiatives and to ensure a positive impact, the government has adopted the innovative Malaysian model on high impact economic intervention which the country calls Operation Phakisa. The model ensures detailed operational planning, monitoring and intervention in targeted sectors such as the ocean economy and health systems.

The Minister concluded his keynote address by re-capturing the key outcomes of the workshop, and emphasised the importance of international experiences which will be of great interest to the South African context. He wished the delegates a fruitful 3rd International Knowledge Sharing Workshop.

5. Overview of the South African National Development Plan

Mr Khulekani Mathe; Acting Head of National Planning, DPME

5.1 The National Development Plan

Mr Mathe started his presentation by sharing four quotes about planning. He then mentioned the lessons that consistently emerged from international comparisons, and insights from developmental states which include, amongst others (i) the use of planning to identify key opportunities and shift their development trajectory; (ii) shaping incentives to ensure that key public and private sector stakeholders have shared interest in pursuing a particular objective.

The processes, timeline and structures involved in developing the South African national plan were explained. The different phases included (i) consultations of the constitution; (ii) White Paper on the transformation of the public service; (iii) formation of the Policy Coordination and Advisory Services (PCAS) in 2001; (iv) National Planning Framework; (v) Medium Term Strategic Framework; (vi) Revised Green Paper: National Planning Commission 2010; (vii) Release of the National Development Plan 2012; and (viii) Medium Term Strategic Framework, 2014-2019. The alignment of the different plans and their duration was explained, as well as the principles that inform the alignment. These include localization and contextualisation; prioritization and sequencing; consistency and problem solving; linkages and coordination.

Mr Mathe gave an overview of the background and key engagements that led to the development of the South African National Plan. The process began with the appointment of the Commission in 2010. In June 2011, a Diagnostic Report was published, and the draft National Development Plan was released in November. This was followed by a series of consultations in 2012. In August of 2012, the plan was submitted to the President and to the nation. It was then adopted by cabinet in September of 2012 and by the ruling party in December. Implementation began in 2013.

Mr Mathe emphasized that the plan is not just a vision, but rather a long-term strategic plan that serves the following four broad objectives:

- (i) Providing overarching goals to be achieved by 2-30
- (ii) Building consensus on the key obstacles and specific actions to be undertaken
- (iii) Providing a common framework for detailed planning
- (iv) Creating a basis for making choices about how best to use limited resources.

The objectives of the plan are to eliminate poverty and reduce inequality through the six pillars that seek to: (i) unite South Africans around a common programme to eliminate poverty and reduce inequality; (ii) encourage an active citizenry and keeping government accountable; (iii) raise economic growth, promote exports and make the economy more

labour absorbing; (iv) focus on key capabilities of both the people and the country which include skills, infrastructure, social security, strong institutions and national and international partnerships; (v) building a capable and developmental state; and (vi) strong leadership throughout society that work together to solve problems.

Emphasis was placed on the economic vision of moving income poverty from 39% to zero; and inequality from 0.69 to 0.6. The projected employment in a dynamic diversified economy, 2030 was also presented.

The broad goals of Vision 2030 were highlighted to include (i) eradication of poverty by 2030 at R423 per person in 2009; (ii) reduction of unemployment to 6%; (iii) significant reduction of inequality; (iv) creation of a comprehensive safety net; and (v) growing the size of the economy 2.7 times or 5.4 per annum.

5.2 The Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF)

The MTSF was explained as a five year implementation plan for the NDP which provides clear targets and timeframes to monitor the implementation of key actions. Its emphases is on growing the economy, improving service delivery, improving the performance of the public service, and increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of local government. The balance between the MTSF, strategic plans and detailed planning was outlined. The MTSF and strategic plans are high level plans intended to chart the direction and elevate key priorities. They do not typically promote detailed planning.

Mr Mathe concluded his presentation by pointing out that planning in South Africa is fairly comprehensive and well established. He cautioned that it should not be treated as a once-off event, but rather as an on-going process, that does not lend itself to mechanistic approaches or to the creation of an excessive planning burden. The different dimensions of planning should be aligned without them becoming a compliance exercise. More

attention should be given to policy instruments and policy levers that can promote alignment of the varied planning instruments.

6. The Role of M&E in implementing the SA National Development Plan

Ms Nolwazi Gasa; Acting Deputy Director General, DPME

Ms Gasa gave an overview of what DPME does, and its major programmes, which include the planning and monitoring of national priorities; management of performance and the extent to which this is assessed in different government departments; the monitoring of front-line service delivery; and the government-wide M&E system. DPME implements its programmes in ways that lead to building the capacity of departments and municipalities to monitor and evaluate their own work, and to develop a culture of continuous improvement. Several challenges were highlighted which M&E aims to address. These range from disappointing results and a lack of positive change in key indicators, such as rural unemployment; poor quality of service delivery; and insufficient value for money. Weaknesses were observed as DPME was strengthening M&E in the country. These entailed the need to inculcate a culture of continuous improvement that focuses more on the results or the impact of activities; monitoring and reporting for compliance rather than for improvement; evidence-based planning and decision making not sufficiently valued.

Ms Gasa gave an overview of the outcomes monitoring and evaluation (OME) system which aligns the 14 outcomes of government's key priorities with the messages of the NDP. She proceeded to explain the 2009-2014 Medium Strategic Framework which contains the five year plans for the 14 priority outcomes. Ministers enter into performance agreements with the President, and are held accountable for the outcomes of government. The country has a web-based programme of action (PoA) which is accessible to the public to review commitments and give an indication of progress on the outcomes.

Ms Gasa emphasized that the implementation of the NDP is the most important priority of government in the next five years. Its concern is on getting the more than 150 national and provincial departments and 250+ municipalities heading in the same direction and consistently implementing the NDP. The 2014-2019 Medium-Term Strategic Framework is the mechanism through which government gets all national and provincial 5-year plans aligned and pulling in the same direction.

The function of the MTSF was clarified as providing details for implementing the NDP. It incorporates targets and actions from other government plans and emphasizes service delivery. Its key actions and targets addresses issues related to the economy, and to service delivery. An example was given of the key targets for Outcomes 4 and 6: employment and infrastructure. These include, amongst others, an increase in the investment rate to 25% of GDP; an increase in employment and the reduction of unemployment to 14%.

Coordination is critical in implementing the MTSF since outcomes cannot be achieved from one intervention.

Ms Gasa concluded her presentation by highlighting that the NDP is not just a plan for government, but for the whole country. She stressed that its implementation requires the involvement of all sectors of society and an active citizenry. In implementing the MTSF, government will pay attention to building partnerships across society to achieve the goals of the NDP.

7. Translating the Medium Term Strategic Framework into Strategic Plans of government departments

Ms Edeshri Moodley; DPME

Ms Moodley started her presentation by linking planning to the challenges that were diagnosed as contributing to poverty and inequality in South Africa. The benefits of

having national plans were listed as having the potential of contributing to prosperity and equity. The process of implementing the NDP requires that all national and provincial departments should produce 5 year strategic and 3 year annual performance plans. The alignment of these plans is done by the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF), which is a key mechanism for ensuring that medium-term and short-term plans are pulling in the same direction. The MTSF is a 5 year implementation plan for the NDP which provides clear targets and timeframes for implementation of key actions.

Ms Moodley highlighted that prior to the outcomes system, the South African government focussed on inputs and outputs. Government has since introduced outcomes-based plans which focus on the quality of services offered. It has moved beyond number crunching to quality of services. This is done through placing emphasis on the country's planning; budgeting and reporting cycles, and aligning these to the MTSF, whose indicators must be reflected in strategic plans. Quarterly performance reports are used to monitor the implementation of plans in-year, and data generated from these is published in open domains to enhance transparency, hence the emphasis on collecting comprehensive and reliable data. With regard to annual reporting, departments report on targets set in the annual performance plans, and data generated through these is audited and quality assessed.

South Africa has followed the logic of developing plans in context. This begins with the MTSF cascading into national plans and planning frameworks, and find expression in departmental strategic plans – typical top-down planning. National departments consult the (i) Integrated Development Plans (IDP's) of local governments; (ii) Provincial Growth and Development Strategies of provincial governments; and (iii) the Premier's State of the Nation Address to address duplication in the three spheres of government (bottom-up planning).

Ms Moodley gave a brief description of the two critical plans in government i.e. (i) strategic plans which are 5 year plans aligned to broader government strategies; and (ii) annual performance plans which link to budgets and the performance of an institution. It presents programme performance indicators and targets to achieve goals and objectives over Medium Term Expenditure Framework period. She proceeded to explain that the plans contain relevant MTSF commitments (as well as other commitments and information not in the MTSF), which aligns them to the MTSF. With regard to Provincial Plans, these have to be aligned to the 10 concurrent functions¹, which also aligns them to the MTSF. The process is driven by the fact that performance indicators should be aligned to the MTSF. They form the basis for planning and reporting in 2015/16, and departments report on these in the quarterly performance reporting model.

Lastly, Ms Moodley explained how reporting on the MTSF is done. She stressed that Quarterly Performance Reports and Programme of Action (PoA) reports track progress against the MTSF deliverables which are reflected in the Strategic and Annual Performance Plans. Quarterly Performance data is also published on the website of DPME and provincial treasuries in an attempt to promote transparency and accountability.

8. Linking Planning, Monitoring, Reporting and Budgeting

Ms Euody Mogaswa; DPME

To measure value for money (VFM), Ms Mogaswa presented the complexity of linking financial and non-financial data since there is rarely a one-on-one link between indicators and budgets. The VFM assessments may however be done through the use of statistical data or proxy indicators to indicate whether departments are achieving the planned deliverables in an effective, efficient and economical manner.

¹ The 10 sectors that have performance indicators aligned to the MTSF are: Education; Health; Social Development; Environmental Affairs; Cooperative Governance; Agriculture; Transport; Public Works; Sports and Recreation; Safety and Liaison.

The linking of plans to budgets was explained, and the centrality of budget programmes in planning was stressed. The structure of budget programmes reflects the main areas of service delivery. It forms the key link between objectives of strategic plans and operational budgets. In South Africa, planning documents are tabled after the tabling of budgets.

Ms Mogaswa emphasized the importance of linking performance and expenditure reporting. Departments are able to establish whether money spent during a particular quarter is in line with what has been planned. In short, in-year monitoring and reporting is done against plans and budgets. Ms Mogaswa illustrated this process by using the National Department of Higher Education.

She showed how the following plans and the information they contain, interface with each other: (i) information reported in strategic plans (i.e. strategic goals; strategic objectives and the programmes of higher education); (ii) information reported in the annual performance plans (i.e. strategic objectives with targets specified for each programme; related programme performance indicators and annual targets; quarterly targets reported in the APPs); (iii) information in quarterly performance reports; (iv) information reported in budget documents (i.e. estimates of National Expenditure and estimates of Provincial Revenue and Expenditure for the different higher education programmes; Adjusted Estimates of National Expenditure (AENE)); (v) information reported in the Annual Report. These different sources of information show continuity for reporting for particular programmes. In short, it shows alignment of planning documents with budgets.

Ms Mogaswa concluded her presentation by highlighting improvements which South Africa still has to make in enhancing alignment of plans to budgets and actual spending; improving reliability and credibility of performance indicators that direct budget and policy decision making; improving target setting within institutions (compliance vs

management tool); finding the right balance between compliance with frameworks for auditing purposes, and ambition and innovation in managing performance; and using data to appropriately inform decision making.

9. Panel Discussion on South African Planning Systems

Panelists: Mr K. Mathe; Ms N. Gasa; Ms E. Moodley; and Ms E. Mogaswa

9.1 Issues emanating from the presentations

The three presentations on national planning, implementing national plans through the MTSF, translating the MTSF into strategic plans of government, and linking planning, monitoring, reporting and budgeting generated interesting discussions and raised the following concerns:

- How the country obtains buy-in from minister to implement targets/goals of the NDP.
- Action which DPME takes in instances of poor performance by departments. Who takes these departments to task? Would it be the President, Cabinet or DPME?
- Differentiation between the NDP and vision 2030. Are they at the same level and how do the two merge?
- Mobilization of a significant majority in the Public Sector to implement the NDP.
- Alignment of stakeholders to achieve the objectives in the NDP.
- Collaboration between the Planning Ministry; Prime Minister and Bureau of Statistics.
- Organization of information into a system that supports M&E.
- Outcomes approach – How were the 12 or 14 outcomes formulated, and how are they cascaded to implementing agencies?
- Linking of planning instruments and their reciprocal influence during implementation.
- How Cabinet gets reports if reporting is to Parliament?

- Information of who the high level experts are, and their location within the DPME organizational structure was sought.
- The possibility of leaving out institutions that do not fit into outcomes, and budgeting implications of such.
- Assuring data quality to ensure that it is credible and verified when articulating strategic plans was raised.
- The management of complex indicators was questioned.
- Integration of planning, budgeting and audits which are seen to be separate.
- The adequacy of funding and how South Africa gets it right was asked.
- The existence of soft criteria that identifies soft targets which minimize the illusion of overachievement.
- Information around the budget document, what it is called, its alignment, lifespan, and its location (either in the Ministry of Treasury or elsewhere).
- Criteria used to prioritize the 14 outcomes

9.2 Responses to raised issues

- In response to the question of how one gets buy-in from ministers to implement NDP targets/goals, Mr Mathe pointed out that that the involvement of multiple stakeholders starts with the ruling party who make policy which is implemented by government. All parties in parliament were consulted in parliament in the drafting of the NDP. They represent approximately 93% of voters. The plan was adopted by the ruling party as its own framework.

Mr Mathe stressed that it was rather difficult to get buy-in from stakeholders outside of political parties. It is known that the majority of unions support the NDP, but not all of them agree to it, especially on matters related to labour reforms.

- Differentiation between the NDP and Vision 2013

Mr Mathe gave an overview of how Vision 2013 was conceptualized. In 2010 the President needed a plan that would span a periods of 18 months. This led the Commission on Planning to come up with a vision statement written as though the country was in 2030, which allowed it to reduce the time it would have taken it to develop a vision. As a result, the two terms – NDP and Vision 2030 are used interchangeably to reflect what the country needs to achieve in 2030 and the roadmap to get there.

- Penalty of performance which is below 100%

South Africa has a system that encourages the setting up of strategic objectives and action plans linked to specific indicators that can be assessed. Ministries develop these plans that are submitted to parliament and signed off. If less than 80% performance target is obtained then performance is deemed as unachieved. There is however the recognition of incremental improvement.

- Linkages between various planning instruments

Ms Moodley reminded the delegates that the NDP is a long-term vision for the country which is broken into chunks that can be delivered in periods of 5 years. DPME assesses strategic plans and annual performance plans for a clear line of sight of deliverables.

Departments are expected to incorporate targets into their APPs that are in line with the MTSE.

Ms Moodley added that the centre of government does not issue thresholds for deviation to ensure that departments do not focus on planning for compliance.

On the question of reporting, Ms Moodley stated that departments report using various mechanisms. They generate trend data which are collected over time, but have quality challenges.

- On the question of who holds departments accountable, Ms Mogaswa indicated that

reports are submitted to parliament who engages with departments that are not performing. DPME simply forwards reports to parliament, and facilitate consultations between the two.

- With regard to the top-down system of planning in South Africa, Mr Mathe indicated that this is due to poor communication. He explained that the constitution has three spheres of government which are interdependent, but have relative autonomy. Each sphere is required to produce its own strategic plans to reflect the needs of communities, which invariably far outweigh available resources. This then calls for a rationalization process which has to be effectively communicated, which is not often the case, hence the illusion of a top-down system of planning.

- The 12 outcomes do not reflect a sum total of what South Africa does. Some of the programs of government do not fit into outcomes, hence the introduction of change agenda as opposed to a sustained agenda.

- With regard to data challenges when doing strategic plans, DPME advocates the use of data such as official statistical data and findings from evaluations which exists outside of departments.

- Soft targets versus hard targets – there are no criteria to assess these. Plans are assessed in accordance to their ease to achieve targets. DPME has since realised that departments tend to increase targets for non-core delivery programs at the expense of core targets.

- Ms Mogaswa pointed out that the planning and budget processes run parallel. Departments are given indicative budgets for three years as well as a final allocation letter to finalize the process.

10. Linking national planning to programme planning: South Africa Case Study

Mr Antonio Hercules, DPME

Mr Hercules began his presentation by explaining what it means to implement government programmes and the different planning instruments to back this up. He highlighted the importance of harmonising and aligning the different planning documents to ensure that various organs of government have plans that reflect a shared vision. He explained how the different frameworks and annual performance plans are aligned in ways that emphasize the outcomes monitoring and evaluation approach. Institutions are meant to focus on the achievement of outcome-oriented planning and report the results in line with this.

The function of the two kinds of departmental plans, i.e. strategic plans and annual performance plans was explained as reflecting performance targets which departments will attempt to achieve. The progress is reflected in the quarterly performance reporting system. Each department has a budget structure which is tightly aligned to its programs.

Mr Hercules gave broad definitions and functions of implementation programmes, and indicated that South Africa has developed a guideline for the planning of new implementation programmes to give practical guidance on minimum standards for their design.

He concluded his presentation by using an example from higher education to stress the purpose of implementation programs as the translation of a broad vision or strategy through a program that is linked to a budget, and mapping the consequential logical steps to achieve the stated outcomes.

10.1 Issues emanating from the presentation

The following issues were raised:

- The difference between high level budget programs and implementation programs
- The standards used in implementation programs
- The need for a theory of change for all programs was questioned.
- Clarity of the relationship between policy and program was sought, i.e. which fits into the other

10.2 Responses to raised issues

Mr Hercules stated that both budget and implementation programs are outcomes based and driven by the MTSF. With regard to program planning, a road map is set on how to achieve outcomes.

He added that budget programs are set at a much higher level than implementation programs. The latter assists in articulating the higher level order of government, and cut across sectors and different spheres of government. Departments jointly plan the implementation of programmes and set targets.

With regard to the theory of change, Mr Hercules stated that it is not required for budget programs, but for evaluation programs.

11. Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT)

Mr Lebohang Masolane, DPME

Mr Masolane highlighted that the implementation of the management performance assessment tool was motivated by the recurrence of weak administration across priority areas² of government that led to poor service delivery. It was also introduced to address the challenges of translating inputs into outputs and outcomes; and the entrenchment of a culture of continuous improvement and sharing of good practices. Mr Masolane pointed

² Weak administration was observed in the areas of financial management; supply chain management; asset management; human resource management; planning; monitoring; and facilities management.

out that MPAT seeks to complement some initiatives in departments which have a common objective of delivering services to people. The strategic focus of MPAT is to improve the culture of management in the public service to people.

He explained the tool, emphasizing that it is a web-based self-assessment tool that focuses on management practices of about 155 departments annually. It assesses 32 standards which are underpinned by legislation which lends a certain level of credence to the model. The four key performance areas are: (i) strategic management; (ii) governance and accountability; (iii) human resource management; and (iv) financial management.

The MPAT results are moderated to ensure a level of objectivity in self-assessed results. Moderators are drawn from the public service policy-makers and consist of people at the fore front of policy making. Results are shared with various forums before they are taken to cabinet. Analyses of results lead to the identification of systemic challenges and inform policy review. The overarching value proposition of MPAT is that it gives a voice to ignored M&E departments.

MPAT results are rated on a 4-level scale in terms of a department's compliance with legal regulatory requirements. The process entails three phases: (i) self-assessment validation; (ii) external moderation and feedback; (iii) improvement and monitoring. The MPAT journey started with a paper based excel platform, where hard copies were submitted and moderation was manual. The tool evolved into a web-based system with assessments being completed online.

Mr Masolane outlined several strategies used by DPME to ensure stakeholder support. These include advocacy; improved communication and coordination; acknowledgement of limitations; peer pressure; DPME location; strategic partnerships and continuous improvement of the model. The country has seen a 100% participation rate by departments both nationally and provincially.

Mr Masolane concluded his presentation by mentioning the documentation of good practice in the form of case studies. These allow DPME to share lessons and management practices widely with departments that need to enhance their management performance. DPME continues to enhance the MPAT system through efforts such as the evaluation of the model.

11.1 Issues emanating from the presentation

The delegates engaged in extensive discussions, and raised the following concerns:

- A question was raised on whether the web-based system was developed in-house, or bought off the shelf.
- Delegates were interested in understanding more detail on the content of the tool.
- A concern was raised whether MPAT ratings reward good performance or are there consequences after results?
- A question was asked of how the tool is implemented in departments.
- The frequency of feedback was questioned.
- A concern was raised whether the focus of MPAT is on weaknesses or on strengths.

11.2 Responses to raised issues

- On the question of the web based system, Mr Masolane mentioned that it was developed in-house and was continuously improved through the input obtained from its implementation.
- It is not DPME's mandate to hold poorly performing departments accountable. Instead it is the Cabinet's responsibility.
- With regard to the implementation of MPAT in departments, DPME pointed out that a unit is dedicated to coordinate all MPAT-related functions, with each having approximately 14 officials who focus on this targeted function.
- Mr Masolane pointed out that feedback is continuous. DPME constantly engages with departmental coordinators.

- The focus of MPAT is not only on poorly performing departments. Those that are performing well are reported upon.

12. Local Government Performance Assessment (LGMIM)

Ms Jackie Nel, DPME

Ms Nel began her presentation by outlining developments of local government in South Africa in the 20 year period, emphasizing the unification of the fragmented, undemocratic, unaccountable and racially divided system which compromised democratic accountability and delivery of services. The implementation of this change proven to be more challenging and has contributed to constrained service delivery to citizens. She stressed that local government is at the centre of development, and the achievement of the aspirations of a transformed and effective local government requires strong leadership and a clear long-term strategy.

Ms Nel defined LGMIM as a model or technique that DPME uses to measure the institutional performance of municipalities. It provides an analytical framework for municipal leadership to reflect on what the organization does and how it approaches its tasks to improve the quality of service delivery. Essentially, LGMIM focusses on the management and administrative practices of the municipality as an organisation across several critical performance areas, thereby making it easier to prioritise areas that are in need of significant improvement and potential support.

LGMIM processes entail five phases: (i) self-assessment; (ii) internal verification; (iii) moderation; (iv) feedback; and (v) improvements. Its six Key Performance Areas consists of (i) integrated planning and implementation; (ii) service delivery; (iii) human resource management; (iv) financial management; (v) community engagement; and (vi) governance Results are rated on a 4-level scale in terms of a municipality's compliance with legal regulatory requirements and prescribed best practice requirements. The value

proposition of LGMIM is that information generated from the model provides an integrated snapshot of the state of management practices within municipalities. It can also be used by management to improve performance, as well as by transversal departments to provide targeted support and inform decision-making and policy considerations.

Ms Nel concluded her presentation by stating that DPME and its partners plan to develop an in-depth understanding of the operating environment and quality of management practices of municipalities using the Local Government Management Improvement Model. The information will be used to build a responsive, accountable, effective and efficient developmental local government system.

12.1 Issues emanating from the presentation

- The LGMIM presentation generated interesting discussion. Concerns were raised around the following:
- How measurements of Key Performance areas are done? This question relates to SMART indicators.
- Links between MPAT and LGMIM
- Interface of LGMIM with other functions in government such as the financial management system.

12.2 Responses to raised issues

- On the measurement of KPAs, Ms Nel pointed out that the LGMIM model does not use indicators but rather uses criteria which are obtained from legislation. These are used as standards.
- There is a strong methodological link between MPAT and LGMIM, especially the management practices in municipalities (as assessed by LGMIM), and the management performance measures of CoGTA, which is the national policy-making

national department that has oversight functions over municipalities. The likelihood of trickle-down effects from CoGTA MPAT scores to municipalities is high.

- LGMIM interfaces with other core government departments such as water & sanitation, CoGTA and the national treasury financial maturity model to reinforce their core functions.
- DPME pointed out the challenges of assessing departments that was not easily accepted, hence the creation of DPME in the Presidency to assess significant weaknesses in management, which is an engine that drives departments.

13. 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:

- Unannounced facility-level monitoring visits;
- The Presidential hotline;
- 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 that are not 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.

13.1 Facility-level monitoring of the quality of service delivery

The roles played by the different the partnering institutions, i.e. DPME in partnership with the Offices of the Premier, conduct dip-stick testing of results when implementing the

FSDM program in respective provinces. Ms Leon outlined the implementation modalities. 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: location and 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. DPME simply does dip-stick monitoring and analyse these performance standards.

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.

13.2 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. The system captures more than 2000 complaints, and data and the complaints resolution of performance are reported to departments; provinces; and to Cabinet. DPME also conducts qualitative independent surveys of citizens who use the hotline.

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.

13.3 Community-based monitoring (CBM)

Ms. Leon mentioned that when DPME started, it envisioned a role to strengthen citizens with capabilities to monitor. 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 thematic areas for DPME capacity and knowledge support to are: (i) citizen-based monitoring approaches and tools; (ii) turning data into change; and (iii) building the conversation. The objectives of the CBM programme are to develop approaches or tools 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.

DPME has partnered with the South African Police Services; Department of Social Development; Department of Health; and South African Social Services Agency to implement the pilot. The four components of the model are listening, conducting of surveys, monitoring commitments, and agreeing on change. Lastly, Ms Leon presented the different instruments of the model, as well as the CBM cycle.

13.4 Issues emanating from the presentation

The direct question of where DPME obtains its models was asked.

13.5 Responses to raised issues

Ms Leon pointed out that South Africa thought out the models based on extensive consultations from experienced government officials. The tools are based on existing tools in government which were adjusted to the current realities of front-line service delivery challenges of the country.

She explained that the Presidential Hotline was conceptualised by the President, and is managed as an ombudsman, which also includes a teaching component. The conceptualization of the Citizen-based model was through a consultative process with civil society. It emulated what other NGOs are doing.

Lastly, Ms Leon added that whatever system DPME was building, there were intensive searches for best practices, which were modified and adapted to suit the South African situation.

14. Evaluation and Research

Mr Antonio Hercules, DPME

Mr Hercules started by explaining the importance of evaluation. He then outlined the evaluation policy framework as an institutionalised conceptual base that links planning and budgeting in an effort to improve government's programme performance, accountability, decision-making and for generating knowledge. In short, government's effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability are enhanced. The NEPF focusses on a limited number of evaluations per annum which cover different evaluation types.

The criteria for including evaluations into the NEPF are: (i) they should be large enough to cover a large section of the population, and should not have had a major evaluation for five years. (ii) Evaluations should be linked to the 14 outcomes, and (iii) should be of strategic importance; (iv) should be innovative and lead to learnings; (v) should be of significant public interest.

Mr Hercules informed the workshop about implications of evaluation being incorporated in the evaluation plan. These are approved by cabinet, who in turn receive evaluation reports. Different types of evaluations have been included in the evaluation plan during the period 2012-2014. These were at various levels of completion – either completed, underway, about to start or delayed.

Mr Hercules concluded his presentation by mentioning that since 2012, three national and provincial evaluation plans have been developed. Thirty nine evaluations have been completed and 18 guidelines have been designed. DPME faces key challenges of an inadequate supply of skilled evaluators; some evaluations are taking a long time to be brought to cabinet; departments are taking long to finalise improvement plans; and some departments have weak programme planning.

14.1 Issues emanating from the presentation

The following key issues were raised around evaluations:

- Who monitors DPME?
- How are evaluations funded?
- Does a department use its own officials to undertake evaluations?
- How protected is DPME if evaluation findings are adverse?

14.2 Responses to raised issues

Mr Hercules explained that for evaluations that cost more than R2 Million, DPME contributes 50%, while departments that are being evaluated contribute 50%. For evaluations that involve multiple stakeholders that span across sectors, DPME has put in place a system of multiple funding sources. Departments are encouraged to include evaluations in their budgets and APPs. Once cabinet approves evaluations, it is not easy to withdraw these.

DPME plans to include a department's officials to undertake evaluations. Such a decision is also informed by the tough economic and financial challenges.

DPME manages adverse evaluation findings in a consultative manner. Evaluation steering committee meetings are chaired by line departments, which make it difficult for them to walk away in instances of adverse findings.

15. Overview of National Development Planning lessons from international experiences

Dr Kathrin Plangemann, World Bank

Dr Plangemann's presentation began by reviewing concepts involved in conceptualizing national planning. These include considerations of the nature of planning which should be seen as providing strategic guidance for the country; its scope which is defined in terms

of its national-wide versus thematic coverage; its macro-level government-wide planning as opposed to meso/micro-level planning; its visionary long-term planning time horizon as opposed to operational medium-term planning; and its practical and implementation mechanisms across government. She then outlined the objectives of national planning, and emphasized that they establish a country's comprehensive agenda of development goals and identify common priorities for the long-term.

The key issues or challenges which countries grapple with start with the challenge of understanding the processes involved in developing national development plans. Dr Plangemann briefly outlined the challenges which countries face during the various phases of the process. These are (i) conducting an effective diagnostic of a country; (ii) defining and prioritising government goals i.e. when a country encounters difficulties in agreeing on an objective. Dr Plangemann stressed that some countries have priorities which are often interrelated; (iii) promoting an effective participatory approach across government, the private sector and civil society; (iv) ensuring realism across an actionable document that can effectively guide national decision-making, i.e. when a number of aspirations find their way into the national plan; (v) staying within fiscal space – i.e. alignment of national plans with budget and staying focussed on delivery agreements; and (vi) aligning implementation planning, and results-based implementation across national and sub-national levels; (vii) designing an M&E system to track implementation, i.e. M&E which looks good in theory but face challenges during implementation.

Dr Plangemann explained how the World Bank collaborates with countries on national planning and M&E. She emphasized that the World Bank works on public sector performance globally by looking at all aspects of the performance value chain from planning budgeting, performance management and performance M&E. The World Bank not only shares rich analytical and operational experiences across regions for knowledge-sharing and benchmarking, but also has a strong emphasis on customized tailoring of global experiences to local context.

Comparative perspectives of key elements of NDPs in six countries³ were shared with the delegates. These cover aspects such as: (i) current NDPs or government programs; (ii) vision; (iii) sector policy planning; (iv) links to budget; (v) links to public investments; and (vi) M&E of Key Performance Areas.

Lastly, a case study of the Malaysian System-design was presented. This looks into its vision (2020); strategic goals; nation-wide policy planning documentation; Performance Management & Delivery Unit (PEMANDU); its 8 steps of transformation and the lessons learned.

15.1 Issues emanating from the presentation

Dr Plangemann's presentation elicited interesting discussion on:

- An appropriate approach to the carrot and stick issue (incentives).
- The importance of public discussions on demands for greater performance.

15.2 Responses to raised issues

Dr Plangemann clarified that the choice of incentives allows countries to avoid the 'business as usual' problems and not having much room to change. Countries should have a framework for carrots and sticks (incentives) and stressed the importance of flexibility.

16. Country reflections on presentations

Different countries were asked to reflect on three questions:

- What key lessons did you learn yesterday?
- What requires more clarity?
- What could be taken forward in your own institution?

³ The six countries whose NDPs were compared are: (i) Malaysia; (ii) Mexico; (iii) Colombia; (iv) Chile; (v) Seychelles; and (vi) United Kingdom.

Responses to these are captured in the table below:

#	Country	Reflective Questions		
		What are key lessons learnt?	What requires clarity?	What would you take forward in your own institution?
1	Swaziland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Flexibility on instant feedback ensures effectiveness and focus is maintained on long term vision. ▪ Planning is facilitative and engaging approach rather than top-down which ensures ownership of the plans and long term goals. ▪ Concept of doing more with less, given resource constraints requires commitment to achieve priority outcomes. ▪ Paradigm shift from lending to country-specific response. ▪ Importance of having an operational and effective M&E framework system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The World Bank approach on the paradigm shift from lending to country-specific response, given that WB is helping Swaziland to have an integrated approach, and identifying priority areas for support. ▪ Clarification on M&E systems in terms of efficient use of budget vis-à-vis implementation rate of programmes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation of MPAT which allows for self-assessment to improve quality of service delivery. ▪ Proposal to strengthen and enhance internal Auditor's office for effective M&E of budget and systems implementation. ▪ Systemic review and improvement of implementation programmes within focused and consistent framework to achieve strategic objectives; feedback Citizens based & facilities monitoring. ▪ Ministry-level budgeting for M&E activities to ensure improved effectiveness within planned for & allocated resources.
2	Malawi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Linking planning, budgeting, and implementation. The country lacks the continuous flow of information. ▪ Link between budgeting and performance is important. There is no link between what was planned and actual achievements. ▪ Departments plan but do not link these to the MTSF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Malawi seeks the magic bullet of what needs to be done to make the planning and M&E systems to deliver. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Information management tools (ICT). The Malawi assessment tool was initially in the form of hard copies. It has since improved to an excel-based tool. ▪ Inspired by South Africa who also went through the same process as Malawi before they could have a web-based tool. ▪ Interested in MPAT to review how management performance contributes to service delivery.
3	Lesotho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The importance of the existence of political will and buy-in from Ministers which require wide consultations. ▪ The importance of the feedback loop in every stage of implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarity on monitoring of Minister's performance contracts that hold them accountable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Application of the principles that assess the competencies of managers. Lesotho has no coordination between the Auditor General and other M&E bodies; and no coordination between the Minister of planning and other oversight bodies.
4	Comores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All strategic planning systems must be long-term. ▪ Importance of having the MTSF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How South Africa coordinates M&E activities through different structures. ▪ How long it took South Africa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management of conflict of interest which still exists in Comores. ▪ Complaints management.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Importance of formulating well-developed M&E framework and national plan to support the country's strategy. ▪ Comores have only one body mandated to monitor all government programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to develop budget programs. ▪ Ownership of programs – how the public sector has ownership of government programs. ▪ Operationalizing planning and M&E instruments - Comores faces challenges with regard to procurement body and budget reporting. How long did it take South Africa to make this work? ▪ What kind of oversight coordination system exists in South Africa? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reporting and publication at national level.
5	Nigeria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The institutionalization of M&E requires both technical and political support. ▪ Adequate guidelines should be generated for M&E to operate effectively. ▪ The importance of coordinating the budget process. ▪ The wide application of M&E to influence performance in government. ▪ Sustaining M&E through consultations with stakeholders. ▪ Need for adequacy of funding, skilled staff and autonomy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Structure of DPME in South Africa. ▪ Clarity on challenges and how these are mitigated against. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The importance of brokering a relation between Ministers and agencies. ▪ Focusing attention on guidelines and frameworks. ▪ Linking with governance unit of the World Bank. ▪ Initiate a collaboration and study tour to South Africa.
6	Namibia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Performance agreements to enhance accountability and commitment. ▪ Performance management tools. ▪ Political will from politicians to technocrats. ▪ Importance of coordinating M&E activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The role of the AG in M&E. ▪ The time National Treasury gives budget estimates to planners so as to link planning to the budget process. ▪ Explanation of the South African government organogram. ▪ The sourcing of high level experts from either other government departments or from DPME. ▪ Clarity on budget cycle. ▪ Frequency of reporting to parliament. ▪ Monitoring and evaluation of donor-funded projects. ▪ Evaluation of policies. ▪ Building of the capacity of stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impressed with performance management tools. Plan to adapt these to the Namibian Public Sector. ▪ Signing of performance agreements between the President and Ministers. Plan to import the practice, and modify it in Namibia.
7	Zimbabwe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How are monitoring units structured? Are they special units within each government department? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarity sought on the implementation of the NDP incentives, and on how DPME gets buy-in from other stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Importance of institutionalizing M&E. ▪ The structuring of evaluations in the National Evaluation Framework.

17. Responses to issues raised

17.1 Ms Nolwazi Gasu, DPME

Ms Gasu provided clarity to common issues raised around planning, M&E and the budget process. She mentioned that political leadership gives the needed impetus to M&E. She noted that although some countries have legalized M&E, there are limitations that hold them back from giving the needed advice.

With regard to 'facipulation', government officials have to acknowledge when to pull back in telling political principals when they are not performing. Such advice is often based on facts. Ms Gasu highlighted the importance of having long-standing statistical bodies to produce, use, interrogate, inform planning and drive implementation and to give views of where countries are. Data becomes one of the more critical success factors in planning and M&E.

With regard to planning and M&E coordination mechanisms within DPME, the department has a branch that is made up of sector experts who are mainly responsible for providing direction on planning priority outcomes; clarifying outcomes; drafting high level performance agreements of the President, which link outcomes to the MTSF.

The country has other planning and M&E coordination mechanisms such as the Forum of South African Director Generals who are organized according to clusters of Cabinet, and feed into cabinet committees and to the President. The other coordinating mechanism is the Program of Action (PoA) system which covers an array of work on all the outcomes.

The South African government constantly engages its stakeholders to ensure ownership and buy-in. It facilitates the buy-in of departments so as to clarify the 14 outcomes. This ensures that the outcomes are reflected in their strategic plans and annual performance plans linked to the MTSF.

Ms Gasa highlighted the challenge of coming up with platforms that link different programmes of DPME, and help the reader see the broader picture.

17.2 Ms Euody Mogaswa: Linking Planning, Monitoring, Reporting and Budgeting, DPME

Ms Mogaswa provided clarity on how M&E systems enable the assessment of efficient use of the budget in relation to the implementation of programmes. She pointed out that the country has monthly and quarterly expenditure reporting systems which enable assessment of spending against allocated budget programmes and sub-programmes, and lower level spending items. These reports are analysed together with quarterly performance reports to determine if spending is in line with achievement of set targets. Identified under-spending and under-achievement of targets in a particular quarter are discussed with the relevant departments to agree on remedial actions.

She continued to explain that the Annual Report which is tabled at the end of the financial year provides progress on financial and non-financial performance and is audited by the Auditor General. The purpose of auditing, to some extent, motivates the department to work towards achieving their targets with the allocated budget.

In the Estimates of National Expenditure, departments are required to report on the strategic focus over the medium term period and how the budget will enable the achievement of the strategic objectives.

In response to how long it has taken South Africa to be where it is with Programme – Based Budgeting, Ms Mogaswa stressed that it took the country many years and departments are to date required to revise their budget programme structures. After the enactment of the Public Finance Management Act in 1999, departments were required to start budgeting by programmes and no longer for line items. By then, most budget

programmes were the same as organizational structures. Subsequent to this, departments were required to develop outputs for each of their budget programmes; then develop performance indicators and targets for programmes.

Ms Mogaswa pointed out that in 2009/10, National Treasury identified the need to develop guidelines for budget programme structures to standardise the process and ensure common understanding. Departments were assisted to review their budget programmes using the guidelines. The review of budget programmes is part of the annual budget process. This is on-going as there continues to be a need to refine the quality of budget programs and performance information related to the programmes.

Timing for issuing budget allocations versus planning

Ms Mogaswa explained that the planning and budgeting cycles run parallel. Departments receive their indicative allocation letters for the next budget cycle at the end of October. This is just in time before the submission of the draft strategic and annual performance plans which are due by the end of November. Departments then get their final allocation letters early in December and this enables them to finalise their plans which they table between March and June at a date determined by the Legislature.

With regard to the monitoring of donor funded projects, Ms Mogaswa mentioned the existence of a dedicated unit within the National Treasury which is responsible for donor funded projects. Their responsibility includes sourcing donor funding, negotiating donor funding contracts for sector budget support and general budget support. They receive quarterly reports from departments on donor funded projects. Donor funded projects are also reported in detail in the Estimates of National Expenditure which can be accessed from www.treasury.gov.za

17.3 Clarification to issues raised in Table 1

#	Issue	Response
1	Do departments have M&E Units?	Yes. Every single department has well established M&E units which are staffed by experienced officials. There is no blue print for their structure. DPME has not stipulated what the structure.
2	What is the magic bullet for success?	South Africa was advised by international partners such as the Canadians that once the M&E unit is set up, the whole system will go into passive resistance. Criticism of the system will reduce as soon as credible results are produced.
3	Monitoring of performance contracts of Ministers.	The President requests DPME to prepare briefing notes from a variety of sources. DPME gives input to guide the President's engagement with Ministers.
4	Clarity on the M&E coordination system	South Africa has a cluster coordination system as well as national and provincial M&E forums consisting of Heads of M&E from various government departments. The Forums are convened regularly, and their purpose is to build a community of practice who share M&E practices and tool from their respective national and provincial departments.
5	Ownership of government programs	Outcomes find expression in strategic planning documents and annual performance plans. The role of DPME is to give an opinion whether these are aligned to the MTSF.
6	Setting up of the M&E system	South Africa started focusing on M&E in 2010 by a few officials who saw the potential of growing the system.
7	The Role of the World Bank	The World Bank focusses on lending and providing advice. It receives requests for advisory and strategic support. The BANK is positioned to provide global comparisons of good practice and create networks that bring synergy between different countries.

18. M&E System - Western Cape Province

Ms Zeenat Ishmail, Office of the Premier: Western Cape

Ms Ishmail presented the Western Cape M&E system. She started by outlining the regulatory framework that informs all M&E work, focusing on the GWME regulatory framework, DPME enablers, and National Statistical enablers. The Results based approach was explained. This approach ensures that the Provincial Executive Policy development, strategic planning, and programme and project implementation initiatives are informed by relevant and accurate strategic management information. The six phases which the Western Cape Government (WCG) undertook to develop its PME were modelled from the Malaysian Results Budgeting System and the World Bank's 10 steps. The phases are: (i) readiness assessment & stakeholder engagements; (ii) development of strategic frameworks; (iii) indicator development; (iv) development of monitoring and

results framework; (v) data management assessment; and (vi) information architecture. All these lead to the implementation of M&E systems.

Ms Ishmail stressed the integrated nature M&E IT systems. This consists of a suite of Information Technology products that assist the Province to provide services together, strategically plan and conduct province-wide monitoring and evaluation more efficiently. The suite consists of (i) Biz Projects which is an enterprise project management system that manages strategic and department-specific projects, based on sound PM principles; (ii) Biz Performance which is the annual performance assessment system that generates Annual Performance Plans; Quarterly Performance Reports and Annual Reporting tables; (iii) Biz Brain which is the business intelligence system, i.e. the single point of access to relevant and reliable data and information in a range of formats.

The key M&E Provincial focus areas are MPAT; FOSAD; FSDM, CBM and Evaluations. Data is generated from each in accordance to indicators of BizSystems, APPs; QPR; and Annual Reports. A detailed explanation of the processes involved in each was given.

Ms Ishmail concluded her presentation by showing the delegates the different Information Technology platforms of the province.

18.1 Issues emanating from the presentation

The delegates commented on the advanced M&E system of the province, and raised the following interesting questions:

- A question on budget for undertaking M&E in the Province, and the staff complement was asked.
- How has the OTP made people have an appreciation of its work?
- How is indicator development done - does the OTP liaise with budget officers?

18.2 Responses to raised issues.

Ms Ishamail noted that the budget is not high. It is approximately R34.4 million. The Province faces staff challenges. M They currently have a team of 16 officials in the M&E office.

The appreciation of M&E is heightened by political champions, i.e. the Director General and the Premier who regularly communicate the benefit of M&E. The existence of a regulatory framework and a mature results-based M&E has also contributed to the appreciation.

With regard to the development of indicators, the province looked at the different policy contexts as they defined the indicators, and their attributes and data sources. For the intermediate outcome indicators, departments supported and assisted in developing and quality assuring these.

19. Country presentations

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.

19.1 Malawi

In 2010, Malawi put together its national development plan and vision 2020; MTSF; Poverty Reduction Strategy; and its Growth and Development Strategies I, II. The country draws strategic plans from these which run for 5 years. Each is then developed into annual performance plans.

Malawi has Annual Performance Agreements which are signed by the Principal Secretary General and Ministry. The country plans to upgrade this process to escalate it to the level of President for accountability.

The country has a decentralized local government system that devolves powers to these local governments and districts. There is no link of performance agreements between central and lower levels.

Planning and M&E are located in one ministry as separate ministries. They have recently been merged with finance. The delivery unit in the Office of the President ensures that departments assess and monitor the delivery of ministries. M&E assesses the impact of outputs on citizens. The institutions that are involved with Vision 2020 are the planning department and the Ministry of finance. The MTSF is taken care of by the planning department, and has not yet been publicized. Budgeting is informed by the Annual Work plans and is based on the MTSF. The budget process is not a 3 year rolling plan.

Malawi stated that it faces the challenge of weak links between planning, budgeting, policy and performance agreements.

19.2 Namibia

Namibia highlighted that M&E is relatively new. It was established in 2012. The country currently has a directorate for M&E which is located in the Presidency under the Office of the Prime Minister. Namibia is receiving extensive M&E training at Stellenbosch University in South Africa.

19.3 Comores

Almost all M&E projects are implemented by donors who have their own processes which are not supported by the national budget. The Minister of Finance does not exercise oversight which is a challenge in that the resources are not projected in the national budget. Comores have a database of donor coordination but face the challenge of donors not providing information. The country has tools but planning and coordination is a problem.

19.4 Madagascar

In 2008 Madagascar implemented the national M&E system in partnership with donors and the European Union. This was based on the Paris Declaration.

The country has been implementing the Madagascar Action Plan since 2007. In 2014 they started working on a new national development plan to strengthen the M&E system. Plans are also underway to create an on-line system, and they are open to learn from Anglophone countries.

19.5 Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe developed and implemented Medium and short-Term Plans since independence. Fourteen (14) of these plans have been developed and implemented. The first of these was the Growth and Equity Plan (1981). In pursuit of a new trajectory of accelerated economic growth, the country has formulated the Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation (Zim Asset): October 2013 – December 2018. Zim Asset was crafted to achieve sustainable development and social equity anchored on indigenization, empowerment and employment creation.

Zimbabwe has also developed the following planning instruments: long-term vision 2020/2040; MDGs/Sustainable Development Goals; Medium term plans (Zimasset) and Sectoral Policies and budgets, which are short term plans.

20. Concluding Remarks

When set against its stated aims and objectives, the Third International Knowledge Sharing 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; Madagascar; and Comores indicated that their M&E function is at an early stage of development. They have expressed a need for additional advisory

support from the World Bank and bilateral networks that bring in global experiences. Similarly, DPME was encouraged to visit other countries to understand their M&E systems and provide support. Other countries were interested in understanding the South African structural arrangements of M&E units. Almost all countries expressed a keen interest in replicating, to some degree, the performance agreements between Ministers and the President, and the country-wide coordinated M&E system.

Capacity building was acknowledged as key to the success of effective and efficient systems. Even though countries have different skills, the importance of enhancing their integrated approaches to M&E was stressed. Countries are mindful of the fact that linkages between various components of an M&E system to planning and budgeting might be a challenge due to the line of command. Considerations of integration of reporting, roles and responsibilities in M&E are important, in other words custodianship and location of the M&E function. South Africa was seen as having integrated both planning and M&E under one ministry. Other important factor that emerged during deliberations is the efficient and effective use of resources by Ministries, and reporting on these. The importance of integrated planning mechanisms for inter- and intra-ministerial cluster planning was emphasized. This was seen as having the potential to strengthen effective and efficient planning system in a country.

21. Way Forward

The delegates recommended the following theme for the 4th International Knowledge Sharing Workshop: *Planning and M&E from a Budgeting Perspective*.

22. Closure

In closing, the delegates thanked the organizers, indicating the usefulness of such knowledge sharing platforms. They appreciated the cross-breed where countries share experiences. They expressed the need for organizers to arrange the 4th International Knowledge Sharing Workshop.

The World Bank mentioned that they will be launching 20 years of democracy in South Africa, as a way of exporting the South African experience to other countries. The Bank will also be hosting its Annual Spring meetings in Washington, D.C. wherein countries will share their M&E experiences globally.

ANNEXURE 1

**THE 3RD INTERNATIONAL KNOWLEDGE SHARING WORKSHOP
PROGRAMME IS ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT.**

ANNEXURE 2

THE ATTENDANCE REGISTER IS ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT