



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

**REGIONAL WORKSHOP
ON
PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

The Sheraton Hotel
South Africa
June 23 - 24, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction -----	3
2.	Participating Countries -----	5
3.	Key Note Address Hon Mr. Buti Manamela, MP Deputy Minister -----	5
4.	Welcoming Remarks Hon Mr Buti Manamela, MP Deputy Minister -----	7
5.	Summary of Proceedings-----	8
6.	Topic 1: Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation -----	9
7.	Topic 2: Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT)-----	15
8.	Topic 3: Local Government Management Improvement Tool (LGMIM)	17
9.	Topic 4: Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring -----	17
	9.1 Unannounced Monitoring Visits -----	17
	9.2 The Presidential Hotline -----	18
	9.3 Community-based monitoring (CBM)-----	19
10.	Topic 5: South Africa’s National Evaluation System -----	20
11.	Overall Comments on DPME Presentations -----	22
12.	Government-Wide Performance Monitoring and Evaluation: Global Practices and Experiences in Performance M&E -----	23
13.	Country Presentations on specific M&E Themes-----	26
	13.1 Kingdom of Lesotho-----	26
	13.2 Senegal -----	26
	13.3 South Sudan -----	27
	13.4 Madagascar -----	28
	13.5 Namibia -----	29

13.6	Malawi	-----	29
13.7	Embassy of Suriname	-----	29
13.8	Trinidad and Tobago	-----	30
14.	Breakaway Sessions – Thematic Discussions	-----	30
15.	Closing Remarks	-----	34

APPENDICES

Annexure 1: Regional Workshop Agenda

Annexure 2: List of Delegates

1. Introduction

The South African Presidency's Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) was created in 2009 to promote performance M&E across government. The Department values the use of evidence from research, evaluations, good practice M&E case studies, conferences, study tours, stakeholder engagements and international exchange and other global knowledge sharing to continually strengthen its performance systems. Given the experience gained in implementing various M&E programmes, there is growing interest from peer countries to learn from the South African experience and from each other. International knowledge sharing workshops thus become an important means through which local, national, regional and global knowledge is shared for developing capacity and strategies on performance M&E, and for contributing to performance improvement.

The World Bank actively supports performance M&E in South Africa through global knowledge exchanges, advisory services and technical assistance. There is a growing interest among Countries to learn from peer countries who have gained experience in implementing various M&E programs; as well as to benefit from global experiences. The knowledge shared will strengthen countries' interest in and commitment to M&E.

To accommodate strong interest by countries to get to know the South African experience, this second international knowledge sharing workshop was hosted to achieve the following objectives:

- 1.1 To share DPME experiences in relation to the design and implementation of key elements of the South African M&E system, including the Outcomes System; Management Performance Assessment Tool; Local Government Management Improvement Model;

National Evaluation System; Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring; Citizen-Based Monitoring; Presidential Hotline and M&E Capacity Building Programs.

- 1.2 To stimulate the exchange of information between the participating African countries on their M&E systems, and to share global knowledge on M&E.
- 1.3 To discuss how to take forward the lessons learned in a practical way in individual countries and as a Community of Practice.

2. Participating Countries

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

- Lesotho
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Namibia
- Nigeria
- Senegal
- South Sudan
- Trinidad and Tobago

Embassies of Cuba and Suriname

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

3. Opening Keynote Address

Honourable Mr B Manamela, MP; Deputy Minister in the Presidency

The Honourable Deputy Minister, Mr Buti Manamela opened the International Knowledge Sharing Workshop by welcoming all delegates. He indicated that he appreciates their participation in this workshop, and looks forward to more long-term and mutually beneficial future partnerships. He emphasized the need to continue to share useful information and work

together to devise strategies that will address challenges of poverty and under-development that continue to face our continent.

The Deputy Minister pointed out that South Africa conducted a comprehensive review of the country's achievements in the past 20 years of democracy, and the triple challenges of poverty, inequality and unemployment that affect the lives of many people. Challenges such as these have prompted South Africa to consolidate the planning and performance monitoring and evaluation functions into a single ministry. He stressed that good planning is fundamental to proper resource allocation and prioritization, and shared the plans that the country has in delivering quality services and improving the quality of life. These include finalizing the new Medium-Term Strategic Framework which implements the ruling party's election manifesto and the country's long-term National Development Plan into a government 5-year strategic plan.

The Deputy Minister stressed that public sector performance monitoring and evaluation is a new field, hence the significance of conducting knowledge-sharing sessions such as these. South Africa will be sharing experiences gained from designing and implementing a range of its programmes to continually improve government performance using local and international best practice. The Deputy Minister stressed that the scope for improvements is wide, given the magnitude of the challenges faced by the country. He invited the delegates to provide critical feedback and stated that he was looking forward to learn from the various countries' monitoring and evaluation practices.

He concluded his talk by urging the delegates to exchange ideas that would ensure mutual innovative solutions to socio-economic problems facing the respective countries.

4. Welcoming and Opening by the Dr Sean Phillips, DPME Director General

Dr Phillips welcomed the guests and participants. He expressed the hope that the workshop would contribute to strengthening the performance of various governments by enhancing their performance monitoring and evaluation systems.

In his address, Dr Philips listed a range of challenges related to M&E that lead to, amongst others, the inability to design adequate improvements of key indicators and basic education outcomes; implementation weaknesses; poor quality of service delivery and disappointing results. In dealing with these challenges, the South African Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) focuses on three levels of performance monitoring and evaluation. The focus since 2010 has been on facilitating the development of plans for priorities such as basic education, health, reducing crime and creating employment. He pointed out that the key political imperative in South Africa is to improve the quality of services provided directly to citizens. This is done by carrying out M&E at the level of frontline service delivery directly to citizens.

Dr Philips listed the reasons for carrying out public service reform process. The most important of these being the need to address shortcomings such as poor education and health results relative to expenditure per capita.

South Africa emphasizes results-based monitoring and evaluation as part of the broader public service reforms and modernization process. This involves changing the management culture and management capabilities in the public service.

Emerging areas of interest in performance monitoring and evaluation in South Africa were highlighted. These include:

- an awareness of results-based M&E not being adequate to deal with the complexity of public sector challenges;
- piloting operations management approach to improving service delivery facilities;
- adopting a Big Fast Results approach;
- strengthening planning through better design of implementation programmes which will enhance implementation focus and evaluability;
- future International Knowledge Sharing workshops to share emerging lessons from emerging programmes.

Dr Philips mentioned useful reports about South Africa from an M&E perspective. These reports were distributed to delegates in the resource material packets, and include the 20 year synthesis report and Development indicators that track key facts and figures in 10 thematic areas.

In closing, Dr Philips indicated that DPME will be presenting all its M& programmes. He invited participants to provide critical feedback and share their own country experiences.

5. 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 key lessons learnt and recommendations that came out of the proceedings:

Day 1: The Frontline Service Delivery Model is most impressive. Government often concerns itself with new policies and interventions and less with listening to the ordinary citizens. The South African FSDM model affords citizens with a platform to express their voices. .

The Presidential Hotline was found to be an interesting and unique model that links ordinary citizens to government office. Countries such as Lesotho indicated that it is rare that citizens

could get connected to the Presidency. The Hotline affords them an opportunity to express their challenges and complaints. Presidential Hotline officials are then able to support departments with improvement plans in specific areas to address the challenges raised by citizens. In short, the Office of the President not only identifies concerns, but also provides support. Lesotho was potentially going to adopt a similar model with modification into context.

The South African National Evaluation System was highly commended in that countries tend to evaluate more of the results and impact and have less engagement with the process.

Political will in South Africa was seen as having greatly contributed to the performance monitoring and evaluation system. The importance of collaboration for buy-in and implementation was stressed.

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

6. TOPIC 4: Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation

Presenter: Ms Nolwazi Gasa, Deputy Director General: Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation Branch, DPME

6.1 Outcomes Monitoring System

DPME explained that the outcomes system is intended to increase the strategic focus of government by focusing on a limited number of priority outcomes. Its purpose is to improve coordination across spheres of government by introducing whole-of-government plans in the form of delivery agreements that are linked to key outcomes. The ultimate purpose is to move towards a culture of continuous improvement that moves government away from a culture of doing repeated activities without considering the impacts.

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 presented the 5 year results-based inter-departmental and inter-governmental delivery agreements for key cross-cutting outcomes, and how these are aligned to strategic and annual performance plans, as well as linked to the National Development Plan and to the National Evaluation System. Quarterly progress reporting is made to Cabinet to assess progress with the achievement of the key priorities of government.

The 12 Delivery Agreements are captured and monitored in a 'Programme of Action' website that can be publicly accessed. Progress reports to Cabinet ensure that Cabinet regularly assess progress in the achievement of the key priorities of government. Many departments are embracing the outcomes approach and are focussing on measurable results, improving their data and are becoming more effective.

Two case studies on outcomes monitoring were presented: (i) life expectancy; and (ii) education and skills. With regard to education, the learner performance in different grades was explained and the monitoring thereof using different instruments. Other indicators used include the quality of teaching and learning at schools, curriculum coverage.

The challenges of implementing the outcomes approach were mentioned as: (i) some delivery agreements are too long and detailed with many indicators; (ii) the theory of change is not strong enough; (iii) the information management system to produce required data is not fully in place in some departments; and (iv) the overall lack of a culture of continuous improvement in government.

The outcomes system is contributing to changing the management culture in government into one which analyses progress against key indicators to identify ways of doing things better to improve impact.

6.2 Medium -Term Strategic Framework: 2014-2019

The mid-term strategic framework is a five year implementation plan for the National Development Plan (NDP) covering the 14 priority outcome areas in the NDP. It is a mechanism for ensuring that medium term and short-term planning of government is aligned to the NDP. The strategy outlines critical actions to be undertaken during 2014-2019 that will place the country on a positive trajectory towards the achievement of the 2013 vision. Cabinet uses this high-level strategic document to monitor the implementation of the NDP.

6.3 Development Indicators

DPME is responsible for the production of development indicators that assist government to measure the impact of its policies. The 2012 edition contains 85 indicators that are grouped into 10 themes.

7.4 Twenty Year Review

DPME 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 of how to best address these.

6.5 Siyahlola Presidential Projects

DPME explained that Siyahlola Presidential Projects are random visits by the President to communities. These 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.

6.6 Discussion

- (i) A question was asked on who signs the delivery agreements, and on whether Principal Secretaries are involved?
- (ii) Is there an optimal number of Outcome priorities to monitor?
- (iii) Senegal commented that performance agreements are signed between the President and Ministers, but actual reporting happens to the Presidency. A concern was also raised on the review of performance agreements after 3 years even if the term of office of the minister is not yet complete.
- (iv) What are the rewards and penalties in the system?
- (v) How is efficient development monitored in the education system, which is one of the priority areas of the country?

6.7 Responses

- (i) The department has about 200 official with a budget of R200 million. The department is strategic on how it uses its limited resources.
- (ii) The tool that is used to monitor basic education covers various levels in the system, from pre-school, middle levels (grades 3, 6, 9) and the final year of schooling (matric), as part of the new Results-Based system. The tool is called the Annual National Assessment. The first round of implementation demonstrated poor quality in various aspects of the basic education system. Comparative data is sought such as in the case of TIMMS and SAMMEC. In response to what gets monitored in education, the focus is on the foundation phase; pre-school and Primary education. Certain indicators are monitored whilst assessing the quality of education at the same time.
- (iii) Delivery agreements are reviewed periodically during implementation and not only at the end of the election cycle.

- (iv) The challenge with implementing consequences or sanctions is that there is no law that governs them. Performance agreements are a management tool to help coordinate the implementation process rather than punitive measures.
- (v) DPME provides briefing notes to the Presidency political principals to ensure that they can critically assess the reports provided by other Ministers. The score-cards allow the peers in Cabinet to compare notes on the performance of their focus areas.
- (vi) DPME acknowledges that 14 Outcomes are quite a lot. An ideal situation would be to have a few outcomes rather than many. These will tend to be reduced as the system matures.

7. TOPIC 1: Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT)

Presenter: Mr. Ismail Akhalwaya, Head; Management Performance Assessment, 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 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 goal of the initiative is to develop a culture of continuous improvement, and to link institutional performance to the management practices of Heads of Departments. MPAT is located within the Results-Based M&E approach, with a special focus on the processes used to convert inputs into outputs.

The four key performance areas were presented as: (i) Strategic management; (ii) Governance and Accountability; (iii) Human resource management; and (iv) Financial management. A total of 31 standards are monitored under these key performance areas. The progression model is based on the 4 levels of compliance with legal or regulatory requirements: (i) non-compliance; (ii) partial compliance; (iii) full compliance; and (iv) full compliance and doing things smartly.

The three MPAT phases include self-assessment and validation; external moderation and feedback; and improvement phase.

The MPAT journey from 1.1 to 1.3 was explained as having started with it being paper-based, then web-based and partly manual; and lastly completely online.

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, DPME mentioned the value proposition of MPAT as management assesses themselves. Departments acknowledge their own state of management practices and thus develop improvement plans. DPME will be conducting design and impact evaluation of MPAT as part of improving the tool.

7.1 Discussions

The issues raised by delegates are summarized below:

- (i) MPAT focuses on results and changing people's mind and attitudes. How was change management done to ensure buy-in into the assessment process
- (ii) A concern was raised on the mechanisms used by the department to coordinate MPAT, given the scope and size of the country and the number of departments
- (iii) How is the administrative burden avoided as these systems appear to be complex and demanding to the public servant?
- (iv) How is efficient development monitored in the education system, which is one of the priority areas of the country?
- (v) How do you strike a balance when allocations do not meet what is planned?
- (vi) What is the link between MPAT and Outcomes?
- (vii) How can MPAT work in reducing corruption in Africa?

7.2 Responses

- (i) Political will is deemed necessary to assess management performance of departments. The President and Cabinet had unequivocal message about the need for the assessment. The country looked at management practices holistically, though there was huge resistance from Heads of Department not to publish the results. This was however made acceptable by peer pressure, the role of Cabinet and political support from the centre. Some Heads of Department feel MPAT is too operational and not strategic.
- (ii) The nature of support which DPME provides to departments facilitated the change management process.
- (iii) With regard to publishing of results, DPME stressed the importance of the strategic location of this function, and that reports are tabled in Cabinet.
- (iv) With regard to reporting overload, DPME asks for primary information and collaborates with other transversal departments such as National Treasury and the Public Service Commission to ensure that there is no overload of reporting. They also encourage departments to use existing information. Lastly, they align their indicators to ensure that there is no duplication of the reporting process.
- (v) Departmental strategic plans are linked to budgets and performance is measured against budgeted plans.
- (vi) With regard to corruption, it is advisable not to start MPAT as an anti-corruption system as that will lead to mere compliance.

8. TOPIC 3: Local Government Management Improvement Model (LGMIM)

Presenter: Mr. Hassen Mohamed, Head; Local Government Performance Assessment, DPME

The introduction of local government assessments was motivated by concerns of not achieving planned results. This resulted from a mechanistic and simplistic conception of performance monitoring which elides the operational aspects or ignoring the internal workings of

organizations which make the delivery of results possible. The local government context is described as 'chaordic'. It is a fast changing and complex environment wherein each municipality is unique in terms of the balance between its socio-economic, cultural and political environments. Management practices and the internal operating environment of organizations are important in ensuring that the public sector has a positive effect on society.

The model considers and focuses on the managerial practices of a municipality as it determines what the organization does and how it approaches its tasks to achieve the desired results. It identifies where improvements are needed and the nature of the improvements. The six key performance areas are: (i) integrated development planning; (ii) service delivery; (iii) human resource management; (iv) financial management; (v) community engagement; (vi) governance. Each of the 28 performance standard is assessed and scored against the four point scale.

8.1 Discussion

The delegates were concerned about the administrative burdens as the DPME performance monitoring systems appear to be complex and demanding to the public servant.

8.2 Responses

DPME acknowledges that municipalities are over-burdened with reporting requirements from both central and sector departments. They produce 135 reports to provincial and national government departments and public entities, hence the LGMIM is being introduced slowly and systematically by targeting 25 municipalities to demonstrate value.

9. TOPIC 4: The Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Programmes

Presenter: Ms Bernadette Leon, Head: Presidential Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring, 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) Unannounced Monitoring Visits;
- (ii) The Presidential hotline;
- (iii) Citizen-Based Monitoring.

DPME pointed out FSDM responds to M&E weaknesses which include the absence of on-site verification of reported outputs and impacts; user views not being regularly collected and analysed and not valued as important source of M&E; weaknesses in using M&E information to improve performance. The three programmes of FSDM are summarized below.

9.1 Unannounced Monitoring Visits

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.

The different types of score cards were presented. These measure facility-level information; improvement plan that facilitates 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 instances where data provides insights to provinces and departments of the performance at facility level and areas where government is either achieving or not achieving its intended outcomes. DPME presented the longitudinal assessments of a facility, which are yearly assessments of the same facility to assess if agreed improvements are being implemented; 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

DPME 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 entails monitoring the responsiveness of government, i.e. the resolution rates; supporting departments to improve complaints management and resolution; presenting reports on the service delivery trends emanating from the Hotline to Cabinet.

A presentation was made on how the entire hotline process functions through the use of telephones, mailing of complaints through the use of letters, fax, and e-mail. Different score cards are used to measure the minimum performance resolution standard of 80%; and the quality of complaints resolution, which includes assessing the satisfaction of citizens.

Complaints information generated from the Presidential hotline is presented to the Forum of South African Director Generals (FOSAD), the Presidential Coordinating Committee (PCC) and to the Governance and Administration (G&A) Cabinet Cluster.

9.3 Community-based monitoring (CBM)

DPME mentioned that the CBM programme was motivated by the ad-hoc participation of citizens in monitoring of government service delivery which often led to lost opportunities for experiences of citizens to influence 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 and perceptions on defined indicators of service delivery; 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 involves the participation of 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

- (i) Delegates were interested in understanding how ordinary citizens from rural areas access the services offered by the Presidential Hotline. They were specifically concerned about creating digital divide in the country.

- (ii) The principle behind the comprehensive approach of CBM was highly commended.
- (iii) How is the model able to obtain contact details of citizens?
- (iv) Is DPME planning to conduct international partnerships on CBM. Can the country take the lead in organizing these kinds of workshops for purposes of knowledge-sharing?
- (v) South Sudan indicated that they have a pending World Bank agreement to implement M&E and other systems. They expressed that they would like to invite DPME officials to share their experiences.
- (vi) A concern was raised on the users of the Presidential Hotline - is it for a specific Ministry or for the public?

9.5 Responses

- (i) Citizens contact details are captured when complaints are lodged. DPME acknowledges that at times it is not easy to get hold of people since they have multiple cell phones.
- (ii) DPME has committed to arrange a knowledge-sharing workshop on frontline Service Delivery Monitoring in May or June of 2015.
- (iii) South Africa has a requirement by the President that political principals should engage with the citizens yearly and to report to Cabinet, hence this program is very strategically focused.

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

Presenter: Dr. Ian Goldman, Head: Evaluation and Research, DPME

Dr. Goldman presented on the South African National Evaluation System. He looked at what evaluation is by reviewing sample evaluation questions that were considered during the evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP); Grade R; Land Recapitalisation and Development; and Business Process Services. 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 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.

10.1 Discussion

DPME stressed that it experiences high resistance due to unknown implications and lack of understanding by the owners of the program.

The question of whether evaluations are conducted by the officers in the department or external providers was raised.

Senegal pointed out that the evaluation of impacts is much more complicated.

10.2 Responses

DPME stressed that for purposes of ensuring credibility and independence, it becomes important to use external independent providers.

South Africa does more of the implementation evaluations due to the challenges of data availability. Departments do request impact evaluations, but DPME advises that they start with an implementation evaluation first and then later conduct the impact study.

11. Overall Comments on DPME Presentations

Lesotho mentioned that they are interested in replicating the Presidential Hotline in their country and modify it to their context. They consider it a very interesting and unique model of linking ordinary citizens to the Presidency, and is an effective mechanism for responding to challenges and complaints.

Lesotho was highly impressed by the Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Model. They recognize that governments tend to focus more on policies and less on listening to their people. Lesotho appreciates the extent to which ordinary people are provided platforms to express their

voices. They commented on the good practice of hand holding that is done by the Presidency to assist departments to improve service delivery.

Malawi stressed the importance of engaging the right people to make things happen, and the importance of collaboration for buy-in and implementation.

They were highly impressed by the National Evaluation System. The country tends to evaluate more of the results and impact, and engage less with the process.

Nigeria viewed political will as an important success factor for the South African system of M&E, which is sometimes lacking in other countries. They stressed the importance of developing fewer indicators as well as the need to train other Ministries.

The delegate from South Sudan mentioned that he has learnt a lot. He particularly found the presentation on evaluation useful in that it highlighted how issues are addressed and propose the way forward for change on a project.

12. Topic 4: Government-Wide Performance Monitoring and evaluation: Global Practices and Experiences in Performance M&E

Presenter: Dr. Kathrin A. Plangemann – The World Bank

Dr. Plangemann mentioned the objectives of the GW performance M&E systems as including support for national and sector planning and ensuring the implementation of national goals. She explained the government-wide, integrated performance M&E system as a combination of incentives and tools that allow governments to achieve results and savings cross-sectorally. Each country has a unique starting point and desired end-point. There are, however, common challenges in customizing country-specific approaches which include defining and implementing

government goals (e.g. NDP); locating and institutionalizing M&E; use of M&E findings and budget linkages.

The World Bank Group (WBG) works on public sector performance globally across regions and countries. The WBG has found that countries such as Mexico; Colombia; Chile; Australia; and South Africa have different design features and the quality of their M&E work is generally good. An overview of each country's M&E systems was presented. The strengths and challenges were summarized as:

(i) Strengths

Mexico: M&E findings are used by different stakeholders which include budget, analysis, policy advice, and by the Cabinet in its budget decision-making; the country has strong access to information policy.

Colombia: High utilization of the SOGOB by President for oversight of ministers and ministries for accountability via performance targets; the country has a collaborative approach between DNP and sector ministries/agencies, and with sub-national governments, especially municipalities.

Chile: The country is a top example in performance M&E. They have an effective planning intervention and their goals are reflected in individual performance agreements. The country has a high utilization of M&E findings by Minister of Finance in the budget process and for obtaining management improvements on ministries/agencies.

Australia: Evaluation findings are heavily used in budget analysis, policy advice; by the Cabinet in its budget decision-making; and by sector departments and agencies. Evaluations are done systematically and linked to the budget cycle. They are conducted jointly between the finance Department and other central and sector departments.

(ii) Challenges

Mexico: In the initial stages of the implementation of the guidelines, a heavy administrative burden was placed ministries who needed to buy into these.

Colombia: The country had to focus on key presidential goals and on making the value chain clear and implementable. There is a need to consolidate strategic alliances within and outside government to strengthen support for M&E.

Chile: The country initially had low utilization and low ownership of the Minister of Finance's evaluations by sector ministries. There was an un-evenness in the quality of evaluations due to cost and time constraints and potential under-spending.

Australia: There is a limited focus on overall government goals. The quality of evaluations is uneven. They are used for policy redesign and implementation in a systematic and phased approach. The country pays insufficient attention to regular performance information and monitoring.

The lessons learnt by the World Bank from working with different countries include: (i) good design of M&E is key; (ii) the location of the function and the key role players or M&E champions is important. It should be centrally-driven yet demand sensitive and empowering. (iii) a solid diagnosis to inform and customize strategy design is crucial. This is the case in Mauritius and Botswana; (iv) the focus should be on the M&E strategy and the M&E framework around national priorities. (v) On the supply side, the independence of statistical institutions for purposes of strengthened data systems was stressed, while on the demand side the concerns are around creating greater demand for M&E through regularly adjusting the incentives framework; lastly change management and risk management strategy are important.

13. 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.

13.1 Kingdom of Lesotho

The National vision of Lesotho is captured in the Vision 2020 National long-term plan which was developed in 2002. The country's Medium-term plan will be developed from this Vision 2020 plan. The country also has the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) for the years 2012/13 – 16/17 which seeks to address key priorities such as: (i) poverty reduction; (ii) pursue high, shared and employment creating economic growth; (iii) improved health, combating HIV and AIDS and reduce vulnerability; (iv) enhance the skill base and technology transfer; (v) develop infrastructure; (vi) promote peace and democratic governance; and (vii) reduce environmental degradation.

The country has several monitoring and evaluation tools which include the 5-year NDSP M&E Framework; the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTSF); the Budget Framework Paper (BFP); the Public Service Act of 2005; Public Service Regulations 2008; and Performance Contracting of Principal Secretaries and Honourable Ministers.

The key challenge faced by Lesotho is the structural and technical deficit, which results in weaknesses in coordination capacity and fragmented or silo implementation efforts.

13.2 Senegal

Senegal institutionalized performance monitoring and evaluation in February 2013. The country has a National Plan in place, which falls under the Ministry of Finance which focussed more on finances and less on performance monitoring.

The Senegalese government has since developed new M&E systems that focus on a number of sectors such as disaster management; governance; private sector development; health; and others. The country embarked on a capacity building campaign to enhance a unified understanding of M&E because there were different perceptions of what it was. This also included training on the design of log frames. The President also heightened communication around M&E for increased buy-in and ownership. This was done through a Review Team. Given that they started in 2013, the reviews were pragmatic. They focussed on activities, and not on results; and on binding constraints such as the review of laws and regulations. The country has since established an M&E Unit in the Presidency after the initial capacity building and Presidential M&E advocacy drives. Existing policy units work jointly with the Presidential M&E Unit. Senegal has both annual targets and trimester targets.

Senegal's challenge is the low number of statisticians.

13.3 South Sudan

The Ministry of Finance in South Sudan has started the process of developing a National M&E Framework. This was started after the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the ten different states. The joint government conducted a country-wide assessment of the processes necessary for development projects; and for developing an M&E system that will address the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Work on strengthening the fragmented

M&E system is underway and accountability thereof rests with Under Secretaries. The implementation of Public Sector reforms has been launched.

Evaluations in South Sudan are not part of a structured system. They focus on quarterly and annual reports, which are approved by targeted officers.

13.4 Madagascar

Madagascar has been implementing the National Integrated System for Monitoring and Evaluation (NIMES) since 2008. This system sets forth mechanisms and processes for monitoring and evaluating development programs nationally and within the 22 Regions of the country. Its development is informed by the 2007 country strategic document entitled the Madagascar Action Plan for Sector Programs; and the National Statistical System (NSS).

Madagascar has had several successes in implementing NIMES. These include the existence of an integrated system for collecting, reporting and use of monitoring data; enhanced M&E capacity at all levels of the responsible directorate, especially with regard to Results-Based Management, data management, framework logic, indicators; development and dissemination of procedure manuals and guidelines; and annual report monitoring of the implementation of government programs.

Madagascar has faced challenges that are related to the promotion of a culture of performance monitoring; mainstreaming M&E as a management tool.

As a way forward, the Madagascar plans to enhance the capacity of all its stakeholders in M&E methodologies and in the use of tools on Managing for Development Results. In addition, they plan to update procedure manuals on NIMES and refine the organization of NIMES; and prepare a 5-year implementation plan of the National Development Plan (NDP). Lastly, the

country will continue monitoring and evaluating its programs based on the Results of Matrices and Matrix indicators.

13.5 Namibia

The performance monitoring function in Namibia is located in the National Planning Ministry in the Office of the President. The country has a Vision 2013 in place which is supported by National Development Plans (NDP). 5-year sector execution plans are also linked to NDPs. These cover several sectors such as education, and extreme poverty. The country also has Annual Sector Financial Plans which outline strategies on the implementation of the NDP.

Challenges faced by Namibia as they implement their NDP include incomplete and unreliable information. Namibia is currently developing a national M&E framework through the assistance of the World Bank.

13.6 Malawi

Malawi has the Growth and Development Strategy as an M&E master plan which it uses to monitor the achievement of performance goals. Reporting is done to the Economic Planning and Development Ministry. The country has performance agreements between the principal secretary and ministers. These operational performance agreements only highlight outputs of the implementing department. Quarterly reports are submitted to the Office of the President.

Malawi has also introduced programme-based budgeting reform which is linked to the performance management system.

13.7 Embassy of Suriname

The performance management system of Suriname is at an infant stage. The country has a National Development Plan in place which is backed up by National goals. Each Ministry has special units that are responsible for implementing M&E in different sectors, and report to the Minister.

The country does not have Performance Agreements and Delivery Agreements between the President and Ministers. They plan to engage the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in South Africa in understanding the processes involved to establish such agreements.

13.8 Trinidad and Tobago

Trinidad and Tobago has an Information Resolution and Communication (IRCP) web-portal that engages citizens to express complaints against ministries. The country also uses telephones to send text complaints, and to call in, though the operating system is different from a hotline. The portal is centralized to enhance citizen's understanding of civil society, open up communication channels with government, and allow citizens to contribute to policy.

The management of the IRCP falls under the Head of the Public Service. Complaints received through the IRCP get routed to the Permanent Secretary, and reports that are generated are attended to by a committee on a monthly basis.

Lastly, Trinidad and Tobago has an Integrated Performance Management System (IPMS) which is integrated with other financial management systems to monitor all government projects and programs.

14 Breakaway sessions – Thematic Discussions

14.1 The delegates were divided into 4 groups to discuss the following questions:

Group 1:

What are the key success factors for a strong performance M&E system?

How can you help create/strengthen them in your country?

Group 2:

How can you create greater demand across government for greater performance M&E?

What kind of incentives (carrots/sticks) could help create greater demand and buy-in?

(Involvement of oversight institutions, civil society, sectors etc. Carrots and sticks for demand stimulation).

Group 3:

How can the supply-side of M&E be strengthened?

What kind of M&E systems and tools and information is necessary to help promote performance M&E? What kind of tool can be used?

Group 4:

How can performance M&E be best integrated with other public sector reforms, including those led by other officers, to enhance its impact?

How can the linkages of performance M&E to strategic planning (performance-based) budgeting and performance management be enhanced, so there is an integrated performance reform agenda? (SA example of bringing together M&E and planning less than one Ministry)

14.2 Plenary Discussions from break-away sessions

Group 1: What are the key success factors for a strong M&E system?

- (i) Shared Vision: almost every country has a vision. However, there is a challenge of implementing that vision.
- (ii) Role definition: Roles should be defined and clarified at all levels, and this includes public participations. The example of the Freedom Charter in South Africa was given. Also, the Senegalese approach which starts with activities rather than a top down approach was mentioned.
- (iii) The accountability role of government to report to citizens and get feedback is key.
- (iv) Do not be ambitious to do everything at once.

The group stressed the need for strong legal systems to support M&E work. They have also observed that championing at the highest level leads to success in M&E.

Group 2: How can we create greater demand across government for greater performance M&E?

- (i) The group identified stakeholders as political leaders; M&E officials and citizens. It is important to expose political leaders to M&E processes so that they can drive it. They should be exposed to best practices through study tours to other countries.
- (ii) Citizens should be involved as secondary stakeholders in M&E. Platforms should be created to engage citizens and for following up on service delivery complaints.
- (iii) Technocrats should sign performance contracts and performance should be assessed. Good performance should be rewarded with benefits or incentives. Where there is a lack of performance, officials should be re-deployed.

On the question of promoting M&E, the group mentioned initiatives that will incentivise Cabinet/Parliament. Performance contracts that are signed by politicians have to be made public. Performance contracts for technocrats should be used. The General Public should be

given a platform in which they will engage with government and government should be capacitated to respond.

Group 3: How can the supply side of M&E be strengthened?

- (i) The group mentioned the need for a good policy framework to guide M&E.
- (ii) The capacity of officials in Ministries to carry out M&E should be enhanced through training.
- (iii) The location of M&E is important in championing its cause and in making it more recognized by departments.
- (iv) M&E tools such as an M&E database and an accessible web-based system are important for storage. Independent bodies such as statistical departments are key in providing quality data.

On the question of promoting M&E, the group mentioned initiatives that will incentivise Cabinet/Parliament;

Group 4: How can the linkages of performance M&E to strategic planning, budgeting and performance management be enhanced, for an integrated performance reform agenda?

The group reported on specific current practices in Malawi, South Africa, Lesotho, Senegal.

They identified the following current patterns and issues as catalysts for integration:

- (i) Namibia – each pillar (National planning and M&E integrated); PBB budgeting is located in the Ministry of Finance
- (ii) South Sudan – planning is done by individual ministries in line with Vision 2040 and the South Sudan Development Initiative. These are then submitted to the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning for approval.

- (iii) South Africa – Strategic Planning and Annual Performance Planning functions have recently been transferred to the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation. Performance Budgeting is with the Ministry of Finance. There is limited integration of performance management systems.
- (iv) Lesotho – The Ministry of Planning is responsible for the National Plan. Ministries submit their individual plans to the Ministry of Finance.
- (v) Malawi – Economic Development and Planning are responsible for national planning. Ministries develop their sector strategic plans which they submit to the Ministry of Finance. ECD is responsible for M&E Framework. The President and Cabinet monitor the quarterly reports in line with performance contracts of Ministers. Evaluations are conducted on an annual basis.
- (vi) Senegal – The Ministries of Planning, Finance and Sector Ministries work together to match planning with budget. The Ministry of Finance approves programme-based budgets and the Office of the Prime Minister and report on priority results Delivery Unit in the Presidency. Autonomous agencies have agreements to implement M&E systems.

The common patterns that were identified by the different countries in Group 4 are: (i) Departments and Ministries present annual performance programmes/plans and budgets to Parliament for approval; (ii) the integration of the 4 pillars of performance M&E; strategic planning; budgeting; and performance management are gradually evolving in each country.

The group further identified 3 issues that will be a catalyst for integration: (i) Performance contracting of HODs which integrates planning, budgeting, performance management and M&E; (ii) merging of planning and PME functions under one department, office or ministry as the case in South Africa, Namibia and Senegal; (iii) Communicate the conceptual relationships between the four pillars more clearly to different stakeholders.

16. Closing Remarks

There was a growing interest from peer countries to learn from each other, given the M&E knowledge and experience of participating countries. International knowledge sharing workshops of this nature have become an important means through which local, national, regional and global knowledge is shared for developing capacity and strategies on performance M&E, and for contributing to performance improvement. The workshop delegates agreed to conduct more knowledge sharing workshops of this nature.



**REGIONAL WORKSHOP
ON PERFORMANCE MONITORING
AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS**



REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS PROGRAMME

Date: 23-24 June, 2014

Venue: Sheraton Hotel, Pretoria, South Africa

Organizers: South Africa's Presidency's Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation and the World Bank

Background and Objectives

The South African Presidency's Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) was created in 2009 to promote performance M&E across government. The Department values the use of evidence from research, evaluations, good practice M&E case studies, conferences, study tours, stakeholder engagements and international exchange and other global knowledge sharing to continually strengthen its performance M&E systems. Given the experience gained in implementing various M&E programmes, there is growing interest from peer countries to learn from the South African experience and from each other. Regional workshops thus become an important means through which local, national, regional and global knowledge is shared for developing capacity and strategies on performance M&E, and for contributing to performance improvement. The World Bank actively supports the performance M&E in South Africa through global knowledge exchanges, advisory services and technical assistance. To accommodate strong interest by countries to get to know the South African experience, a First Regional Workshop on Performance M&E took place in February 2014. Due to the great interest by participating and other governments, the DPME and the World Bank are now co-hosting a Second Regional Workshop that seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- (i) To share experiences from DPME in relation to the design and implementation of key elements of the South African M&E system, including the Outcomes System; Management Performance Assessment Tool; the National Evaluation System; Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring; Citizen-Based Monitoring; Presidential Hotline and M&E Capacity Building programmes.

- (ii) To stimulate exchange of information between the participating African peer countries on their M&E systems, and to share global knowledge on M&E.
- (iii) To discuss how to take forward the lessons learned in a practical way in individual countries and as a Community of Practice.

AGENDA

DAY I (June 23, 2014): Highlighting DPME's Work on Performance M&E		
CHAIRPERSON: Dr Sean Phillips: Director-General, DPME		
ITEM	RESPONSIBLE	TIME
Registration and welcoming tea	ALL	08h30 – 09h30
Opening keynote address	Honourable Mr B Manamela, MP Deputy Minister in the Presidency	09h30 – 09h45
Background and overview on the work of DPME	Dr Sean Phillips: Director-General	09h45 – 10h15
Welcoming remarks		
Performance M&E in South African in the global context	Asad Alam, PhD	10h15 – 10h30
Introductions	ALL Delegates	10h30 – 11h45
Outcomes System	Ms Nolwazi Gasa DDG: Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation Branch. DPME	10h45 – 11h30
Discussions		11h30 – 11h45
BREAK (11h45 – 12h00)		
Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT)	Mr Ismail Akhalwaya Head: Management Performance Assessments, DPME	11h45 – 12h15
Local Government Management Improvement Model (LGMIM)	Mr Hassan Mohamed Head: Local Government Assessments, DPME	12h15 – 12h45
Discussions		12h45- 13h15
LUNCH (13h15 – 14h15)		
Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Presidential Hotline Citizen Based Monitoring	Ms Bernadette Leon Head: Presidential Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring. DPME	14h15 – 15h00
Discussions		15h00 – 15h15
National Evaluation System	Dr Ian Goldman Head: Evaluation and Research. DPME	15h15 – 15h45

Discussions		15h45 – 16h00
Discussion about lessons learnt	ALL	16h00 – 16h30
CLOSURE OF DAY 1		
WELCOMING COCKTAIL (17h00)		
DAY 2 (June 24, 2014): Regional Experiences and suggestions for the way forward		
CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Tumi Mketi, Deputy Director-General (DDG): Institutional Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Branch		
ITEM	RESPONSIBLE	TIME
Recap of the previous day	Ms Tumi Mketi	08h30 – 09h00
Global practices and experiences in Performance M&E	Dr Kathrin A. Plangemann World Bank: thematic discussions	09h00 – 09h30
Country Presentations on specific M&E themes	Country Representatives	09h30 – 10h30
BREAK (10h30 – 10h45)		
Breakaway Sessions – Thematic discussions		10h45 – 11h45
Plenary Sessions	ALL	11h45 – 12h15
General discussion about lessons learnt from Day 2	ALL Delegates	12h15 - 13h00
LUNCH (13h00 – 14h00)		
Travel to the Union Building for afternoon session	ALL	14h00 – 14h30
M&E Learning Network - Kenya Case Study	Dr Victor Naidu	14h30 – 15h30
On-Line Presentations - PoA; MPAT; Evaluations	Dr Hermi Boraine Mr Henk Serfontein Dr Ian Goldman	15h30 – 16h30
CLOSING COCKTAIL (17h30)		

DAY 3 (June 25, 2014): Visit to Hotline (For Lesotho delegation only)

ITEM	RESPONSIBLE	TIME
Visit to Hotline	Ms Bernadette Leon/ Mr Sifiso Mkhize	09h00-13h00