



---

HoD PMDS On-line Survey Questions and Answers

---

**1. Do you think your role in HoD PMDS is critical to support the EA/DG/HoD?**

Positive Responses: (33)

Yes: All 33 respondents consider their role in the Head of Department Performance Management and Development System (HoD PMDS) critical to supporting the EA/DG/HoD.

It was pleasing to see that all respondents understand that their role in HoD PMDS is critical in supporting the EA/DG/HoD/CEO. The high level of responsibility leads to better compliance with the HoD PMDS Directive.

**2. Does the HoD PMDS effectively assess the individual contribution and organisational performance of DGs and HoDs?**

Positive Responses: (33)

Yes: All 33 respondents believe that the Head of Department Performance Management and Development System (HoD PMDS) effectively assesses the individual contribution and organisational performance of DGs and HoDs.

All respondents agree that the Directive has been correctly developed, by ensuring that it assesses both individual and organisational performance. The individual performance of a DG/HoD is linked to organisational performance as they provide leadership and strategic direction in the achievement of the organisational goals.

**3. Do you understand individual and organisational performance?**

Positive Responses: (33):

Yes: All 33 respondents indicate that they understand individual and organisational performance.

Due to the ongoing training workshops and support provided by the DPME, all respondents understand the difference between individual and organisational performance. The understanding should be translated into practice as this will greatly assist in how the DGs/HoDs performance agreements are crafted.

**4. In your opinion, what should form part of the individual performance of a DG/HoD?**

Some respondents indicated that there should be Standardised Key Result Areas (KRAs) in the performance agreements of DGs/HoDs across the public service, specifically focusing on the mandate and corporate administration of the department. This will emphasise the individual role of the DG/HoD in achieving departmental objectives. This will also ensure that measurement is fair

and transparent. The corporate administration should include areas such as strategic and annual planning, risk management, budget/expenditure plans and reports, gender mainstreaming plans and reports, HR planning/reporting, IT/automation, legal services reports and stats, highlighting the role of coordination, managing processes, and effective decision-making as critical components.

Some respondents indicated the importance of regularly review and updated outdated Key Government Focus Areas (KGFAs) to ensure relevance. The importance of being cautious about including non-strategic matters in the DG's performance agreement, ensuring alignment with the National Development Plan (NDP), MTSF, other strategic government plans as well as organisational goals, Annual Performance Plan (APP) and Business Plan was also mentioned. However, it is important to avoid duplicating APP targets in the performance agreements of DGs that will result in double dipping between individual performance and the APP. It was mentioned that workshops for DGs/HoDs to enhance their understanding of the system must be considered.

Some respondents indicated that the emphasis should be on governance and should include an integrated District Municipality Model for DGs/HoDs to account for their role. There is a need for the assessment of skills and competencies to be part of individual performance dimension which should include the assessment of Deputy Directors-General (DDGs) and other direct reports.

**5. If you answered "no" to any of the above questions please elaborate below in the space provided.**

Some of the responses when requested to elaborate indicated that the Performance Management and Development System (PMDS) should be reported similarly to Auditor General (AG) outcomes, with a focus on percentage compliance with Performance Agreements (PAs) based on Persal reports. Some of the participants propose the inclusion of Persal reports as uploaded evidence. Another respondent stated that the Departmental Coordinator has limitations due to having only view functions, limiting their ability to assist in certain aspects. The DPME designed the functions for the different users for specific purposes, i.e. the coordinator's role is to oversee and coordinate the entire HoD PMDS process and ensure the timely submission of the Performance Agreement.

**6. Do you think that HoD PMDS should be delegated to other levels for capturing?**

Positive Responses: (15):

Yes: 15 respondents believe that the Head of Department Performance Management and Development System (HoD PMDS) should be delegated to other levels for capturing.

Negative Responses: (18):

No: 18 respondents do not think that HoD PMDS should be delegated to other levels for capturing.

There were mixed responses in terms of delegating HoD PMDS capturing to other levels. The intention of giving the capturing role to another official was to alleviate the DG of the administrative burden, however, the Performance Agreement should be discussed between the DG/HoD and the

Capturer which is then captured on the system. The captured information must then be verified by the HoD/DG. The high number of participants who were anti-delegation of HOD PMDS to other levels may be due to ensuring that the DGs/HoDs to be accountable for their performance.

**7. Is the content of the performance agreement drafted by the relevant DG/HoD?**

Positive Responses: (22):

Yes: 22 respondents indicate that the content of the performance agreement is drafted by the relevant DG/HoD.

Negative Responses: (11):

No: 11 respondents disagree, stating that the content of the performance agreement is not drafted by the relevant DG/HoD.

As indicated in 4.6 the content of the Performance Agreement must be provided by the HoD/DG, as the DG/HoD will be rated on the indicators provided in the Performance Agreement. It is a concern that a mentionable number (11) of respondents indicated that the contents of the performance agreements is not obtained from the HoD/DG which places doubt regarding the validity of such information.

Performance Agreements (PAs)

Although there should be alignment between the duties of the DG/HoD and APP expectations it is important to avoid duplicating APP targets as this will result in double-dipping which means that the DG/HoD will be assessed twice on the same indicator. It was mentioned that PAs are perceived as being too operational, lacking strategic elements linked to State of the Nation Address (SONA) and State of the Province Address (SOPA) pronouncements. Performance Agreement capturing done by individuals outside the DGs/HoDs office introduces delays and hinders the process. The system allows other managers to provide inputs via the Capturer, which is considered an advantage.

Mid-Year Reviews:

Mid-term reviews become challenging, especially when covering percentages of outputs that are not under the direct control of the relevant DG/HoD, under the standardised key government focus areas, e.g. women in SMS, youth and persons with disabilities.

Annual Assessments:

Lack of feedback on targets met creates a challenge in finalising individual performance reviews or assessments. Late finalisation of performance assessments between the Minister (EA) and DG/HoD leads to non-compliance.

Evaluation Process:

Delays in receiving evaluation results hampers the implementation of corrective measures (implementation of improvement plans) for DGs/HoDs.

Cross Cutting Phases:

Constant turnover in office managers of DGs/HoDs makes coordination challenging. Lack of public service experience impacts negatively with MEC support which further adds to the difficulty. A general lack of commitment to implementing performance management in the public service is observed. Challenges arise when relevant individuals are uncooperative, impacting the smooth progression between different stages and resulting in the non-compliance of DG/HoD performance management documents. One respondent indicated proposed linking performance management to salary, suggesting that a salary could be stopped if HoD PMDS documents are not submitted without a valid reason. However, this is not currently permissible within the legislative framework.

Lack of familiarity with the HoD PMDS processes in the HoD's office staff leads to reliance on HR, emphasising the need for urgent training. Another challenge that was mentioned is the time constraints for DG/HoD due to operational reasons posing challenges in meeting deadlines and dedicating sufficient time to the HoD PMDS. The Directive on HoD PMDS however has standing time-frames which do not change except in years of national elections, therefore the planning of HoD PMDS and compliance with due dates must be prioritised. It is thus evident that the planning of HoD PMD related tasks require more attention.

A challenge is noted when people do not know their respective roles and responsibilities and as a result are not actively involved in performing their dedicated HoD PMDS roles, which results in delays and/or non-compliance. The sign-off by the Minister (EA) were mentioned as a potential stumbling block by several respondents.

System Related Matters:

A respondent indicated that there are challenges related to viewing and downloading captured information, which highlights the need for user-friendly templates for easy editing. Most respondents however indicated that the system is user-friendly and challenges are promptly addressed by the DPME team.

**8. Indicate whether the custodians of policy and implementing departments eliminate the stumbling blocks that occurred**

Positive Responses (Yes): 17

17 respondents believe that the custodians of policy and implementing departments eliminate the stumbling blocks that occurred.

Negative Responses (No): 16

16 respondents indicate that the stumbling blocks are not eliminated by the custodians of policy and implementing departments.

There is a split in opinions regarding the effective addressing and elimination of stumbling blocks in the HoD PMDS processes. There are different implementing departments which are DPME and Offices of the Premier in each province, whilst the DPSA is the policy custodian department.

**9. Is the DG/HoD performance agreement strategic in nature?**

Positive Responses (Yes): 33

All 33 respondents agree that the DG/HoD performance agreement is strategic.

All respondents believe that the DG/HoD performance agreement is strategic, aligning with the overall strategic goals of the organisation. Since the implementation of the Directive on HoD PMDS in 2018, it has been noticed by the DPME during quality assurance of performance agreements that the majority of performance agreements submitted are not strategic.

**10. If it is operational what are the reasons, please elaborate?**

Eighteen (18) respondents stated that the DG/HoD performance agreement is strategic, and aligned with the strategic goals and objectives of the organisation. Three (3) respondents indicated that performance agreements are more operational as opposed to strategic due to the inclusion of operational aspects, including oversight, reporting roles, and the need to show how targets are achieved. Twelve (12) respondents either find the question not applicable or expressed uncertainty about the distinction between strategic and operational aspects. The majority of respondents strongly assert that the DG/HoD performance agreement is strategic, reflecting alignment with organisational strategies and goals. Some responses suggest that the operational aspects may be covered in branch-specific plans and not necessarily in the DG/HoD performance agreement.

**11. What do you think should form part of DG's Key Result Areas (KRA's)?**

The following are important matters respondents indicated that should be part of a DG's KRAs: Governance and Leadership with emphasis on providing strategic leadership, direction, and high-level management of the department. Financial and Personnel Management responsibilities. Aligning with the strategic activities, priorities, and mandates of the department. It should reflect core functions and strategic mandates of departmental programs. There is also a need for risk management to be incorporated and understanding and implementing of government prescripts.

There was a suggestion for a generic KRA dealing with corporate support services, scored for compliance similar to audit outcomes, to improve PMDS compliance and service delivery. Some respondents believe that everything needed is already covered in the performance agreement, while others suggest specific KRAs such as risk management, integration into the District Development Model, and commitments from SONA and Executive Authority Priorities.

**12. Should some areas of the DG/HoD KRAs be standardised?**

A majority of respondents (29 out of 33) support the idea of standardising some areas of DG/HoD Key Result Areas (KRAs). A few respondents (4 out of 33) expressed reservations or disagreement with standardisation.

A balance between standardisation and flexibility in DG/HoD KRAs should be achieved to optimise performance alignment and organisational effectiveness. Given the majority of support for standardisation, Departments may consider identifying and standardising certain key areas within DG/HoD KRAs to ensure consistency and alignment with organisational goals. While standardising certain aspects, allow flexibility in other areas to accommodate the unique context and priorities of individual departments.

**13. If you answered "Yes" to Q19 please indicate the areas to be standardised.**

Standardising KRAs based on those similar functions performed by all HoDs/DGs, i.e. Financial, Supply Chain, Corporate Services, strategic management, risk management, human resources management and business support services. Other areas that were suggested to be standardised include leadership, ethics, and organisational culture. There should be consideration for standardisation based on sectors or clusters.

**14. Is it necessary to amend the DGs/HoDs performance agreement?**

Yes (23 responses): Some respondents advocate for the necessity of amending DGs/HoDs performance agreements, possibly to address evolving priorities, align with changing strategic objectives, or enhance the effectiveness of the performance management system.

No (10 responses): Others believe that it is not necessary to amend the performance agreements, suggesting that the existing agreements adequately capture the required performance areas.

Some respondents proposed conducting periodic reviews to assess the relevance and alignment of performance agreements with changing organisational priorities and strategic objectives. Another proposal was to seek input from key stakeholders, including DGs/HoDs, executive authorities (EAs), and relevant departments, to ensure that any amendments are well-informed and reflect a consensus on performance expectations. A suggestion was received to design performance agreements with flexibility and adaptability to accommodate changes in organisational goals, government priorities, and the broader operating environment. It is also important to communicate the reasons behind any proposed amendments and ensure that stakeholders understand the intended benefits of such changes. A balance between maintaining stability in performance agreements and introducing dynamism to address emerging challenges and opportunities is crucial. By considering these recommendations, Departments can navigate the decision-making process around amending DGs/HoDs performance agreements in a manner that enhances the effectiveness and relevance of the performance management framework.

**15. What challenges have you experienced in amending DGs/HoDs performance agreements on an annual basis?**

Respondents mentioned difficulties in amending agreements when DGs/HoDs are transferred or seconded to new positions, leading to delays or challenges in aligning the agreement with the current role. Another challenge is getting all parties involved in the agreement to revisit and resubmit the document, potentially due to busy schedules or differing priorities. The time-consuming nature of the process, particularly when executives have busy schedules, can lead to delays in finalising amendments. Some respondents mentioned confusion amongst data capturers who may not be familiar with the department's strategic priorities, leading to difficulties in crafting KRAs at the HOD level and obtaining baseline information. There are still challenges experienced with the online system, such as downtime or limitations which prevents the smooth submission and amendment processes, IT officials being the only ones able to amend the system and potential delays in the quality assurance process. In cases where there are natural disasters or immediate changes in the department's focus it may require adjustments to targets, adding complexity to the amendment process. Lack of ownership and resistance by DGs/HoDs makes it difficult to timeously finalise required amendments and hinder efforts to improve the quality of performance agreements. The inability of Capturers to engage DGs directly for questions of clarity regarding the agreement which negatively impact the amendment process. A respondent indicated that once an agreement is submitted, they are no longer able to make changes to the document.

**16. Do you agree with the quality assurance feedback provided by the DPME/OTP?**

Positive Responses (Yes): 29

Negative Responses (No): 4

It seems that the majority of respondents agree with the quality assurance feedback provided by the DPME/OTP, with 29 out of 33 respondents indicating agreement. However, there is still a small portion (4 respondents) who do not agree with the feedback. This suggests that there may be varying perspectives on the effectiveness or accuracy of the quality assurance process conducted by DPME/OTP. It might be beneficial for the DPME/OTP to address the concerns raised by those who disagree to improve the overall quality assurance process. DGs/HoDs who do not agree with the quality assurance feedback are not compelled to amend the Performance Agreements, they should however draft a letter indicating the reason(s) why they are not amending and upload it on the HoD PMD System, otherwise, they will not be allowed to progress to the next phase of the HoD PMDS.

**17. Is the 30 days provided to amend the DG's/HoD's performance agreement sufficient?**

Positive Responses (Yes): 22

Negative Responses (No): 11

It appears that opinions are divided on whether the 30 days provided to amend the DG's/HoD's performance agreement is sufficient. While 22 respondents believe it is enough, 11 respondents express that it is not. This suggests that there may be differing perspectives on the adequacy of



the given timeframe. The time allowed for the amendment of Performance Agreements is similar to the time for the development/drafting thereof (30 days). It is something the DPME can take into consideration when reviewing the Guidelines on HoD PMDS.

**18. If you answered "no" to any of the above questions in this section please indicate your reasons in the space below**

The feedback indicates several challenges related to the 30 days for amending DG's/HoD's performance agreements. Key reasons include the complexity of departmental operations, the unavailability of key stakeholders, the need for concurrence from multiple parties, and the time-consuming nature of the amendment process. Additionally, concerns were raised about the sufficiency of training and the understanding of provincial operations by DPME, as well as the need for more time for engagement and discussion between DPME and HoDs. A one-size-fits-all approach may not be suitable for all departments, and considerations for the unique circumstances of each department should be considered. One of the respondents indicated that the feedback provides valuable insights into the challenges faced during the amendment process.

**19. Is the online system user-friendly?**

The feedback on the user-friendliness of the online system is mixed with 21 respondents indicating that the system is user-friendly, while 4 respondents did not experience the system to be user-friendly. It is noted that 8 respondents did not answer this question. This suggests that there might be variations in experiences and perceptions among users. Continuous support, manuals, and training videos are provided by the DPME to make the HoD PMD System experience user-friendly and easy. The DPME is in the process of engaging the NSG to develop HoD PMDS training courses for the different roles.

**20. Does it operate within the required speed?**

Positive Responses (Yes): 31 responses

Negative Responses (No): 2 responses

It is noted that the ICT infrastructure in different provinces/departments may pose challenges in accessing the online system.

**21. Does the online HoD PMD System meet all the requirements for its intent?**

Positive Responses (Yes): 30 responses

Negative Responses (No): 3 responses

The large majority of respondents are of the view that the system meets all the requirements for its intent. The DPME team continuously identify areas where the system can be improved in order to ensure a user-friendly system that fully caters for the user's requirements.

**22. What are the reasons for feedback discussions not being facilitated?**



There are instances where the planned meetings do not take place as scheduled, possibly due to the busy schedules of the EA and DG/HoD or other unforeseen circumstances. The 30-day timeframe can contribute to challenges in facilitating discussions. These dates/timeframes are however planned and captured in the performance agreement of the DG/HoD. For some respondents, especially those who are new users, the process might be unfamiliar, and the Office Manager or relevant personnel may have a better understanding. The involvement of the Offices of HoDs Executive Support is crucial in facilitating performance processes between the Executive Authority (EA) and the DG/HoD.

Regular discussions/feedback between the EA and HoD/DG is very important. It is important to ensure that all stakeholders are well-informed about the importance of timely discussions. In cases where physical meetings cannot be conducted the EA and HoD/DG can also resort to online discussions.

**23. Has your department requested condonation in the past?**

Out of a total of 33 respondents 16 indicated Yes and 17 indicated No.

Condonation only needs to be applied for in cases where the HoD/DG did not comply with the due dates. In accordance with the Directive on HoD PMDS condonation needs to be obtained from the Minister for Public Service and Administration (MPSA) within 30 days from the due date.

**24. Was the condonation approved/not approved by the MPSA?**

The majority of respondents, 15 out of 16 that applied for condonation, indicated that their requests were approved by the MPSA. Only one (1) response mentioned that the condonation request was not approved. Any request for condonation will be declined by the MPSA if it is submitted after 30 days from the due date and if valid reasons were not cited.

**25. If "Not approved" what were the reasons?**

Some of the respondents mentioned that feedback was not provided by the MPSA, indicating a communication gap. Reminder emails are sent to non-complying departments to inform them to apply for condonation within the prescribed time frames (30 days from the due date). Follow-ups must be made by the department(s) with the MPSA if no response is received for condonation.

**26. If you answered "no" to any of the above questions in this section please indicate the reasons.**

Priorities of the Executive Authority (EA) and Head of Department (HoDs) are not aligned, leading to a perception that performance management is viewed as an administrative nuisance. There was a suggestion to score EAs based on HoDs' PMDS compliance. Some responses indicated consistent and timely submission, eliminating the need for condonation requests. Challenges in

honouring scheduled performance discussion dates between EAs and DGs/HoDs due to various commitments were also cited.

**27. Are the HoD PMDS timeframes reasonable?**

Positive Responses (Yes): 31 responses

Negative Responses (No): 2 responses

There was consensus amongst the majority of respondents (31) that the HoD PMDS timeframes are reasonable.

**28. Is the due date for the annual assessment which is the 31st of December annually conducive?**

There was a mixed response to this question, with 16 respondents indicating that it is not a problem 17 respondents indicated there is a problem with the due date for the submission of the annual assessment being the 31st of December. It is also noted by the DPME that most employees are on leave during December which leads to high levels of non-compliance.

Reasons for No Responses are indicated below:

Some respondents are of the view that the year-end period could be stressful, and setting a deadline during this time may negatively impact work-life balance. Others may perceive that the year-end is a busy operational period, making it challenging to focus on performance assessments. The reviewed Directive will consider changing the due date for Annual Assessments.

**29. What could be changed in terms of timeframes in general?**

There were concerns from some respondents regarding the challenges associated with the 31st December submission date for annual assessments. There were suggestions for changing the due date to November, considering December as a challenging period due to holidays and recess. There were proposals for aligning DG/HoD timeframes with all employees in the department, ensuring assessments are conducted simultaneously. The reason it is not aligned is because other employees in the department need to craft their performance agreements in-line with that of the DG/HoD therefore the earlier date for the DG/HoD was implemented. There were also some suggestions for aligning timeframes with the end of the financial year cycle for comprehensive APP target reviews. Other respondents suggested extending the submission period to January or later, accommodating holidays, and ensuring a reasonable timeframe for discussions. There was also some advocacy for considering the availability of Auditor-General findings in determining the timing of annual assessments. The proposals received will be considered during the review of the timeframes in the Directive for HoD PMDS.

**30. If you answered "no" to any of the above questions in this section please indicate the reasons.**

Some respondents expressed concerns that a 9-month cycle is too long. Suggests the need for a closer timeline to avoid delays and ensure timely submission. The reason for the 9-month cycle is to allow for the publication of the Annual Reports and Auditor-General findings. Several respondents highlighted the challenges associated with the festive season, including holidays and numerous campaigns, affecting the availability of PMDS role players. There are certain departments that experience high activity levels between October and December, posing challenges for accounting officers and executive authorities to engage in PMDS matters during this period. There were also suggestions to consider alternative due dates, such as January or February, to accommodate the Christmas break and ensure availability for discussions between the EA and DG/HoD. The proposals received will be considered during the review of the timeframes in the Directive for HoD PMDS.

**31. Should the Public Service Commission be included in the evaluation panel?**

Positive Responses (Yes): 21

Negative Responses (No): 12

The majority of respondents 21/33 agreed that the Public Service Commission (PSC) should be included and 12 participants disagreed that the Public Service Commission (PSC) should be included in the evaluation panel. Respondents supporting inclusion may perceive benefits such as impartiality, external oversight, and enhanced objectivity in the evaluation process. Those opposing inclusion may have concerns about potential challenges, bureaucratic processes, or a preference for internal evaluation structures as well as the fact that the PSC is responsible to resolve any grievances that may arise from the HoD PMD process.

It could be a balanced approach, potentially involving the PSC in specific phases or aspects of the evaluation process where their expertise and oversight could add significant value without compromising efficiency can be considered.

**32. If "yes", how should their role be enhanced?**

Participants express diverse views on how the PSC's role should be enhanced in the evaluation process. Some suggested granting the PSC full rights to act as assessors, providing oversight or act as moderators during the evaluation process, which would assist in monitoring fairness during evaluations and provide an additional layer of scrutiny.

While others emphasised the PSC's role in maintaining objectivity and impartiality, especially in light of current political dynamics. Some recommend the PSC's involvement as an independent oversight body to be observers, providing an impartial perspective without direct decision-making authority.

**33. If "Not" who should be in the evaluation panel and why?**

Some respondents recommend involving stakeholders who regularly interact with the DG, due to their understanding of departmental operations. Other suggestions included representation from DPME, the Presidency, Ministers and other DGs, possibly as part of a secretariat or in specific roles. There were also views that the current panel arrangements are working adequately, and there might not be a need for significant changes. There was a proposal suggesting forming a panel of professionals with a good track record and understanding of the public service. Another proposal, to ensure comprehensive evaluations, was to have MECs and DG to be serve as panel members and for the Premier to be the Chairperson. The involvement of the Auditor-General is suggested, possibly to ensure a focus on accountability and compliance.

**34. Will the 360-degree assessment improve HoD PMDS?**

Yes - 23:

No - 10:

The majority of participants believe that a 360-degree assessment would improve HoD PMDS, suggesting potential positive outcomes and benefits. Some participants express uncertainty or a neutral stance, possibly indicating reservations or a need for more information about the potential impact. Further exploration or clarification may be needed to understand the specific concerns or considerations influencing these views.

The importance of ensuring that the 360-degree is conducted by people that understand the environment of the public service, nature of the the work of the HoD/DG and relevant department is critical.

**35. Please provide suggestions on how the 360-degree assessment can best be implemented.**

Twenty-six (26) responses were received for this question providing valuable suggestions on how the 360-degree assessment can be implemented effectively.

The importance of clearly defining the goals of the 360-degree feedback initiative, addressing individual and organisational readiness as well as establishing clear criteria for assessing both organisational performance and how individual performance impacts the organisation was highlighted. It is necessary to develop a well-designed process for administering the assessment, and selecting appropriate tools.

Identifying and preparing participants for the assessment process is critical at the time of contracting and the relevant employees/stakeholders must be made aware that they will be involved in the assessment process. Training to understand the importance and purpose of holistic performance assessments is essential for the success of the 360-degree assessment approach. The National School of Government (NSG) will be instrumental in the development and roll-out of training. There must be a clear link between individual and organisational performance, managing and holding individuals accountable for poor performance as well as recognising good

performance. This can also serve as a tool for development based on the good practices that are identified.

Stakeholders should be involved in assessing the DGs, possibly through submitting feedback before evaluation meetings. DGs/HoDs can receive feedback from direct reports (DDGs) and fellow DGs/HoDs, utilising State of the Service (SOS) results and participant satisfaction ratings ensuring a well-rounded assessment.

Prior to the implementation of the 360-degree assessment the organisation must be prepared for the changes of the new approach. It is important to create a conducive environment for colleagues and other stakeholders to provide input freely and without biasness which would ensure that these inputs are honest and truthful. The assessment should be administrated correctly to obtain the best results which must be used to improve the training and learning within the organisation.

The success of the implementation is dependent on the maturity of the Public Service, political office bearers and all stakeholders who will be involved in the 360-degree assessment approach. There was also a suggestion to extend the 360-degree assessment to all Senior Management Service (SMS) members in the public service.

**36. If you answered no to any of the above questions in this section, please indicate the reasons.**

Ten (10) responses were received for this question.

Concerns were raised about the subjectivity and possible disparities, especially given the high level of the DG positions and potential influences between administrative and political heads as well as a possible delay in the finalisation of assessments. There were further concerns that senior managers may have an opportunity to vent disagreements, potentially influencing the outcome of a moderation. It was also mentioned that the transparency in providing objective performance might be compromised, raising concerns about the fairness of the assessment process. A respondent suggested that the 360-degree assessment might be abused, especially if it focuses on personal feelings or decisions that certain individuals didn't appreciate. There is a call for a focus on abilities, knowledge and skills.

Some respondents expressed uncertainty or lack of understanding about what a 360-degree assessment entails. There was also some uncertainty about the role and contribution of the Public Service Commission in the 360-degree assessment process. The assessments should go beyond just the supervisor's perspective, indicating a preference for a broader evaluation.

The responses provided, highlight concerns related to fairness, transparency, potential biases and the need for a clear understanding of the 360-degree assessment process. Education and communication about the purpose and mechanics of 360-degree assessments may address some of these concerns.

**37. If there is anything that was not addressed in the questions that you would like to add or suggest to improve the HoD PMDS please indicate in the space provided below.**

There were suggestions to involve the MEC in the assessment submission process, with both HoD and MEC signing off after the MEC has rated the HoD and to enhance the system with the development of an APP (Annual Performance Plan). This is already part of the existing HoD PMD process/system. A recommendation was received to consider adopting new trends, such as electronic signatures, to modernise the system. The DPME team responsible for the implementation of the HoD PMDS has requested the System Developer to investigate the possibility of electronic signing and its implementation.

Another respondent suggested the implementation of specific timeframes and guidelines for both DG and EAs to guide them on what is acceptable and unacceptable in putting together the DG's PA. This includes timeframes for PA amendments. The current HoD PMDS Directive and Guidelines already includes the requested information and also provide an example of how a performance agreement must be crafted. After conducting quality assessments of performance agreements, the DPME/OTP provides feedback on how the agreement should be amended to ensure compliance with the Directive on PMDS for HoDs.

It is noticed that the suggestions mainly focused on streamlining the submission process, incorporating modern technologies, and providing clear guidelines for timeframes. These ideas aim to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the HoD PMDS.