Actions and Behaviours Essential for Monitoring & Evaluation to Succeed in South African Public Service

MOFOLO, Malefetsane | MKUYANA, Lungepi | SKADE, Tembile

Abstract

an intervention mechanism to Timprove service delivery, the concepts of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is recently growing in popularity among countries, including South Africa. To this end, questions are posed in this article to establish the effect of making use of M&E in the South African public service. These questions are posed in view of the fact that South Africa has established a number of sound regulatory frameworks in the past, which should serve as a 'fertile' environment for effective service delivery. On this basis, attempts are made to investigate the answers to such questions, and then the body of knowledge through literature review was consulted so as to contextualise and conceptualise arguments

and recommendations that could be made at the end of the article.

Monitoring and Evaluation could be seen as a critical tool for government institutions to be effective towards achievement of their goals and objectives, as well as making an impact on the lives of South African citizens. In view of this, much needs to be done to several unresolved issues, particularly around the organisational/operational culture, peculiar public servants' attitudes, inefficiency and incompetence, as well as non-compliance with relative legislation.

Recommendations with regard to the required actions and behaviours in the public service are, therefore, proposed for consideration.

Keywords: Monitoring and Evaluation, Service Delivery, Outcome Approach, Delivery Agreements, Developmental State, Batho Pele Principles.

Introduction

In recent years, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is growing in popularity among the developed countries, including South Africa. The cue to this practice is drawn from many international organisations, such as the United Nations, the World Bank group and the Organisations of American States, which have been practicing it for so many years. Against this background, Ijeoma (2010:343) asserts that time has arrived for institutionalising M&E in the South African government.

M&E is described as a process that assists in the improvement of performance and is geared towards eliciting results. Its focus is specifically on improving current and future management of outputs, outcomes and impact. Furthermore, it helps to assess the performance of projects, institutions and programmes established by governments. Horton *et al.*, (1993) in Ijeoma (2011:1288) put the concept of M&E concisely by saying that it is 'an integrated process of observation, information gathering, supervision, and assessment.

This then brings a question to one's mind: "In what way could M&E bring improvement into the South African public service which then could lead to the achievement of efficient and effective service delivery?" To this question, National Treasury (2007:1) states that any institution is likely to perform well, if it knows that its performance is being monitored.

This manner of reasoning appears to be convincing, however it can also be viewed as inadequate, because according to section 196 of the Constitution (1996), the issue of monitoring and evaluation has been the responsibility of the Public Service Commission (PSC) as an independent body, to ensure effective and efficient performance within the public service. This then indicates that the PSC has been making use of M&E since 1996, and the nine values and principles of public administration, which are enshrined in the Constitution, have been in operation for nearly two decades (Public Service Commission, 2012:5).

When above issues are taken into consideration, another question that comes to mind is: "What kind of environment would favour the implementation of M&E in South African public service to ensure effective service delivery?" This (as we shall see in service delivery challenges in subsequent pages) is also in view of the fact that South Africa has established a plethora of sound regulation frameworks in the past, which should serve as

a 'fertile' environment for effective service delivery. In fact, to be correct, since 1994, policy measures have already been promoted to create an environment that is suitable for efficient and effective service delivery.

When all of the above are considered, it becomes clear that the article is not intended to address the manner in which M&E should be implemented, but to highlight the internal factors, such as organisational/operational culture, public servants' attitudes, the inefficiency and incompetence, and non-compliance issues with legislation that should be addressed in order to create an environment that would support effective implementation of M&E in the South African public sector.

Therefore, as an attempt to investigate the answers to above questions, the body of knowledge by making use of a literature review was consulted so as to contextualise and conceptualise arguments and recommendations that could be raised at the end of this article. To this end, the article starts by presenting the challenges that have been critical for service delivery deficiency in the South African government. Then, the outcomes approach; Delivery Agreements; Developmental state; 'Batho Pele" principles; the introduction and the legal context of M&E in South Africa are investigated; and lastly, findings from the literature review are highlighted, which lead to recommendations of some actions and behaviours that could be complied to, which should create a conducive environment for the implementation of M&E in the South African public service, an issue which forms part of service delivery challenges in the public service.

Service delivery challenges in the public service

Given the magnitude of service delivery protests from 1994 to 2014, it can be concluded that the past two decades of democracy in South Africa have been characterised by challenges pertaining to service delivery. According to Engela and Ajam (2010:13) in Govender (2013:811), some of the reasons for these challenges include: a lack of political will; inadequate leadership; management weaknesses; and institutional design. The Department of National Treasury (2007:2) also reveals that the main challenge in the public sector has been the inability to efficiently make use of resources.

This challenge happens regardless of laws that guide public finance management such as: the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996 (Act No. 108 of 1996); Public Finance Management Act, 1999 (Act No. 1 of 1999 as amended by Act No. 29 of

1999); and Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act, 2003 (Act No. 56 of 2003).

To this end, Nzewi and Musokeri (2014:48) indicate that the inability to efficiently make use of resources is of grievous concern even in the office of the Auditor-General (AG). To this, these researchers argue that, it is because of the fact that most of the institutions and departments do not comply with all legislative requirements that govern public financial management.

Speaking of legislative requirements, a sound legislative environment started as early as 1994. Kanyane (2014:91) reveals that the period between 1994 and 2004 became an epoch in which state 'machinery' was mainly involved in developing the legislation that was intended to bring about transformation. Consequently, the avalanche of policies and regulations such as, acts of Parliament, proclamations, white papers and by-laws were established and proclaimed. Regrettably however, their implementation was lacking, and even the resultant programmes were not satisfactory.

Issues of delays and lack of quality of services became central in the operations of the public service in South Africa. To this, Matshiqi (2007:7) writes that "public administration has become to be associated with delays, red tape, insensitivity and inefficiency in the regulation of cost and time". Fortunately, South African government agrees to this, and takes it a step further to indicate that usually those issues are symptoms of managerial weakness in the public service (Presidency Twenty Year Review, 2014:31)

While one could argue that the apartheid culture in the public service also had an influence on the challenges indicated above, Hologram (2003:156) in Kanyane (2014:93) raises another perspective, that the African National Congress (ANC) government was faced with many tasks at once. For example, *inter alia*, from 1994, government has been embarking on policy development, continuously striving to address the injustices of the past, providing services to meet the needs of the citizens, working on physical infrastructure backlogs, addressing social security and implementing policy alleviation measures.

In contrast to the above, Matshiqi (2007:2) indicates that the action taken by government gives a feeling of admission that the culture of service in the public service, even way beyond 1994, lacked rigour, hence the expression that: "government has noted that many public servants have not yet internalised Batho Pele principles as part

of their day-to-day operation while providing services to members of the public. In order to deal with this, the Department of Public Service and Administration has developed a "Batho Pele revitalisation strategy" that aims to inculcate the Batho Pele culture among the public servants and improve service delivery in the public service."

Furthermore, another issue which becomes a challenge to the public service in South Africa over the past two decades is the issue of planning. Bosch (2011) in Kanyane (2014:101), put forth that planning in the country has not yet considered the reality of different cycles due to the fact that M&E is not yet the 'life-blood' of sound and efficient planning and implementation. According to Bosch, a planning cycle should focus on the results that matter, so as to learn from previous successes and challenges in order for existing and future initiatives to be better able to expand people's choices and also to improve their lives.

The issue of planning and the lack of M&E in the departments and municipalities become evident when considering, for example, the research on Operation Clean Audit 2014 (OCA 2014). According to Powell, O'Donovan, Ayele and Chigwata (2014:1), the objective of the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) with regard to OCA 2014, was that all 283 municipalities (currently 278) and departments in 9 provinces should achieve a clean audit by 2014. These authors argue that a miracle would have to happen for the majority of municipalities to achieve the 2014 target.

This argument makes sense, particularly when looking at the comments of President Jacob Zuma in his State of the Nation Address (2014) after being elected as the President of the country for the second term, when he reiterated that "We are pleased that eleven municipalities stand out for consistent good performance in audits, expenditure on municipal infrastructure grants and service delivery".

Well, although the President's comments are good from an Appreciative Inquiry theoretical point of view, which Watkins and Mohr (2001) in Scheel and Crous (2007:32) state that, among its underlying assumptions, it asserts that change is created by amplifying the positive characteristics of an organisation rather than trying to address and fix the negative characteristics; but really, eleven successful municipalities is too small a percentage, representing just a 'drop in the ocean'.

Now, drawing lessons from their research findings, Powell, *et al.* (2014:17-20) reveal that firstly, COGTA's objectives and targets were based on inadequate information about the real situation in municipalities. Simply put, the information lacked significant quality

to inform about the real situation in municipalities. Secondly, the set targets were rigid and never considered the changing circumstances. This shows that no monitoring and evaluation has ever taken place. Thirdly, COGTA never made use of measures to control change in order for OCA to be realised. Lastly, no sanction on municipalities and provincial departments for failing to reach the OCA targets.

While we are still on these facts, reports indicate that most government departments have not yet institutionalised M&E, despite the dictates of the legislation (National Treasury, 2011:2; Molepo, 2011; & Govender, 2013:811-812). Furthermore, Mackay (2007:45) indicates that more often than not, the performance information in African countries is of poor quality. Looking at South Africa, this is not a surprise, given a number of AG's reports, which frequently reveal mistakes on the submitted financial statements for auditing (Bailey & Hawker, 2012 in Mofolo, 2014:24).

Given this position, it becomes increasingly clear that government was required to introduce new mechanisms to improve service delivery. Hence, in the second decade of democracy, their focus has shifted and they started putting more effort into improving and driving service delivery implementation. To this end, government brought about a new way of focusing, by introducing an outcomes approach in order to promote efficient and effective performance (Public Service Commission, 2012:13), which gets discussed below.

The outcomes approach

Essentially, the aim of an outcomes approach is to address a number of weaknesses in government, *inter alia*, the lack of strategic focus, challenges pertaining to inter-departmental and inter-governmental coordination, the predisposition towards working individualistically, a lack of rigour in planning and weaknesses in implementation (Public Service Commission, 2012:13).

Furthermore, the former Minister in the Presidency, Minister Collins Chabane (2010), indicates that since 1994, government has made strides to provide services to the people of South Africa, but substantial increases in expenditure did not always produce the expected results; hence the introduction of outcomes and measurable outputs approach.

The above initiative is geared towards changing the way government works. What is critical to the approach is to improve service delivery by getting different departments

and spheres of government to work together in developing plans or producing delivery agreements for priority outcomes. Additionally, linking inputs and activities to outputs and outcomes, as well as providing targets and timeframes should form part of the strategy. Significantly, this approach strives to promote a joint government, and emphasises on the need to integrate planning, budgeting and monitoring and evaluation (Public Service Commission, 2012:13), of which delivery agreements form a central part.

Delivery Agreements

In the year 2009, South Africa's ruling party, the African National Congress and the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2009–2014 concentrated on the following five priorities, namely, creation of decent work and sustainable livelihoods; education; health; rural development; food security and the fight against crime and corruption. These issues then became the basis for the twelve (12) priority outcomes which government intended to pursue (Chabane, 2010; & Public Service Commission, 2012:14).

Therefore, in January 2010, the following 12 priority outcomes were adopted in the Cabinet, which were:

- Education: quality basic education
- Health: a long and healthy life for all South Africans
- Safety: all people in South Africa are and feel safe
- Employment: decent employment through inclusive economic growth
- Skills: skilled and capable workforce to support an inclusive growth plan
- Infrastructure: an efficient, competitive and responsive economic infrastructure network
- Rural: vibrant, equitable, sustainable rural communities contributing towards food security for all
- Human settlements: sustainable human settlements and improved quality of household life
- Local government: responsive, accountable, effective and efficient local government system
- Environment: protect and enhance our environmental assets and natural resources

- Internal and external relations: create a better South Africa, a better Africa and a better world
- Public Service: an efficient, effective and development oriented public service and an empowered, fair and inclusive citizenship (Chabane, 2010; & Public Service Commission, 2012:14).

According to Chabane (2010), these 12 priority outcomes also have their associated measurable outputs. Singling out only priority outcome number twelve (12), which involves an efficient, effective and development-oriented public service and an empowered, fair and inclusive citizenship, from which the following seven (7) measurable outputs are derived:

- Service Delivery Quality and Access
- Human Resource Management and Development
- Business processes, systems, decision rights and accountability management
- Corruption tackled effectively
- Nation Building and Developing a National Identity
- Enhancing public participation
- Enhancing uniform service standards to all (Molepo, 2011)

According to the Guide to the Outcomes Approach (2010:14), the purpose of delivery/performance agreements primarily is not to serve as a punitive mechanism, but as a management, coordination and learning tool. However, President Jacob Zuma in his address on the occasion of his second term inauguration as the fifth President of South Africa (Presidency, 2014:6) stressed that this second term of his government will ensure that productivity is promoted and there is much tighter accountability, with firm consequences where public service fails to deliver services to South African people. This time, according to the President, key targets will be eradication of corruption and inefficiency in the public service, which closely links to the role of developmental state.

Developmental state

According to Fakir (2007:1-2), there have been a number of debates around characterising South Africa as a developmental state. Resultantly, a varied set of indicators have been forwarded to give weight to this characterisation. Be that as it may,

the PSC expressed its views in its 2007 State of the Public Service Report to this issue in the following manner:

South Africa's efforts to promote growth and development are being pursued within the context of building a developmental state. Without going into a detailed discussion on the different conceptions of a developmental state, it suffices to say that such a state seeks to capably intervene and shepherd societal resources to achieve national developmental objectives; rather than simply rely on the forces of the market.

What gives rise to and shapes the nature of a developmental state depends on the context and history of a country.... Against this background, many have quite correctly cautioned against any attempts to suggest that there is a prototype of a developmental state that can be constructed on the basis of what worked in other countries.

What then is the specific context within which to locate a South African developmental state? The PSC believes that the Constitution provides the basis on which to understand developmentalism in South Africa given how it captures the collective will and determination of her people to create a better life for themselves (Public Service Commission, 2008:8).

In cognisance of the above, the Public Service Commission (2008:8) dictates that when state institutions or government programmes are evaluated, such exercise should consider the type of state in which such institutions and programmes are located. Therefore, Section 195(1)(c) of the Constitution (1996) provides that "Public administration must be development-oriented". To this end, the Public Service Commission (2008:8) posits that state institutions and government programmes should be designed and drafted based on the foregoing principle.

To this issue, Fakir (2007:4) states that the role, function and mandate of the public service is widely defined by the Constitution (1996). To that effect, Section 197(1) of the Constitution states that "within public administration there is a public service for the Republic, which must function, and be structured, in terms of national legislation, and which must loyally execute the lawful policies of the government of the day."

Additionally, section 195(1) of the Constitution (1996) prescribes that public administration must be governed by the following democratic values and principles, which are:

- A high standard of professional ethics must be promoted and maintained.
- Efficient, economic and effective use of resources must be promoted.
- Services must be provided impartially, fairly, equitably and without bias.
- Peoples' needs must be responded to, and the public must be encouraged to participate in policy-making.
- Public administration must be accountable.
- Transparency must be fostered by providing the public with timely, accessible and accurate information.
- Good human resource management and career development practices, to maximise human potential, must be cultivated.
- Public administration must be broadly representative of the South African people, with employment and personnel management practices based on ability, objectivity, fairness, and the need to redress the imbalances of the past to achieve broad representation.

Considering these values and principles, it is apparent that a new direction in the public service is being pursued in the post-apartheid era. However, Matshiqi (2007:2) indicates that in many cases, more especially in the first term of the democratic government, lack of service delivery was experienced, because of the lack of capacity in the government; and this situation forced government to bring about new measures, such as "Batho Pele" (People first) principles, discussed briefly in the next section.

"Batho Pele" principles

According to Matshiqi (2007:2), "Batho Pele" principles objectives are to:

- introduce a new approach to service delivery by putting people at the centre of planning and service delivery;
- improve the face of service delivery by raising new attitudes such as increased commitment, personal sacrifice, dedication; and

improve the image of the public service.

Furthermore, "Batho Pele" principles were developed to serve as acceptable policy and legislative framework with regard to service delivery in the public service. These principles are aligned with the Constitutional principles discussed above.

Having considered the environment and context under which public service should be operated, monitored and evaluated, the introduction and legal context of M&E in South Africa should receive attention.

The introduction and legal context of M&E in South Africa

As a way of improving performance in the public service, Ijeoma (2010:351) states that M&E was introduced in 2005, and the focus was only on staff performance evaluations. According to Ijeoma (2010:351) the Presidential ten year review in 2004, became a catalyst for the introduction of monitoring and evaluation policy in South Africa.

To add to this, the Public Service Commission (2008:4) reveals that in the 2004 State of the Nation address, the President also emphasised the importance of monitoring and evaluation, as well as reporting in government by saying:

The government is also in the process of refining our system of Monitoring and Evaluation, to improve the performance of our system of governance and the quality of our outputs, providing an early warning system and a mechanism to respond speedily to problems, as they arise. Among other things, this will necessitate an improvement of our statistical and information base and enhancing the capacity of the Policy Coordination and Advisory Services unit.

This address was delivered during the period of the reign of President Thabo Mbeki; and in this period, the President made an undertaking of reporting bi-monthly on the implementation of the system that would monitor and evaluate government performance in terms of service delivery. To this end, the Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (GWM&ES), and National Treasury Framework responsible for managerial programme performance were instituted (Ijeoma, 2010:351).

The above policy frameworks were effected in 2007. Presently, the GWM&E is regarded as the overarching policy framework for M&E in the South African government. Therefore, it is applicable to all entities in all three spheres of government. The intention of this policy framework is to close or fill the gaps in the information required for planning the delivery of services and reviewing, as well as analysing the success of policies, which are matters that could not effectively be provided by the previous systems (Presidency, 2007:1; & National Treasury, 2007:2).

The Presidency (2007:4) defines the M&E system as:

a set of organisational structures, management processes, standards, strategies, plans, indicators, information systems, reporting lines and accountability relationships which enables national and provincial departments, municipalities and other institutions to discharge their M&E functions effectively.

Furthermore, the Presidency (2007:4) indicates that in addition to the foregoing, formal managerial elements are the organisational culture, capacity and other enabling conditions which would determine whether the feedback from M&E function influence the organisation's decision-making, learning and service delivery.

In addition, the National Treasury (2011:1) indicates that according to new regulations, national and provincial departments, constitutional institutions and public entities supposed to develop programme performance information (PPI) plans describing and detailing strategies to improve their programme performance information Systems. The organisational programme performance information system involves a programme performance information framework as well as structures, processes and rules to collect, verify, store and use data to produce the required PPI; target, calculate, interpret, analyse and use the PPI in departmental decision making; report on the PPI; and review the PPI framework (National Treasury, 2011:1).

Consequently, it becomes evident that the organisational programme performance information system provides the activities which should be translated into an M&E function in the departments and institutions of government. Thus, what is critical to these activities is the appropriateness, availability and quality of programme performance information (National Treasury, 2011:1). Travers (2010) states that "without trusted information, government would have to exist on hunch and guesswork".

Therefore, to manage programme performance information, the National Treasury (2007:13) stipulates the responsibilities to the following:

- **Executive authorities:** these are Ministers, MECs and Mayors who are accountable to Parliament, provincial legislatures, and municipal councils. In executing this responsibility, they should provide their institutions with full and regular reports concerning matters they are entrusted with. These individuals should also ensure that their institutions set up appropriate PI systems to enable them to fulfil their accountability responsibilities. To that effect, they are also charged with the responsibility of overseeing that those systems are functioning optimally and complying with legislation framework.
- Accounting officers: these functionaries are accountable for establishing and maintaining the systems to manage PPI. In that way, their performance agreements should also reflect these responsibilities. When carrying out such responsibilities, they should be assisted by Chief Information Officers, and also ensure that enough capacity within the institutions exists.
- Line managers: these individuals are accountable for establishing and maintaining the PI processes and systems within their areas of functioning. In the same way as accounting officers, their performance agreements must reflect these responsibilities.
- Other officials: these officials are charged with the responsibilities of capturing, collating and checking performance data related to their activities. For this reason, the integrity of the institution's overall performance information depends on how honestly these officials execute these responsibilities. Their performance agreements and assessments must explicitly deal with the quality of PPI they produce (National Treasury, 2007:13).

In view of the above, it becomes apparent that executive authorities, accounting officers, and line managers are responsible for establishment of PI Systems. While on the other hand all personnel at lower levels are responsible for ensuring the timely collection and availability of required data. The findings of this article now receive attention.

The findings

What follows in this section are the findings gathered through a literature review as the method adopted in this article.

To start with, it is clear that the intention of government for using M&E, is to close or fill the gaps of the information required for planning the delivery of services and reviewing, as well as analysing the success of policies, which are matters that could not effectively be provided by the earlier policy frameworks.

However, from the literature, it appears that, even if M&E could be seen as critical for government institutions to be effective towards achievement of their goals and objectives, as well as making an impact to the lives of South African citizens, but much still needs to be attended to, particularly issues of organisational/operational culture, public servants attitudes, inefficiency and incompetence, as well as non-compliance with related legislation.

In summary, the weaknesses revealed by the literature, show internal factors, which, if not fully attended to or addressed, means that the implementation of M&E could also fail, or fall into the same trap or experience the same treatment like those policies and intervention measures shown in this article.

Thus, there is a need to strongly deal with the highlighted weaknesses in order to create an environment which would effectively promote the implementation of M&E in the public service. The next section suggests some of the actions and behaviours that can be considered in the creating of a conducive environment for the implementation of M&E.

Recommendations

Firstly, in order to establish a favourable environment for M&E in the public service, government should come up with a rigorous drive to instil democratic values and principles enshrined within the Constitution (1996), as well as Batho Pele principles. Furthermore, all officials and employees in the public service should realise their individual contributions towards the developmental goal of their departments, and the country as well. In other words, they must be clear and aware of their roles in meeting the goals of a developmental state.

The above should also be coupled with training. The approach to training on democratic values and principles, including Batho Pele principles should be preceded by an overview or historical summary of public service culture that prevailed during the era of apartheid, where disadvantages of this culture would be raised, as well as the reasons why it was not deemed suitable for democratic South Africa today. In other words, apartheid's public service culture should be juxtaposed with the new culture that is advocated by democratic values and principles, together with Batho Pele principles.

The argument here is, to acquire change in one's behaviour, one should start by being aware of the previous practices, and realise how harmful those practices were for the development and democracy of South Africa, hence the need for change. In support of this, Cummings and Worley (2001:23) state that to encourage employees to replace their old behaviours and attitudes with those that are required, leaders should begin to 'unfreeze' the process by psychologically disconfirming the suitability of the employees' current behaviour and attitudes.

Therefore, there is a need for the induction or orientation of all individuals in the public service, including executive authorities who should understand the need of moving towards the practice of democratic values and principles, as well as working according to Batho Pele principles.

Secondly, when Ministers, MECs and Mayors provide governance, guidance, and oversight in their respective areas of responsibilities, M&E should also be part of these responsibilities, not only ensuring the existence of the System. In order to carry out M&E functions effectively, executive members should be objective, skilled and inquiring. They should strive to acquire knowledge of all policies and regulations within their sphere of influence. Hence, Shah (2007:164) states that they should be duly aware of their organisations' activities and environment.

If any lesson can be drawn from the experience of the AG with regard to successful public institutions, it is that all successes are based on a leadership tone, showing a willingness to accept accountability, establishing a control environment that is conducive to accountability and [sanctions], and decisively addressing weaknesses within a specified timeframe, and continue with performance monitoring (Nzewi & Musokeri, 2014:44).

A strong and active executive authority, particularly when coupled with an effective M&E system, is often best able to identify and correct areas of challenges and weaknesses timeously. The Public Service Commission (2012:5) indicates that it is no

longer accepted that the accounting officers would naturally show accountable behaviour, hence, a form of probity is required, and this is the duty that should be assumed by M&E.

Therefore, in order for executive authorities to be competent in this situation (effective use of M&E system), they should be trained, not once, but continuously as improvements on the system are implemented.

Thirdly, in a similar way as above, it should be realised that accounting officers in the public service should be aware that the ultimate responsibility lies with them, and as a result, they should show and portray a sense of ownership of the M&E system. The manner in which they approach this task should not signal a sense of mediocrity to the lower ranks. More often than not, if management shows an attitude of not being keen to the activity or lack of enthusiasm; in the same way, lower ranks will follow suit.

Shafritz and Russel (2005:15) in Mle (2012:22) indicate that human resources within public administration carry out municipal and departmental duties, and as such, they are charged with the task of ensuring that those organisations' goals and objectives are reached through efficient and effective performance. Therefore, it can be accepted that the basis of success regarding goals and objectives of the public service in South Africa is ethical conduct and professionalism that functionaries should exude at all times.

Mafunisa (2002:194) states that ethics in the public sector should focus on "what is considered to be the right and proper behaviour of political office-bearers and public officials." In other words, attention should be on the system of moral principles that are regarded as generally accepted. On professionalism, Mle (2012:21) states that it is a construct that involves a high standard of work and adherence to certain standards and principles concerning specific work which is pursued.

Following on Mle (2012), it is clear that for M&E to succeed in the public service there must be ethical behaviours and professionalism portrayed from the top and cascading down to managers at all levels, including personnel at lower levels. Information provided through the M&E system must be provided on time, of quality and suitable to the purpose. To sum up, this simply requires for accounting officers in the public service to also set the tone at the top that affects the integrity and ethics as well as other factors of a positive M&E environment.

Fourthly, the issue of skills and qualifications cannot be over emphasised. The 'road map' or strategic direction document in South Africa, namely, the National Development

Plan (2011:365), indicates that the country has undertaken the challenges of building skills and professionalism, starting right from the top to the bottom. According to the Plan, at the top, experience and expertise matter most. At the same time, the National Development Plan (2011:365-366) further indicates that at the lower level, the country should focus on producing the skills and experience that will be required in future to address the needs of the public service.

When all these are considered, the reality is, M&E is relatively a new concept in South Africa, more and more improvements should still take place as part of a policy-making process in future and as such, training would be needed in order for officials and employees at lower levels to meet the requirements of the Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System efficiently and effectively.

Closing remarks

In conclusion, this article started by posing questions, which needed to be answered by conducting a literature review. The intention of the article was not to explore how Monitoring and Evaluation should be implemented in South African public service, but to investigate into internal factors that could be hindrances to the successful implementation of the policy. To that effect, a literature review as a method of research used in this article was embarked on.

The literature review concentrated on the following aspects:

- service delivery challenges in the public sector;
- the outcomes approach;
- delivery agreements;
- developmental state;
- "Batho Pele" principles; and
- the introduction and the legal context of M&E in South Africa.

The findings from these thematic constructs in this literature review article, led to the possible suggestions which could be considered to give effect to the Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System, as an overarching legal framework for M&E in South Africa.

List of References

- Chabane, C. 2010. An outcome based approach to govt [Online]. Available from: http://www.politicsweb.co.za/politicsweb/vew/politicsweb/en/page71656?oid=16048...
 [Assessed 04 June 2014].
- Cummings, T.G. & Worley, C.G. 2001. Organisational development and change. Australia:
 South-Western College.
- Fakir, E. 2007. Public Service Delivery in a Democratic, Developmental State. Policy: issues and actors, 20(3):1-11, Feb.
- Govender, I.G. 2013. Monitoring and Evaluation Systems for enhancing governance and government legitimacy in South Africa. Journal of Public Administration, 48(4): 811-823, Dec
- Guide to the outcomes approach, version 27. 2010. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Ijeoma, E.O.C. 2010. Mainstreaming Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation policy in South Africa: An eye on impact assessment. Journal of Public Administration, 45(2): 343-360, June.
- Ijeoma, E.O.C. 2011. Structural provisions for establishing and managing Monitoring and Evaluation Units in Government Departments. Journal of Public Administration. 46(4): 1288-1308, Dec.
- Kanyane, M. 2014. Exploring Challenges of Municipal Service Delivery in South Africa.
 Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review, 2(1): 90-110, March.
- Mackay, K. 2007. How to build monitoring and evaluation systems to support better government. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Mafunisa, M.J. 2002. Critical perspectives on public administration: Issues for consideration.
 Cape Town: Heinemann Publishers (Pty) Ltd.
- Matshiqi, A. 2007. Public Service Performance: Towards a better life for all. Policy: issues and actors, 20(5):1-21, Feb.
- Mle, T.R. 2012. Professional and Ethical Conduct in the Public Sector. Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review, 1(1): 21-31, June.

- Mofolo, M.A. 2014. Contextualising the Guidelines of Contracting Organisational Development Consultants in South African Municipalities. Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review, 2(1): 23-35, March.
- Molepo, A.N. 2011. Monitoring & Evaluation Framework for the Public Service.
 Presentation to the M&E Learning Network, SA Reserve Bank Conference 15 February 2011. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Nzewi, O. & Musokeri, P. 2014. A critical Review of the Oversight Role of the Office of the Auditor-General in Financial Accountability. Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review, 2(1): 36-55, March.
- Powell, D.M., O'Donovan, M., Ayele, Z. & Chigwata, T. 2014. Operation Clean Audit 2014:
 Why it failed and what can be learned. Cape Town: MLGI.
- Presidency Twenty Year Review. 2014. Twenty Year Review: South Africa 1994 2014.
 Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Scheel, R. & Crous, F. 2007. Leveraging organisational cultural capital. South African journal of industrial psychology. 33(1): 29-37.
- Shah, A. 2007. Public sector governance and accountability series: Local Public Financial Management. Washington, D.C. The World Bank.
- South Africa. 1996. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. Department of National Treasury. 2007. Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. Department of National Treasury. 2011. Performance Information Handbook.
 Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. National Planning Commission. 2011. National Development Plan: Vision for 2030. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. Public Service Commission. 2008. Basic Components in Monitoring and Evaluation. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. Public Service Commission. 2012. Evolution of Monitoring and Evaluation in the South African Public Service. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- South Africa. The Presidency. 2007. Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System. Pretoria: Government Printers.

- South Africa. The Presidency. 2014. Address by His Excellency President Jacob Zuma on the occasion of his Inauguration as fifth President of the Republic of South Africa Union Buildings, Pretoria [Online]. Available from: http://www.thepresidency.gov.za/pebble.asp?relid=17449&t=79 [Accessed 26 May 2014].
- State of the Nation Address, Office of the Presidency, Pretoria.
- Travers, T. 2010. Speaking at EURIM's Round Table, 'Uncovering the truth: Using information to deliver more for less' [Online]. Available from: http://www.audit-commission.gov.uk/subwebs/mailouts/events/eurim.htm [Accessed 30 July 2014].
- Wikipedia. Monitoring and Evaluation [Online]. Available from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monitoring_and_Evaluation [Accessed 22 July 2014].

AUTHORS' CONTACT:

MOFOLO Malefetsane

Dept of Local Govt & Public Finance Walter Sisulu University Email: mmofolo@wsu.ac.za

MKUYANE Lungepi

Dept of Local Govt & Public Finance Walter Sisulu University

SKADE Tembile

Dept of Local Govt & Public Finance Walter Sisulu University