

Monitoring and Evaluating Government Performance in Botswana

BOTLHALE, E.K.

Abstract

In an era characterised by fiscal stress in the post-global recession era, clichés such as 'bang for the buck' are commonplace. Governments are under increasing pressure to spend limited public resources in efficient and effective ways. Efficient and effective governments are a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for economic development. Hence, governments have adopted performance-improving interventions such as New Public Management. Botswana jumped into the bandwagon of public sector reforms in the 1990s through interventions such as Performance-based Management Systems. The focus was almost entirely on

performance enhancement to the neglect of performance measurement through a result-based Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework. However, in 2009, the government decided to mainstream M&E into the development planning regime. Since the M&E tool is still in draft form, Botswana is very favourably circumstanced to learn from others. Meanwhile essentials to do are: attitudinal change, shared vision on M&E, stakeholder management and demand and use of M&E information by policy-makers such as Members of Parliament.

Keywords: Monitoring and Evaluation, Government Performance, Results, Botswana.

Introduction

Governments are purposive organisations; they have strategies, visions, missions, goals, and objectives. These aspirations need to be translated into deliverables such as services and jobs. Hence, governments, like business, are engaged in the production of goods and services by combining primary factors of production; being, land, labour and capital. However, resource scarcity is a reality, even in affluent economies like the US and UK; therefore, it is important that scarce resources be put to good use. Owellen (2007:1) says, 'government agencies are under increasing pressure to demonstrate that they are making effective use of taxpayer dollars'. Therefore, performance management, 'the systematic process by which an agency involves its employees, as individuals and members of a group, in improving organizational effectiveness in the accomplishment of agency mission and goals' (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2014a) is key. Performance management is about establishing a shared understanding about what is to be achieved (Armstrong, 1993) and should be institutionalised; hence, no effort should be spared in institutionalising it in the public sector. In a way, it must be a lived culture. The centrality of government performance is underscored by the promulgation of performance-promoting tools. In many countries, performance management is promoted by government through policy and legislation (Performance Management Association, 2012) as next illustrated. The Government Performance Results Act of 1993¹ in the US (to provide for the establishment of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government (Gore 1994; Office of Management and Budget 1993); as amended by the Government Modernization Act of 2010). The New Zealand's Local Government Act (1974; as amended), and South Africa's Public Service Regulations (particularly, see chapter 1).

Performance Management translates goals into results and goes beyond individual employees and also focuses on teams, programs, processes and the organization (U.S. Office of Personnel Management 2014b). As a result of the central role that performance plays in transforming goals into results, various countries have established offices of government performance management at the highest levels of government; presidency or office of the Prime Minister or strategic ministries like Finance. Examples are: U.S. (Office of Personnel Management in the White House); India (Performance Management

¹ This was amended in February 2012 by President Barack Obama.

Division in the Indian Cabinet Secretariat); New Zealand² (Office of Auditor General); and Australia (Australian Public Service Commission). It is important to note that the language has changed from government performance to government governance. The emphasis is on governance and how it can be used to deliver results. This move is coupled with tools such as implementation analysis (see Weaver, 2010).

While a case can be made that government performance is a socially desirable good, it is important to answer the question; 'how is the government doing?' This is an important, though difficult, question. In this regard, Behn (1995:319) appropriately says;

The measurement question could be asked from a number of different perspectives: How can public managers know if they are doing a good job? How can public agencies know if they are doing a good job? How can legislators and citizens know whether their agencies and managers are doing a good job?

Given the fact that public organisations are not for-profit entities, it is impossible to export performance metrics from the latter to the former. This is so because the two are different in many respects. The public sector exhibits the following peculiar characteristics and features: lack of an explicit bottom line [that is, profit maximisation] (Boston, et al, 1996); varied, changing and ever-changing goals and objectives (Alford 1993; Gregory 1995; Metcalfe, 1993; Pollitt 1990; Wilson 1989) and the ascendance of social values over financial values (Kanter and Summers 1994). However, the foregoing problems do not mean that government performance cannot be measured. It can, however, one has to be alive to the fact that there is no universally agreed single metric, as in the maximisation of profit in the private sector, which can be used to measure government performance. Therefore, various proxies are used to measure government performance. Particularly, the late 1990s, thanks to the emergence of New Public Management, and its derivative re-inventing government – see Gore 1993), saw an increasing use of government performance measurement. At the same time, there was a phenomenal growth of the literature on the subject as argued by, amongst others, Julnes and Holzenr (2001). Examples of such literature works among others includes: Ammons 1992; Bouckaert 1992; Halachmi 1998; Hatry 1999; Kravchuk and Scback 1996; Mann 1986; Newcomer 1997; and Wholey 1999.

² New Zealand was the forerunner in the adoption of New Public Management in the Pacific region.

8 Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review

Given impassioned debates that the subject of government performance measurement elicits among academics and practitioners, it is important that the subject be given sufficient attention in the literature. This is particularly so in countries where there is a dearth of literature on the subject such as Botswana in exception to some of the following; DPSM (2009), Dzimbiri (2008), Marobela (2005), Mothusi (2009), Mpabanga (2009) and Nkhwa (2010), nothing has been written on government performance management in Botswana. This is the gap in the literature and, therefore, this paper aims to add to the burgeoning literature on government performance measurement in Botswana.

The paper is organised as follows. Firstly, it reviews the literature on the impetus for government performance (public sector reforms). Secondly, it discusses the monitoring and evaluation framework. Thirdly, it discusses the monitoring and evaluation framework in Botswana. Finally, the paper makes some recommendations and concludes.

Literature Review

Interest in measuring and improving government performance did not happen in a theoretical vacuum. It happened within a given context. While there are many factors that can be credited with the impetus to measure and improve government performance, none is as prominent as public sector reforms. The overarching objective of these reforms was to improve government performance. Improving performance talks to the three Es of management: efficiency, effectiveness and economy (see World Bank 2008). Reform of the public sector in both developed and developing countries, which began in the early 1980s, was meant to improve ways in which government was managed and services delivered, with emphasis on effectiveness, efficiency, economy and value for money (Economic Commission for Africa, 2010). The role of an efficient and effective public sector is apparent to all and, in a confirmatory note, Rizos (1965), writing in particular reference to African public sectors, says:

Though the dawn has been clouded and goals cannot be easily defined, the vitality of a country's development depends on the rejuvenation of public administration even in the darkness of insufficient knowledge and experience (Rizos, 1965:47).

Public sector reforms were first implemented in developed countries like the UK, US, Canada and Australia and New Zealand in the 1980s. Particularly, US's Ronald Reagan and UK's Margret Thatcher were instrumental as they were largely credited with 'shrinking' and streamlining governments. Delivering his inaugural address on 20 January 1984, Ronald Reagan unforgettably said, 'in this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem, government IS the problem' (Reagan 1980). However, the real reform came through New Public Management (NPM), a reaction to traditional public administration of the Waldo era (see Waldo 1948). The origins of NPM are disputed but some, like Aucoin (1990) and Dunsire (1995), hold that it sprang from the womb of public-choice theory and managerialism. NPM consists, essentially, of two sets of ideas: economics-based theories and managerialist systems (Whitwombe 2008). Some of NPM's distinguishing characteristics are: budget cuts, accountability for performance, performance measurement and strategic planning and management (Gruening 2001).

NPM was first applied in the UK in the late 1970s and early 1980s under Margaret Thatcher and was almost simultaneously implemented in the U.S. [e.g., in Sunnyvale California] (ibid). Across the Atlantic, it diffused to New Zealand (see Whitwombe 2008) and Australia (see Johnston, 2000) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. New Zealand enthusiastically implemented the NPM model by passing enabling legislations such as the State-Owned Enterprises Act (1986) State Sector Act (1988) and Public Finance Act (1989). Thus, by doing so, it implemented a radical version of NPM] (Mulgan 2004). As for the developing world, particularly Sub-Saharan Africa, NPM was adopted and implemented in the 1990s.

Like other reforms, public sector reforms are not static; they are in a state of flux. Similarly, NPM has been supplanted by other public sector reforms such as New Public Service (see Denhardt and Denhardt 2000; 2002) and New Public Governance (Osborne 2006; 2009). In spite of these changes, the preoccupation with improving government performance still endures and, at the moment, lies at the heart of public policy. The pursuit for results spawned new tools such as 'results framework'. A results framework is an explicit articulation (graphic display, matrix, or summary) of the different levels, or chains, of results expected from a particular intervention—project, program, or development strategy' (World Bank 2012:7). In the results framework, there is a link between four variables: inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts. That is, one must be able to see the linkages between these variables. The results framework has led to tools such

10 Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review

as results-based Monitoring and Evaluation. Monitoring and Evaluation mean different things to different people. However, this paper adopts the UNDP's (2002:6) definition:

Monitoring can be defined as a continuing function that aims primarily to provide the management and main stakeholders of an ongoing intervention with early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results.

Evaluation is a selective exercise that attempts to systematically and objectively assess progress towards and the achievement of an outcome. Evaluation is not a one-time event, but an exercise involving assessments of differing scope and depth carried out at several points in time in response to evolving needs for evaluative knowledge and learning...

No matter what form and shape a results-based Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) assumes, the following are key:

- **Results:** the measurable output, outcome or impact (intended or unintended, positive or negative) of an intervention.
- **Goal:** the higher-order programme or sector objective to which a development intervention, such as a project, is intended to contribute. Thus, it is a statement of intent.
- **Objective:** a specific statement detailing the desired accomplishments or outcomes of a project at different levels (short to long term).
- **Outcomes:** the results achieved at the level of purpose. These come in three variants: short-term; medium-term; and long term.
- **Outputs:** the tangible (easily measurable, practical) immediate and intended to be produced....
- **Inputs:** the financial, human, and material resources used to produce the intended outputs...
- **Activity:** actions taken or work performed in a project to produce specific outputs....
- **Indicator:** a quantitative or qualitative variable that provides a simple and reliable measure for assessing achievement, change or purpose.

- **Target:** a specified that indicates the number, timing and location of that which must be realised (IFAD, 2010).

A results-based Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system confers a lot of benefits to organisations, government included. It helps strengthen governance in countries—by improving transparency, by strengthening accountability relationships, and by building a performance culture within governments to support better policymaking, budget decision-making, and management (World Bank 2010:ii). In addition, it can be used to ‘help policymakers and decision makers track progress and demonstrate the impact of a given project, program, or policy’ (World Bank 2004:1) and also apply evidence-based decision-making (Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results 2012). A results-based M&E differs from a traditional implementation-focused M&E. It asks the following questions:

- (i) What are the goals of the organization?
- (ii) Are they being achieved?
- (iii) How can achievement be proven? (World Bank, 2004:1).

It ‘moves beyond an emphasis on inputs and outputs to a greater focus on outcomes and impacts’ (ibid).

While there is no universally agreed upon results-based M&E framework, existing frameworks are built around the 3 Es of management and linking inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts of government interventions. These are minimum essentials. As an example, the South African Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation’s ³M&E framework has some minimum essentials of a results-based M&E framework (see DPME, 2014). The same can be said about M&E frameworks elsewhere, for example: Colombia (its National Results-Based Management and Evaluation System [SINERGIA] dates back to the early 1990s and was a strategic response to the need for a results-based M&E in national planning); Botswana [the National M&E System is still in draft form]; Benin (overseen by the Office for the Evaluation of Public Policy in the Office of the Prime Minister); and Ghana (overseen by the Policy Evaluation and Oversight Unit).

³ To emphasise the centrality of M&E, the DPME is located inside the presidency.

Public Sector Reforms in Botswana

Like the rest of Sub-Saharan Africa, Botswana jumped into the government performance-enhancing bandwagon late. Having gained independence in September, and inheriting a fledgling public sector, public sector reform was not on top of the policy agenda until the early 1990s. Amongst several drivers, the realisation that there was a need for improvement in service delivery capability in the public sector in the late 1980s was key (see Chirairo, 2008). In addition, given problematic issues such as low, if not poor, customer satisfaction and the government's failure to deliver on its development objectives and goals, there was a need for intervention (Botlhale, 2010). Botswana was very favourably circumstanced at the time because waves of public sector reforms were powerfully sweeping across the world. Specifically, the New Public Management movement, which called for managerialism and the need to run the government like a business *à la* Gore (see Gore, 1993), was on the ascendancy. Botswana jumped into the NPM bandwagon in the early 1990s. For benchmarking, she looked towards the east; in this case, Singapore. At the time, Singapore was celebrated as the pioneer of smart partnerships. The smart partnerships referred to fruitful partnerships between the government and private sector (something akin to Private Public Partnerships). Then president, Ketumile Masire, visited Singapore on a study tour. Upon his return, the government introduced the Work Improvement Programme Teams (WITs) programme.

In order to implement the WITs programme, the government established the Botswana National Productivity Centre (BNPC) in 1993. The BNPC was established with 'a primary task to enhance the level of productivity awareness as an advocacy function and to enable individuals and organisations through training and consulting to be productive and competitive' (BNPC, 2010: para 1) and also facilitate delivery of the WITs programme. In 1999, the government introduced the Performance-Based Management Systems (PMS) (DPSM, 2010). The government introduced PMS 'to further improve service delivery' and that 'the implementation of PMS in government brought with it the realisation that service delivery is at the core of government development efforts' (RoB, 2010:6). Others objectives of the PMS are to: 'improve individual and organizational performance in a systematic and sustainable way' and 'inculcate the culture of performance and accountability to manage at higher levels of productivity so as to provide efficient service delivery' (ibid: 6).

There are mixed results from the PMS project (e.g., see Mothusi, 2009); however, customer satisfaction levels have been improving over time. To illustrate, while the Botswana Customer Satisfaction Survey for the Public Service of 2005 gave a low satisfaction score of 25% (RoB, 2010), there was some improvements in 2009. According to the 2009 Botswana Public Service Customer Satisfaction Survey, 83% of the public expressed satisfaction with service delivery by civil servants (RoB, 2009). The latest Botswana Public Service Customer Satisfaction Survey was conducted in 2012. Although the levels of customer satisfaction have largely stayed the same, the survey identified key areas for improvement. In this regard, the results are used to design strategies to improve services and to address capacity gaps. Following the PMS project, the government introduced the Business Process Reengineering (BPR) in March 2006. The BPR project had the overarching objective of 'improving service delivery by setting and monitoring public service performance standards...' (RoB, 2010:6). In addition to the above interventions, when Ian President Khama assumed office on 1 April 2008, he made public service delivery his top priority area (Botlhale, 2013). To signal his commitment to public service delivery, he directed Assistant Cabinet Ministers, who hitherto attended weekly Cabinet meetings, to concentrate their efforts on field work by supervising government projects (Lute, 2008). Ian Khama further emphasised the centrality of public service delivery in October 2009. When addressing a celebratory rally⁴ in Old Naledi, a very economically depressed area in the capital city Gaborone, on 18 October 2009, he jubilantly said:

Now the people have spoken, you have given me the mandate... I can confidently announce to you that now you are going to see my actions... I am going to ensure that the public service delivers. I am going to ensure that your leadership delivers. I am going to push the public service and the party leadership to serve you diligently (Owino, 2009: paragraph 1).

Following the 2009 general election, Khama added the 5th D [Delivery] to his 4-D roadmap of Democracy, Development, Dignity and Discipline. Introducing the 5th D [Delivery], he said,

⁴ His party, Botswana Democratic Party, won the 2009 general election.

14 Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review

I have already started my job as the President. I am adding another "D" to the Four Ds I introduced when I took over last year. I am introducing the Fifth "D" for Delivery. You are going to see us deliver; you shall be the witnesses (Gaotlhobogwe, 2009:1).

In essence, Khama stated that he expected the public service to deliver quality service, and emphasised that he would make it his mission to ensure efficient and effective public service delivery through the 5th D. Unfortunately, no empirical studies have been conducted to determine the efficacy of public sector reforms such as PMS and BPR (excepting Mothusi, 2009 and Mpabanga, 2009) and the 5th D. Hence, this is an area that is fertile for research. In a related vein, public policy pronouncements are in consonance with improving public sector performance. To illustrate, when delivering the 2015/16 Budget Speech on 2 February, the Minister of Finance and Development Planning, Kenneth Matambo said, 'Madam Speaker, as part of the strategy to improve the efficiency of the public sector, the Government adopted the Privatisation Policy of Botswana of 2000...' (Matambo, 2015:7). Other initiatives are: the Public Services Outsourcing Programme and Rationalisation Strategy (adopted in 2009) that resulted in the merging of various parastatals and the establishment of new entities (ibid). However, all these public sector reforms will amount to nothing if there is no objective tool to measure government performance because 'if you do not measure results, you cannot tell success from failure' (Osborne and Gaebler, 1993:146). Hence, the need to measure and monitor government performance through a Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation tool as next discussed.

Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation in Botswana

It is deducible from the foregoing that the government of Botswana jumped into the NPM bandwagon in the 1990s. Unfortunately, no Result-based Monitoring and Evaluation was put in place. As it was, the emphasis was on project implementation as instanced by various policy interventions as next illustrated. It is not a secret that Botswana has a chequered history of implementation; be it the budget or National Development Plans or policies or programmes (e.g., see Maruapula, 2008). Apparently, it looks like this is a problem that is too stubborn to go away. In 1989, then President, Sir Masire, bemoaned poor public project implementation saying that 'there is a growing gap between the establishment of policy and its implementation' and that 'the rapid

growth in the formulation of policies has not been matched by the pace of implementation' (Lucas, 2008:8). Similarly, when President Festus Mogae took over in April 1998, he worried about the same problem. Remarkably, he recalled then Vice President, Ian Khama, from a 12-month sabbatical leave in August 2000 'so that he could direct and co-ordinate ministries to ensure efficiency and expeditious implementation of government projects and programmes' (BOPA, 2000:1). In the subsequent, project implementation did not see improvement as sufficiently evidenced by the poor implementation of the National Development Plan (NDP) 9 [2003/4-2008/9]. Then Finance Minister, Gaolathe Baledzi, stated that 'fewer projects were implemented at a sectoral level compared to what had been scheduled' (BOPA, 2005: 1) when presenting the NDP 9 mid-term review to parliament in mid 2005. This is still the case today as adequately instanced by the Finance Minister, Kenneth Mathambo, decrying on 2 February 2015 that '...government remains concerned about poor project implementation. To this end, Government has taken additional measures such as the establishment of an implementation unit for mega projects under the National Strategy Office' (Mathambo, 2015:23).

In order to decisively address issues of poor project implementation, the government established the Government Implementation Coordinating Office (GICO) in May 2007. GICO's main role was to track and monitor project implementation and to facilitate quality assurance and value for money. GICO replaced prior arrangements whereby project implementation coordination was done through the Standing Committee on Projects Implementation (SCOPI) and bilateral meetings between the Department of Buildings and Engineering Services (DBES) and Government Implementing Agency. Subsequently, GICO was turned into the National Strategy Office (NSO) in May 2009 (see GoB, 2010). Lastly, in May 2014, the Government Implementation Coordination Unit (GISU) was created within the NSO to further improve project implementation.

As stated above, while the government was preoccupied with performance improvement, as amply instanced by various performance-improvement initiatives such as WITs, PMS, BPR, GICO, NSO and GISU, a parallel enthusiasm was not seen in the area of M&E. It is surprising that while evidence pointed to a need to have a results-based Monitoring and Evaluation framework in place; this was ignored in all National Planning Periods from 1966 until 2010 with the commencement of National Development Plan 10 (NDP 10). To provide context, since independence in 1966, Botswana has adopted an

16 Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review

approach of development planning and the government produces a series of National Development Plans (NDPs). The current plan, NDP 10, is the tenth in the series of NDPs and was the first to mainstream M&E. Before NDP 10, Botswana did not have a formal M&E framework; therefore, M&E was done on *ad hoc* basis and haphazard manner. Previously, there existed the following structures: Standing Committee on Project Implementation (composed of selected Permanent Secretaries to monitor implementation of policies and projects); Project Monitoring Unit in 2001 in the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning (MFDP); and a Project Monitoring System by MFDP in 2004. However, for the first time in 2009, the M&E framework was introduced in the NDP. There is a whole chapter on M&E; *chapter 16: Monitoring and Evaluation* (see MFDP, 2009). The following are strategies for M&E:

- Development of a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation System;
- Development of Policy Formulation and Review guidelines;
- Capacity Building: Capacity development will be critical for effective monitoring and evaluation. To that end, Project Management Offices will be established within each Ministry to plan and manage periodic evaluation studies and provide credible and objective information to their respect Ministries;
- Harmonisation of Policies and Strategies; and
- Information Dissemination: The Vision Council has initiated steps to measure progress towards the Vision Goals by using "Botswana Performance" report. This will be an annual report intended to provide information on where Botswana is in terms of each of the seven Vision goals (MFDP, 2009:404).

In addition, a comprehensive Macro Development Results Framework (MDRF) has been developed for M&E purposes at the national level. The MDRF spells out the Macro priorities for the country for NDP 10. Other important components are: M&E Roles and Responsibilities (for example, at the national level, M&E will be the responsibility of Vision 2016 Council and the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning and, at the Sector/Ministry level, M&E will primarily be the responsibility of GICO [now renamed NSO], working with Public Sector Reform Unit (PSRU) and Ministries/departments); and Reporting Requirements through:

- Submission of quarterly progress reports by sectors to GICO;
- analysis of quarterly progress reports by GICO;

- presentation of the analysed quarterly progress reports to Committees, e.g., a Committee of Permanent Secretaries;
- Submission of a Cabinet Information Note on progress on a quarterly basis;
- Sectors should use client satisfaction surveys and other self assessment tools on an annual basis;
- Conduct comprehensive policy/programme evaluation every 3-5 years. In case of a pilot programmes with a life span of less than 3 years, conduct rapid appraisal towards the end of the programme, or an ex-post study after completion (MFDP, 2009:406).

The chapter ends with a warning that 'finally, plans which are contemplated without an inbuilt monitoring and evaluation mechanism are bound to fail' and that 'programme approach will enable implementing entities to pursue national programmes in a coherent, coordinated, participatory and sustainable manner' (MFDP, 2009:406). Similar sentiments were expressed by then Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Local Government, Thato Raphaka, on 4 October 2008 when closing a five-day stakeholders' conference on the draft National Development Plan 10. He emphasised the centrality of the results management orientation of NDP 10 through a results-based Monitoring and Evaluation framework saying, 'let me caution you that we may have good policies, programmes and strategies but if our capacity to implement them, both within government and in the economy as a whole is wanting, then we may not easily reach our noble intentions' (BOPA, 2008:1). While NDP 10 provided for the establishment of a results-based Monitoring and Evaluation framework in Botswana as clearly manifest in chapter 16 (*Monitoring and Evaluation*), this did not happen immediately. It was only in 2013, three years later, that the government of Botswana engaged a consultant from the World Bank to develop an Action Plan for the development and implementation of a National Monitoring and Evaluation system (NMES) for Botswana. Work on the National Monitoring and Evaluation System (NMES) for Botswana is still in draft stages. So far, two very important steps have been taken place: (i) an M&E Readiness Assessment Report (this gave an up-to-date analysis of the current state of M&E in Botswana, along with recommendations for moving forward to further its development) was discussed in September 2013; and (ii) a report on 'Defining the M&E Framework and Strategy' that

identified the architecture for the M&E model to be used in Botswana was discussed and adopted on 27 November 2013. Thus, the project is ongoing, with more meetings planned before it is introduced to stakeholders, hence, extensive comment and critique is not possible at this stage. However, it is pleasing to note that the NMES will borrow from established monitoring and evaluation systems such as Colombia's. Of note, Colombia's national monitoring and evaluation system (SINERGIA), established in 1994, is one of Latin America's celebrated efforts at institutionalising M&E (see Segone, 2010:1). Hence, Botswana will considerably benefit from the Colombian case and others in the region such as Ghana, Kenya, Senegal and Uganda. Since the NMES is yet to be implemented, a few things are worth considering as next stated in the way forward.

Way Forward

Attitudinal change of all the factors that are critical for the success of any project, attitudes are critical. One may have all the technical (or hard) competencies, for example, knowledge about one's job (Armstrong, 2009) but it is soft skills (or behavioural) skills that matter at the end. What good is a qualified doctor with unethical bedside manners? One of the most critical behavioural skills is open-mindedness, particularly, the disposition to accept change. The proposed NMES entails significant change. For a long time, government employees have not been accustomed to being held to account for performance. In this regard, examinations of Accounting Officers, in this case Permanent Secretaries by the Parliamentary Accounts Committee (PAC) are instructive. On average, Accounting Officers are disdainful of the PAC. Either they do not heed invitations to appear before the PAC, or if they appear before it, they come ill-prepared. Worse still, they sometimes send very junior officers for PAC examinations. Notably, the culture of non-accountability for performance is a systemic problem that cannot be enforced by the government Gestapo-style. Hence, change must come from within; it cannot be forced from without and/or above

Shared Vision, for buy-in, there is a need to develop a common and shared vision about the proposed NMES. This is important to ensure a buy-in of the tool. If there is no shared vision, some people will disengage from the project and brand it a 'government project'. Hence, there is a need to build a national vision about the NMES. In this regard, when the government crafted Vision 2016, a national roadmap to 2016, in 1997,

resources were spent in selling the project. Hence, the same strategy should be used to sell the NMES.

Stakeholder management: once the NMES has been sold to stakeholders, there must be a well crafted stakeholder management plan. This is a systematic identification, planning of actions to communicate with, negotiate with and influence stakeholders (Association of Project Management, 2006). Failure to do so will result in a failed NMES.

Demand and Use of M&E Information in an era of evidence-based policy making, policy makers such as Members of Parliament (MPs) must both demand and use M&E information. Therefore, the policy makers must be capacitated to both demand and use M&E information. While the recruitment of MPs is the preserve of political parties, the government has an obligation to capacitate them through training and research staff.

Conclusion

An efficient and effective is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for economic development. Hence, government performance is very critical if countries, particularly developing countries, are to play catch up in resource-stressed times. In this regard, governments have adopted performance-improving interventions such as New Public Management. Similarly, the government of Botswana has implemented performance-improving interventions such as Performance-based Management Systems. For a long time, the focus was on performance enhancement to the neglect of performance measurement through a results-based Monitoring and Evaluation framework. In 2009, the government decided to mainstream M&E into National Development Planning through a results-based M&E framework. The National Monitoring and Evaluation System is still in draft form. This, therefore, means that Botswana is very favourably circumstanced to borrow lessons from existing systems and come up with an efficient and effective system.

List of References

- Alford, J. 1993. Towards a New Public Management Model: Beyond "Managerialism" and its Critics. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 52 (2): 135-48.
- Ammons, D. 1992. Productivity Barriers in the Public Sector. In M. Holzer (ed). *Public Productivity Handbook*. Ithaca, N.Y., New York State School of Industrial and Labour, Relations, pp. 117–36.
- Armstrong, M. 2009. *Armstrong's Handbook of Human resource Management Practice*. 11th Edition. London: Kogan Page.
- Armstrong, M. 1993. *Human Resource Management*. London: Kogan Page.
- Aucoin, P. 1990. Administrative reform in public management: paradigms, principles, paradoxes and pendulums. *Governance: an International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 3: 115–37.
- Behn, R. D. 1995. The Big Questions of Public Management. *Public Administration Review*, 55 (4): 313-24.
- BOPA (Botswana Press Agency). 2008. 'NDP 10 unique, aligned to Vision 2016' – Raphaka. *Daily News*, 29 October, p. 1
- BOPA. 2005. NDP 9 Midterm Review. *Daily News*, 28 November, p. 1
- BOPA. 2000. Khama's leave cut short. *Daily News*, 7 August, p. 1.
- Boston, J., Martin, J., Pallot, J. and Walsh, P. 1996. *Public Management: the New Zealand Model*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Botlhale, E.K. 2013. The rights-asserting contemporary public service customer in Botswana. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(8): 523-31.
- Botlhale, E.K. 2010. Customer Service Culture in the Botswana Public Service; moving beyond public sector reforms and rhetoric. *Perspectives, a public governance journal*, 1(1): 13-19.
- Bouckaert, G. 1992. Public Productivity in Retrospective. In M. Holzer (ed). *Public Productivity Handbook*. Ithaca, N.Y., New York State School of Industrial and Labour, Relations, pp. 5–46.

- Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results. 2012. *African monitoring and evaluation systems exploratory case studies*. Johannesburg: Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results.
- Chirairo, C. 2008. Driving a High Performance Culture in the Public Sector: The Change Leadership Challenge. Retrieved from; www.eoh.co.bw/index.php?id=24&tx...26&tx... (retrieved 29 August 2010).
- Denhardt, J.V. and Denhardt, R.B. 2002. *The new public service. serving, not steering*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Denhardt, R.B. and Denhardt, J.V. 2000. The New Public Service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, 6(6): 549–59.
- DPME (Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation). 2014. *Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation*. Retrieved from; (<http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/about/Pages/Outcomes-Monitoring-and-Evaluation.aspx> (retrieved 10 February 2015)).
- DPSM (Directorate of Public Service Management). 2010. *PMS philosophy*. Retrieved from; http://www.dpsm.gov.bw/pms_philosophy.pdf (retrieved 28 August 2014).
- Dunsire, A. (1995). Administrative theory in the 1980s: a viewpoint. *Public Administration*, 73: 17–40.
- Dzimbiri, L.B. 2008. Experiences in New Public Management in Africa: The Case of Performance Management Systems in Botswana. *Africa Development*, XXXIII (4): 43–58.
- Economic Commission for Africa. 2010. *Innovations and Best Practices in Public Sector Reforms: The Case of Civil Service in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa*. Addis Ababa: Economic Commission for Africa.
- Gaotlhobogwe, M. 2009. Ebullient Khama tells victory rally of fifth "D". *Mmegi*, October 19, p. 1.
- GoB (Government of Botswana). 2011. *National Development Planning*. Retrieved from; http://www.gov.bw/en/Ministries--Authorities/Ministries/Ministry-of-Finance-and-Development-Planning1/NDP10/The-Plan/?p_id=2796 (retrieved 30 October 2014).
- GoB. 2009. *Govt Implementation Coordination Office renamed*. Retrieved from; <http://www.gov.bw/en/News/Govt-Implementation-Coordination-Office-GICO-renamed/> (retrieved 30 October 2014).

22 Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review

- Gore, A. 1994. *Improving customer service. Accompanying report of the National Performance Review*. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Vice President.
- Gore, A. 1993. *Creating a government that works better and costs less*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Gregory, R. 1995. The Peculiar Task of Public Management: toward Conceptual Discrimination. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 54(2), 171-183.
- Gruening, G. 2001. Origin and theoretical basis of New Public Management. *International Public Management Journal*, (4): 1–25.
- Halachmi, A. 1998. *Performance Measurement: Don't Abuse It through GPRA*. Paper presented at the 9th Public Sector Productivity Conference: Performance Measurement, Performance Improvement. Online conference, November 9–20.
- Hatry, H.P. 1999. *Performance Measurement; getting results*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- IFAD. 2010. *Glossary of M & E Concepts & Terms*. Retrieved from; http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/annexa/Annex_A-5DEF.pdf (retrieved 28 August 2014).
- Johnston, J. 2000. The New Public Management in Australia. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 22(2): 345-68.
- Julnes, P.L. and Holzer, M. 2001. Promoting the Utilization of Performance Measures in Public Organizations: An Empirical Study of Factors Affecting Adoption and Implementation. *Public Administration Review*, 61(6): 693-708.
- Kanter, R. M. and Summers, D. V. 1994. Doing Well While Doing Good: dilemmas of performance measurement in non-profit organisations and the need for a multiple-constituency approach. In D. McKeivitt and A. Lawton (eds.), *Public Sector Management theory, critique and practice*. London: Sage Publications Ltd, pp. 221-36.
- Kravchuk, Robert S. and Ronald W. Schack. 1996. Designing Effective Performance Measurement Systems under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. *Public Administration Review* 56(4): 348–58.
- Lucas, T. 2008. Botswana's Implementation Problematic: A Case for a Comprehensive Audit. *Mmegi*, 21 February, p. 8
- Lute, A. 2009. Assistant ministers out of Cabinet. *The Botswana Gazette*, April 15, p. 1.

- Marobela, M. 2008. Political Economy of Botswana's Public Sector Management Reforms. *Globalization* (7): 1-15
- Maruapula, O. 2008. *Facilitative Project Management in Botswana, context interrogation beyond construction*. Gaborone: Pentagon.
- Matambo, K. 2015. *2015/16 Budget Speech*. Gaborone: Government Printing and Publishing Services.
- Metcalfe, L. 1993. Public Management: from imitation to innovation. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 52 (3): 292-304.
- MFDP (Ministry of Finance and Development Planning). 2009. *National Development Plan 10* (NDP 10). Gaborone: MFDP.
- Mothusi. B. 2009. *Public Sector Reforms and Change Management in Botswana. The Case of Performance Management System*. Berlin: VDM Publishing.
- Mpabanga, D. 2009. Modernising Botswana's Public Sector for Excellence through Public Sector Management and Marketing. *Journal for Public and Non-Profit Services*, 37:88-107.
- Mulgan, R. (2004). *Public sector reform in New Zealand. issues of public accountability*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Newcomer, K.E. 1997. Using Performance Measurement to Improve Programs. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 75: 5-14.
- Nkhwa, T. 2010. *Performance management in the Botswana public service*. Retrieved from; <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/AAPAM/UNPAN031850.pdf> (retrieved 25 October 2014).
- Office of Management and Budget (OMB). 1993. *Government Performance Results Act of 1993*. Washington DC: OBM.
- Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. 1993. *Reinventing government. how the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Osborne, S.P. 2009. *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*. London: Routledge.
- Osborne, S.P. 2006. The New Public Governance? *Public Management Review*, 8(3): 377-87.

24 Africa's Public Service Delivery & Performance Review

- Owellen, M. 2007. *Performance Management for Government. BI Review Magazine*. Retrieved from; <http://www.information-management.com/bissues/20070301/2600312-1.html> (retrieved 25 November 2014).
- Owino, W. 2009. Khama takes oath of office. *Daily Nation* (October 20). Retrieved from; <http://www.nation.co.ke/News/africa/-/1066/674656/-/> (retrieved August 28, 2010).
- Performance Management Association. 2012. *Government policies and legislation promoting performance management at national level*. Retrieved from; <http://www.performanceportal.org/government-policies-and-legislation-promoting-performance-management-national-level> (retrieved 10 February 2015).
- Pollitt, C. 1990. *Managerialism and the Public Services: the Anglo-American experience*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Reagan, R. 1980. *Inaugural Address* (20 January 1980). Washington, DC: White House.
- Rizos, E.J. 1965. Country Development: The New Ethic of Public Administration. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 31(1): 279-88.
- RoB (Republic of Botswana). 2010. *Botswana Public Service Customer Service Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.gov.bw/Global/generic.pdf> (retrieved 29 August 2010).
- RoB. (2009). *Public Service Convention Opens* (TAUTONA TIMES no 23 of 2009 The Electronic Press Circular of the Office of the President). Gaborone: Office of the President.
- Segone, M (ed). (2010). *From policies to results; developing capacities for country monitoring and evaluation systems*. Geneva: UNICEF.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2014a). *Performance Management Overview & History*. Retrieved from; <http://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/performance-management/overview-history/> (retrieved 25 November 2014).
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2014b). *Performance Management*. Retrieved from; <http://www.opm.gov/services-for-agencies/performance-management/> (retrieved 25 November 2014).
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 2002. *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results*. New York: UNDP.
- Waldo, D. 1948. *The Administrative State* [2nd ed.] New York: Holmes and Meier.

- Weaver, R. 2010. But Will It Work?: implementation analysis to improve government performance. *Governance*, 32: 1-17.
- Whitcombe, J. 2008. Contributions and Challenges of 'New Public Management': New Zealand since 1984. *Policy Quarterly*, 4(3): 7-13.
- Wholey, J. 1999. Performance-Based Management: responding to the challenges. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 22(4): 288–307.
- Wilson, J. Q., 1989. *Bureaucracy. what government agencies do and why they do it?* New York: Basic Books.
- World Bank. 2013. *Designing a results framework for achieving results. a how-to guide.* Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2010. *Performance in Government; the evolving system of performance and evaluation, measurement, monitoring, and management in the United Kingdom.* Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2008. *Public Sector Reform. what works and why?* Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2004. *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

AUTHOR'S CONTACT:

BOTLHALE E.K.
University of Botswana
Email: BOTLHALE@mopipi.ub.bw