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ABSTRACT

The local government, consisting of municipalities, is an important sphere of government which carries substantial responsibility for the delivery of services and development of the country. Municipalities are expected to contribute towards the country's development discourse - particularly in light of the political and economic philosophy associated with the notion of a developmental state. The contribution of municipalities in a system of cooperative government include operationalising the identified Millennium Development Goals (Outcome 9), the "apex" priorities identified in the State of the Nation Address and the Government's Programme of Action such as poverty alleviation, unemployment and inequality.

The national and provincial governments have the Constitutional and legislative responsibility to provide intergovernmental support to municipalities that may include policy, strategy and training. In this study “support” refers to financial, human, technical and administrative assistance which the national and provincial governments must provide to municipalities so as to enable them to achieve their developmental objectives. To this end, the study provides a legislative and theoretical context of the system of cooperative government in South Africa.

It is highlighted in this study that the South African Government has adopted the principles of outcomes-based governance at the beginning of the current electoral cycle in 2009. The approach has further brought significant implications on the capacity of municipalities. As the new approach of governance emerges, a differentiated approach to national and provincial intervention for municipal support is also required. The study argues that the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (GWM&ES) should be such a mechanism to facilitate effective intergovernmental support to municipalities.

The contribution of this study centres on the acknowledgement that, whereas the practice of the system of cooperative government is fairly mature to pursue
integrated and coherent government, there are weaknesses within the national and provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG respectively regarding utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities. It is these weaknesses within these Departments regarding utilisation of the M&E system that hamper the prospects of effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. In other words, the underutilisation of the M&E system and continued ineffective intergovernmental support to municipalities can be attributed to the absence of a comprehensive M&E system utilisation model. Against this background, the study recommends a new comprehensive M&E system utilisation model that provides solutions on how to eradicate these weaknesses and achieve effective support to municipalities.

The new model is based on the basic premises that each sphere of government should have specific managerial responsibilities to fulfil and the M&E system is utilised effectively. Any other department can utilise the model by adapting it to suit its requirements. The model provides a reference point against which any institution can consider its own practice and identify areas for improvement in terms of process and outcomes.
SAMEVATTING

Plaaslike regering, bestaande uit munisipaliteite, is ‘n belangrike sfeer van die regering wat ‘n aansienlike verantwoordelijkheid vir die lewering van dienste en die ontwikkeling van die land het. Daar word van munisipaliteite verwag om tot die land se ontwikkelingsmandaat by te dra, veral in die lig van politieke en ekonomiese teorie wat met die idee van ‘n ontwikkelingstaat verband hou.

Die bydrae wat munisipaliteite in ‘n sisteem van samewerkende regering maak, sluit in die operasionalisering van die geïdentifiseerde Millennium Ontwikkelingsdoelwitte (Uitkoms 9), die “kern” doelwitte soos uiteengesit in die Staatsrede en die Regering se Program van Aksie rakende armoedeverligting, werkloosheid en ongelyktheid.

Die nasionale en provinsiale regeringsfere het die grondwetlike en statutêre verpligting om interregeringsondersteuning aan munisipaliteite te bied, wat beleid, strategie en opleiding mag insluit. Hierdie studie verwys spesifiek na die finansiële, menslike, tegniese en administratiewe hulp wat nasionale en plaaslike regering aan munisipaliteite moet bied ten einde hulle in staat te stel om aan hul ontwikkelingsmandaat te voldoen. Met hierdie doel voor oë, beoog die studie om ‘n wetlike en teoretiese konteks rondom die stelsel van interregeringsondersteuning in Suid-Afrika te voorsien.

Die studie beklemtoon die feit dat die Suid-Afrikaanse Regering die beginsels van uitkomsgebaseerde regeringsbestuur aan die begin van die huidige verkiesingsklus in 2009 aanvaar het. Hierdie bestuursbenadering het beduidende implikasies op die kapasiteit van munisipaliteite gehad en soos hierdie nuwe benadering ontwikkel, sal ‘n eiesoortige benadering tot nasionale en provinsiale munisipale-ondersteuning benodig word. Hierdie studie verleen aan dat die Departement van Samewerkende Regering en Tradisionele Aangeleenthede ‘n meganisme om effektiewe interregeringsondersteuning aan munisipaliteite te fasiliteer. Hierdie studie ontbloeit dat daar sekere leemtes in die Departement van Samewerkende Regering en Tradisionele Aangeleenthede aanwesig is wat die optimale gebruik van die huidige

Die onderbenutting van die Moniterings- en Evalueringstelsel en deurlopende oneffektiewe interregeringsondersteuning aan munisipaliteite kan toegeskryf word aan die afwesigheid van ’n omvattende Moniterings- en Evalueringstelselbenuttingsmodel. Dus, in hierdie konteks beveel die studie aan dat ’n nuwe, omvattende model vir die optimale benutting van die Moniterings- en Evalueringstelselontwikkel word, ten einde oplossings te bied ten einde die huidige leemtes uit te skakel en om effektiewe ondersteuning aan munisipaliteite te bied. Hierdie nuwe voorgestelde model is gebaseer op die fundamentele aannome dat elke regeringsfeer sekere spesifieke bestuursverantwoordelikhede moet vervul om te verseker dat die Monitering- en Evalueringstelsel optimal benut word. Enige openbare instelling kan met vrug van die model gebruik maak deur dit aan te pas ten einde aan die spesifieke instelling se omstandighede en vereistes te voldoen. Die model verskaf dus ’n verwysingsraamwerk waarteen enige instelling sy eie praktyke kan heroorweg en areas vir verbeterings te identifiseer in terme van prosesse en uitkomste.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 ORIENTATION

The South African Government continuously creates an enabling environment in which a range of support mechanisms can be provided for the local government sphere to effect fundamental change at grassroots level. The White Paper on Local Government, 1998 stipulates that the government in South Africa is constituted as national, provincial and local spheres. Venter and Landsberg (2011:134) indicate in this respect that the local government sphere, consisting of municipalities, is the primary site for service delivery and is closest to communities. Section 41 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (hereafter the “Constitution”) sets out the principles of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations that must be adhered to by all spheres of government. To this end, the national government must maintain effective cooperative government and intergovernmental relations.

Edwards (2008:68) indicates that cooperative government is a partnership between the three spheres of government, where each sphere is distinctive and has a role to fulfil. Mathebula (2011:840) agrees with this assertion and adds that cooperative government is simply a governance philosophy based on a reciprocal obligation of spheres of government to trust, support and assist one another in coordinating service delivery to the community. Kahn et al. (2011:66) also concur with this view and observe that the principle of cooperative government, in fact, obliges all spheres of government to put their collective national interest above parochial interest and to work together for the common good. Coetzee (2010:86) cautions that the main principle of cooperative government is that all spheres of government must provide effective, efficient, transparent, accountable and coherent government. The Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Skills Programme Learner Guide (2006:91) developed the following definition which will be used as the operational definition of this study: cooperative government
collectively harnesses all public resources of the three spheres of government behind common goals and within a framework of municipal support.

The Practitioner's Guide to Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa (2007:1), issued by former Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG), shows that at its most basic level, intergovernmental relations are all about the relationships and coordination of public policies amongst the three spheres of government. Kahn et al. (2011:4) add that the term intergovernmental relations refers to the interdependent relations among various spheres of government. Elazar (1987:16) adopted a more comprehensive view and submitted that intergovernmental relations is a universal phenomenon to be found wherever two or more government (national or subnational) and/or jurisdictions interact in the development and in the execution of public policies and programmes. Mathebula (2011:838) also agrees with this observation and further adds that intergovernmental relations occur when two or more government jurisdictions, functionaries, persons, levels, spheres and/or institutions interact and/or relate. Opeskin (2001:1) confirms this articulation and explained the notion as relations among central, regional and local government including those that occur within a sphere of government and how these relate for the facilitation of common goal attainment.

There is a conceptual difference between the concepts cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. Cooperative government is about a partnership of government as well as the values associated with it which may include national unity, peace, proper cooperation and coordination, effective communication and avoiding conflict. On the other hand, intergovernmental relations is one of the means through which the values of cooperative government such as loyalty to the country and respect for the distinctiveness of the different spheres of government may be given institutional expression (Malan, 2005:230).

Chapter 3, section 41(h) of the Constitution stipulates that all three spheres of government must cooperate with one another by assisting and supporting one another. The Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Skills Programme Learner Guide (2006:76)
states that considering the magnitude of the developmental challenges such as poverty eradication, economic growth and sustainable development, it is appropriate to mobilise all the possible resources collectively whilst recognising and tapping into the particular strengths of every sphere, namely, the national, provincial and local governments. It continues by indicating that the concept of cooperative government embraces the realisation that a single sphere of government cannot handle the responsibility of a developmental state.

Castells (1992:56) defined a developmental state as one which derives legitimacy from its ability to promote and sustain development, that is, its ability to achieve high rates of economic growth and structural change in the productive system. Mbabazi and Taylor (2005:17) support this view by stating that a developmental state is the one whose ideological underpinnings are developmental and which seriously attempt to deploy its administrative and political resources to the task of economic development. Heywood (2007:100) also strongly confirms this view when arguing that a developmental state is one that intervenes in economic life with the specific purpose of promoting industrial growth and economic development. Pronk (1997:5) summed the scenario that a developmental state is one able and willing to create and sustain a policy climate conducive to productive investment, exports, growth and human welfare. A developmental state pursues policies focusing on coordinating investment plans, has a national development vision, engages in institutional buildings to promote growth and development and plays a critical role in resolving the conflicts that arise out of reactions and counteractions to the development trajectory between winners and losers (Chang, 1999:192).

From the definitions above it could be deduced that, as Venter and Landsberg (2011:180) observed, a significant body of the literature on what constitutes a "developmental state" focuses on economic growth and development.

The South African Government determined the 12 Outcomes with a number of measurable outputs with targets as the key focus of work towards the next electoral
cycle in 2014. According to the Annual Performance Plan (2011:5) issued by the former national Department of COGTA, in July 2010, the Minister responsible for COGTA entered into a performance agreement with the Presidency committing the Department to Outcome 9 of Government’s 12 Outcomes. The Outcome 9 has seven outputs on which the performance of the Minister will be measured. In this respect, the Delivery Agreement was developed between the national Department of COGTA and all provincial sector Departments to achieve Outcome 9. The Annual Performance Plan (2011:1) issued by COGTA - Free State further states that the overarching goal of Outcome 9 is a “responsive, accountable, effective and efficient local government system.”

Section 154 of the Constitution stipulates that the national and provincial governments must support and strengthen the capacity of municipalities to perform their functions. According to the Annual Performance Plan (2011:2), issued by COGTA Free State, one of the key roles in the implementation of Outcome 9 is to provide intergovernmental support to municipalities. The Practitioner’s Guide to Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa (2007:34) explains intergovernmental support as measures of assistance to ensure that another sphere is able to perform adequately. The intergovernmental support may include policy, strategy and training. In this study it refers to the financial, human, technical and administrative assistance which the provincial and national governments must provide to municipalities so as to enable them to achieve their developmental objectives. Van Donk et al. (2008:339) observe that the national and provincial governments deliver public goods and services under the charge of municipalities to beneficiaries who are living, working or located in local areas. In this respect, the support which the provincial and national governments must provide to municipalities is to strengthen their financial, human, technical and administrative capacity so as to enable them to achieve their developmental objectives.

Gelb (2006:1) articulates the argument that one of the tasks that a developmental state should be able to execute is the monitoring and evaluation of progress towards the achievement of the intended objectives.
Minnaar (2010:157) defines monitoring simply as “a continuous process.” Prinsloo and Roos (2006:95) support this view and explain monitoring as the process that ensures that actual activities correspond to planned activities. Van der Waldt (2004:67) adds that monitoring involves the constant tracking of performance to determine whether or not the achievement of objectives is likely to occur. Valadez and Bamberger (2000:12) offered a broader perspective of the term when arguing that monitoring is a continuous internal management activity whose purpose is to ensure that the program achieves its defined objectives within a prescribed time-frame and budget. Nel (2005:5) also adopts a more comprehensive view and confirms that monitoring is the routine checking of information on progress so as to confirm that progress is occurring against the defined direction. It commonly involves the monthly to quarterly reporting on outputs, activities and use of resources such as people, time and money.

Shafrits (1998:818) argued that evaluation determines the value or effectiveness of an activity for the purpose of decision-making. Van der Waldt (2004:67) elaborates on this by indicating that evaluation is an in-depth process of investigation which determines whether or not stated objectives have been reached and the nature of the process undertaken. Minnaar (2010:156) strongly agrees with this position by stating that evaluation is the comparison of actual project impacts against the agreed strategic plans. Fox et al. (2004:126) also add a further dimension and explain that evaluation means the systematic assessment of a programme for the purpose of improving policy and programme decisions. Valadez and Bamberger (2000:12) provided a comprehensive definition of evaluation by postulating that it is an internal or external management activity to assess the appropriateness of a program’s design and implementation methods in achieving both specified objectives and more general development objectives, and to assess a program’s results, both intended and unintended and to assess the factors affecting the level and distribution of benefits produced.
In view of the definitions given above, it is essential to note the difference in focus of monitoring and evaluation. Monitoring determines whether the program has been implemented as planned, that is, whether resources are being mobilised as planned and services or products are being delivered on schedule. On the other hand, the evaluation determines the extent to which a program achieves its objectives, the other impacts it produces, the costs per program benefit and the problems responsible for either the poor quality of program implementation or the failure to achieve program objectives.

Valadez and Bamberger (2000:13) stated that when monitoring and evaluation are kept separate, there seems to be substantial support for monitoring project implementation but limited support for evaluation. Evaluation is given a much lower priority because it is seen as an activity that would be supported if time and resources permitted. As a result, little effort is made either to evaluate the extent to which projects have achieved their objectives or to use the experience from completed projects to improve the selection and design of future ones.

Valadez and Bamberger (2000:14) continued by arguing that monitoring and evaluation should be considered complementary parts of an integrated system. Consequently, evaluation should take place either continuously or periodically from the time the project is formulated through implementation and the operational phase. Monitoring information should be fed into the national monitoring and evaluation system to build up a national data bank that can be used to improve the selection and design of future projects. Thus, the study will refer to monitoring and evaluation (M&E) together as the “system”.

The Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation (GWM&E) System (2007:1), issued by the Presidency, defines the M&E System as the set of organisational structures, standards, plans, indicators, information systems and reporting lines that enables national and provincial departments, municipalities and other institutions to discharge their monitoring and evaluation function effectively. The overarching GWM&E System aims to provide an integrated, encompassing framework
of M&E principles, practices and standards to be used throughout Government and functions as an apex-level information system which draws from the component systems in the framework to deliver useful M&E products for its users. In this respect, it may be concluded that the Presidency is responsible for the overall implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems across the three spheres of government in South Africa.

The COGTA Annual Report (2010:31) states that the Department is responsible for the methods, processes and systems of monitoring the performance of municipalities and submission of municipal performance reports to the Presidency. Van der Waldt et al. (2007:124) also make a key observation that monitoring and evaluation evolves from the performance management system (PMS). The monitoring and evaluation initiatives of COGTA should evolve from the Performance Management Systems of municipalities. Kanyane and Mabelane (2009:60) point to the fact that a PMS is an integrated system to measure the performance of an institution and that of its personnel.

The distinction between GWM&E and PMS should be noted. The Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment Policy and Implementation Framework (2010:27) issued by the Department of Human Settlements states the GWM&E provides generic information such as the performance of Departments with regard to the implementation of Government’s Programme of Action across the three spheres of government. According to Van der Waldt et al. (2007:124) the PMS assists municipalities to determine which approaches have the desired impact and form the basis for monitoring, evaluation and improving service delivery. In this context, the GWM&E provides macro oversight over the performance of state and policy impact whilst a PMS is the (micro) management tool in municipalities assisting with the accomplishment of their developmental mandate. The purpose is to develop a dashboard reflecting the performance of government.
In terms of Chapter 6 of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 (MSA) every municipality is required to develop and implement a PMS. This must contain:

- key performance indicators as a yardstick for measuring performance, including outcomes and impact with regard to a municipality’s development priorities and objectives; and
- measurable performance targets for each of the development priorities and objectives.

The MSA further stipulates that with regard to each of the development priorities and objectives and against the key performance indicators and targets, a municipality must:

- monitor performance; and
- measure and review performance at least once a year.

The MSA also stipulates how the different spheres of government should report annually on the performance of municipalities.

The M&E Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:4) issued by the former national Department of COGTA indicates that the M&E system provides decision makers with the ability to draw causal linkages between the choice of policy priorities, provision of resources, programmes, service actually delivered and the ultimate impact on communities. Tansey and Jackson (2008:45) observe that any M&E System needs to measure as precisely as possible how far objectives are being achieved. Görgens and Kusek (2009:2) state that the information and data collected from the M&E System can be used to better inform key decision-makers, stakeholders and the general public.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT
The State of Local Government Assessment Report (2009:5) issued by the former national Department of COGTA continues to show that despite significant gains, many municipalities are in deep distress, distress referring to their faltering ability to deliver basic municipal services which include clean water, electricity and sanitation, managing their institutions such as the municipal councils and administrations as well as involving communities in governance matters. It further points out that, crucially, as many as 5.7 million households do not have universal access to water, sanitation, refuse removal and electricity.

The State of Local Government Assessment Report (2009:17) further reveals that as increasing performance challenges build up within the local sphere, Section 139 of the Constitution interventions were undertaken in respect of 19 municipalities in the financial year 2008/2009 only. It continues by arguing that the nature of the challenges included poor financial controls, inadequate technical capacity, poor human resource management and dysfunctional administrative services. The Consolidated General Report: Local Government Audit Outcomes (2010:82) issued by the Auditor General also shows that only 4 out of all the municipalities in South Africa received financially unqualified reports, that is, clean audits opinions, the vacancy rates at municipal management level is high and there is lack of skilled municipal employees in key focus areas of municipalities.

The Consolidated General Report: Local Government Audit Outcomes (2010:96) further indicated that the weak monitoring and oversight processes or systems within the national Department of Cooperative Governance and provincial Departments of COGTA result in deterioration of audit opinions within the municipalities. The State of Local Government Assessments Report (2009:22) also points to the fact that the causal reasons for the distress in municipalities relate to the following:

- inadequate accountability measures and support systems;
- weak intergovernmental monitoring and support; and
weak application of intergovernmental checks and balances, that is, the oversight and review process by the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (State of Local Government Assessments Report, 2009:22).

Considering the above statements, the ineffective monitoring and inadequate intergovernmental support to municipalities make it problematic to achieve key developmental goals such as poverty alleviation, food security, job creation and infrastructure delivery.

The Annual Report (2010:10) issued by the former national Department of COGTA indicates that the primary mandate of the Department is to promote sustainable development by providing support to local government. The support which DCoG and provincial Departments of COGTA must provide to municipalities should be in terms of strengthening the financial, human, technical and administrative capacity of municipalities to enable them to achieve their developmental objectives. According to Van Donk et al. (2008:3) the municipalities remain the primary sphere responsible for many of the basic services such as water, waste management, electricity reticulation, sanitation, roads, storm water drainage, land use planning and control, and transport planning.

According to the Annual Performance Plan (2011:16) issued by the former national Department of COGTA there are four classes of municipalities derived from spatial, social, municipal capacity and economic indicators, namely,

- Class 1: Very high vulnerability (Local Municipalities:57) (District Municipalities:12)
- Class 2: High vulnerability (Local Municipalities: 58) (District Municipalities:11)
- Class 3: Medium vulnerability (Local Municipalities:58) (District Municipalities:13)
- Class 4: Low vulnerability (Metro’s:6, Local Municipalities:58) (District Municipalities:12)
Considering the classification of municipalities, in this study the Class 1, Class 2, Class 3 and Class 4 refers to Very high vulnerability, High vulnerability, Medium vulnerability and Low vulnerability respectively.

The State of Local Government Assessments Report (2009:6) issued by the former national Department of COGTA reveals that much of the reason for the limited success of past attempts to improve the performance of local government was the inability to recognise that municipalities have different capacities and varying social and economic contexts. Thus, the Annual Performance Plan (2011:27) issued by the former national Department of COGTA shows the implementation of a differentiated approach to municipal support as one of its strategic goals. In the above context, when the M&E system is utilised to support municipalities, it should respond to the different local, district and metropolitan settings of municipalities.

The M&E Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance, 2010 sets out the guidelines for the utilisation of the M&E System by DCoG to support municipalities. The long term goal of the framework is to enable DCoG to improve service delivery efficiencies and effectiveness in local government. Nevertheless, DCoG does experience challenges in utilising the M&E system to support municipalities. The M&E Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:9) issued by the former national Department of COGTA reveals that the Presidency is yet to develop the overall implementation plan of the M&E systems across the three spheres of government. The progress report on the implementation of the M&E Framework presented to the national intergovernmental Committee of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs Minister and Members of Executive Councils (COGTA MinMec) on 31 March 2011 also shows that the following are current realities for the M&E System:

- Misalignment of the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) in each local government with national and provincial Departments’ strategic plans and with the government’s overall programme of action.
• Lack of appropriate institutional arrangements for M&E, leading to confusion on who implements, who monitors and reports.

• Lack of standard reporting formats, templates, terminology, definitions, key performance indicators, baselines and targets.

• Lack of community monitoring and oversight.

The M&E Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:8) issued by the former national Department of COGTA emphasises the fact that DCoG needs to establish the M&E system that will enable the Department to effectively and efficiently monitor, report on and evaluate the work undertaken either directly by DCoG or through the line-function sector departments that provide the necessary resources and support to local government. Clearly, the development of a comprehensive model for M&E system that provides a process framework through which DCoG could improve its mandate to support municipalities is needed.

In the above context, the problem thus is: What are the core challenges associated with the M&E system as far as municipal support is concerned and what should be incorporated in a comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation by DCoG for intergovernmental support to municipalities?

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions are the following:

• What are the principles, practices and realities of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa?
• What constitutes local government support and what are the statutory and regulatory frameworks for national and provincial government support to local government?

• What are the principles, theories and practices associated with performance monitoring and evaluation systems in South Africa?

• How does the M&E system serve as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support by DCoG to municipalities?

• What are the current realities and practices regarding the utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities?

• What should be included in a comprehensive model for the utilisation of the M&E system to enhance intergovernmental support to municipalities?

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this research study are:

• To explore the principles, practices and realities of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa.

• To investigate the statutory and regulatory frameworks for national and provincial government support to enable local government to achieve its developmental objectives.

• To provide a theoretical overview of the concept of M&E systems in South Africa.

• To analyse how the M&E system serves as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities in South Africa.
• To conduct empirical research on the realities and practices regarding the utilisation of a M&E system within the national Department of Cooperative Governance as well as determining the effectiveness of intergovernmental support to municipalities.

• To propose a comprehensive model for M&E System utilisation by DCoG to provide intergovernmental support to municipalities.

1.5 CENTRAL THEORETICAL STATEMENTS

Leedy and Ormrod (1985:7) stated that a central theoretical statement reveals self-evident truths of research. These truths are the foundation upon which a study is built. The following central theoretical statements, which serve as a guiding instrument for the research, are stated:

• The endemic weaknesses in the intergovernmental system accentuate weaknesses in the local sphere of government (Kahn et al. 2011:72).

• The coordination of government activity across the three spheres of government is essential for effective and efficient service delivery (Kahn et al. 2011: 71).

• The experience of governing has confirmed the South African government’s view that the only way to facilitate and expedite integration in service delivery is by engendering a sound cooperative ethnic in the practice of government (Mufamadi, 2005:2).

• The national and provincial governments must, by legislative and other measures, support and strengthen the capacity of municipalities to fulfil their mandates, execute their powers and perform their functions. (RSA, 1996: Section 154(1)).
1.6 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Van der Westhuizen (1993:6) observed that the purpose of a hypothesis was, amongst others, to direct and structure the study and to serve as a link between the literature study (theory) and the research (empirical research) and will eventually result in the expansion of knowledge. Therefore, the following hypothesis has been formulated for this study:

A comprehensive model for the effective utilisation of a M&E system will serve as a mechanism for sustainable intergovernmental support to municipalities.

1.7 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study, a qualitative research design was used in order to explore the effect of the utilisation of M&E system on the intergovernmental support to municipalities. According to Brynard and Hanekom (2006:37), qualitative methodology refers to research that produces descriptive data, generally the participant’s own written or spoken words pertaining to their experience or perception. Maree et al. (2009:257) are of the view that this is the approach through which data is collected from people immersed in the setting of everyday life in which the study is framed. Bogdan and Biklen (1998:106) regarded the term data as referring to the rough materials that the researchers collect from the world they are studying and are the particulars that form the basis of analysis.

1.7.1 Literature study

A literature review focused on legislation, policy documents and government publications. It also included publications such as books and articles by experts in the field directly relating to the topic of the research. Hart (1998:1) states that reviewing literature is important because without it, the researcher will not acquire an
understanding of the topic, on what has already been done on it, how it has been researched and what the key issues are.

A preliminary random search at the North-West University’s Ferdinand Postma and Vaal Triangle Libraries was conducted and adequate material and literature were found to be available to do research on this topic. The available study material and relevant literature included books, journals, government publications and other printed materials.

1.7.2 Databases consulted

The following databases had been consulted to ascertain the availability of study material for the purpose of this research:

- Catalogue of theses and dissertations of the South African Universities.

1.7.3 Empirical study

Semi-structured interviews with relevant officials of the national Department of Cooperative Governance and provincial Departments of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs were conducted in order to generate qualitative data on the extent to which DCoG utilises the M&E system for the effective intergovernmental support to municipalities.

Fox and Bayat (2007:100) are of the view that semi-structured interviews are relatively unstructured in the sense that broad questions are asked, allowing the interviewer freedom to determine what further questions to ask in order to obtain the required information.
In addition, the semi-structured interviews with officials from the local municipalities was conducted to determine whether the level of support they receive from the provincial and national government is adequate to enable the respective local municipalities to discharge their statutory obligations. A sample of 36 local municipalities from the total population of 231 local municipalities was used. This means that four local municipalities comprising of Class 1, Class 2, Class 3 and Class 4 were selected from each of the nine provinces. The focus was only on local municipalities as the purpose of the study is to develop a comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation by DCoG to support the local municipalities particularly those which are in distress.

1.7.4. Sources of data

The study used purposive sampling. Babbie (1995:225) states that purposive sampling is the selection of samples based on a researcher’s own knowledge of the population, its elements and the nature of research aims.

The sample of the study drawn from the national Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) consisted of the respective Directors of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation, Intergovernmental Relations, Internal Audit and Risk Management, Corporate Planning and Project Management, Local Government Institutional and Administrative Systems, Municipal Performance Monitoring and Support and Capacity Building and Hands-on Support Coordination.

The selected members of the population within the nine provincial Departments of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) were the Directors responsible for Municipal Performance Management / Performance M&E Systems.

The key responsibilities of these sixteen selected senior personnel in DCoG and COGTA include intergovernmental capacity building programmes for the municipalities. They are also responsible for performance monitoring and evaluation of service delivery and cooperative governance practices.
Furthermore, the data was also obtained from the managers responsible for the Integrated Development Plan and Performance Management Systems within each local municipality selected from the nine provinces. The identified thirty six municipal officials from each local municipality were suitably placed to indicate whether the level of support they receive from the provincial and national government is adequate for their respective local municipalities to meet their statutory obligations. Thus, the data collected from these participants provided deep insight into the study.

1.7.5 Data collection techniques

Semi-structured interviews were conducted in order to gather information. According to Luthuli (2005:54) the semi-structured interviews employ a list of prepared questions where the interviewer determines which questions to ask and when. They are more flexible than fully structured interviews thus allowing the interviewer to adapt an interview for specific situations.

Therefore, an interview schedule was developed to guide the researcher during the interviews. The interview schedule which was used during the interviews ensured that all the respondents were asked the same questions. Research questions asked in a questionnaire also ensured that participants provided the researcher with what is actually taking place and not just their perception of the utilisation of a M&E system for the effective intergovernmental support to municipalities.

1.7.6 Data analysis, interpretation and presentation

De Vos et al. (2011:397) state that qualitative data analysis involves reducing the volume of raw information, sifting significance from trivia, identifying significant patterns and constructing a framework for communicating the essence of what the data reveal. Schwandt (2007:6) explains that, broadly speaking, this is the activity of making sense of, interpreting, and theorising about the data.
All data obtained from the interviews and questionnaires was interpreted in order for the researcher to draw a conclusion. An empirical analysis was used to interpret the collected data. The results were verified against the literature by incorporating it in larger theoretical perspectives or paradigms.

1.7.7 Validity and reliability of data

Babbie and Mouton (2001:122) explain that validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration. Salkind (2006:113) refers to truthfulness, accuracy, authenticity, genuineness and soundness as synonyms for validity. Boyle (1989:49) stated that the key criteria used to assess the usefulness of information are reliability and relevance. Boyle (1989:49) further stated that the reliability of information is assessed by its verifiability and its lack of bias.

In this study in order to ensure that bias is eliminated, the standardised methodology for the collection of data from the national Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) and provincial Departments of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) as well as the thirty six local municipalities will be used.

1.7.8 Procedure

A literature study was undertaken to analyse from the existing data how a performance monitoring and evaluation system serves as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with identified respondents to determine the existing policies, systems, structures, approaches and operations for a M&E system in DCoG. Furthermore, to determine whether the support that municipalities receive from the national and provincial governments is adequate, the data was obtained from the managers responsible for the Integrated Development Plan and Performance
Management Systems within thirty six (36) of the 230 local municipalities in South Africa.

Based on the research objectives, all relevant information was analysed and evaluated. All information and data was presented scientifically.

1.8 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY


Notwithstanding these initiatives and the existing body of knowledge on public performance management, a comprehensive investigation conducted at the Ferdinand Postma and Vaal Triangle libraries of the North-West University by the researcher could not trace that any scientific study has been conducted to develop a comprehensive model for a M&E System utilisation by DCoG to support municipalities. The objective is to strengthen the financial, human, technical and administrative support to municipalities. The extent to which government policies and programmes in the three spheres of government should achieve their objectives requires ongoing academic support. This is necessitated even further when the machinery of government is decentralised, with powers and functions being distributed across the three spheres of government.

The model entailed the key objectives, indicators and targets derived from the strategic plan of DCoG. It determines how and where data will be collected and validated, identifies data quality measures, identifies M&E tools and systems as well as determining the reporting formats to be used and timelines to be followed. Furthermore,
a utilisation checklist was developed to assist DCoG to determine the extent to which it implements the model.

The identification and design of such a comprehensive model for a M&E System utilisation by DCoG to support municipalities is, thus, the primary purpose of the study. The model which will be presented should provide an early-warning mechanism in order to alert DCoG of areas where the municipalities are experiencing challenges in any area of the execution of their statutory obligations. Any other department wishing to implement an envisaged performance monitoring and evaluation model may do so by adapting it as will be detailed in Chapter 6 of this study to suit its requirements. Moreover, the study made a contribution towards process improvement. This implies that the study aims to identify constraints on the coordination measures, weaknesses of various planning and management systems within the three spheres of government, which if strengthened, may result in the effective financial, human, technical and administrative support to municipalities.

The envisaged comprehensive model for a M&E system utilisation by DCoG to support municipalities serves as an original contribution of this study to the existing body of knowledge on M&E systems as well as the intergovernmental support to municipalities.

### 1.9 CHAPTER OUTLINE

The thesis will be divided into the following six chapters:

Chapter 1 serves as the orientation and problem statement to the thesis. In this chapter the research questions and objectives are alluded to. The methodological method of investigation is discussed and the contribution of the study to the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system utilisation body of knowledge is provided.

In chapter 2 the theoretical grounding of the study is given through the discussion of the system of cooperative governance in South Africa. The chapter explores, among
others, the principles, practices and realities of cooperative governance and intergovernmental relations in South Africa.

Chapter 3 provides the reader with insight into Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems and its implementation in South Africa. The chapter also outlines the origin, statutory and regulatory frameworks of M&E systems in South Africa.

Chapter 4 explores how the M&E system is linked to intergovernmental support for municipalities. It will further explain how a M&E system serves as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities.

Chapter 5 focuses on the research conducted in the national Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG). The research methodology used in this study will also be the focus of the Chapter. In other words, the aspects of qualitative investigation as well as research results will be considered.

Chapter 6 provides a synopsis of the findings of the research objectives in the preceding chapters. Based on the outcomes of chapters 1 to 5 of the study a new model for M&E system utilisation by DCoG to support municipalities is presented.

1.10 CONCLUSION

This chapter aimed to provide the reader with an orientation and understanding of the process which was followed in order to reach a conclusion on the problem statement. The concept studied was introduced and the chapter provided the reader with some key conceptual constructs underlying the study. It also attempted to explain the process that was followed in order to reach the objectives of the study. The contribution of the study to the M&E system utilisation body of knowledge was also provided.

In the next chapter an attempt is made to provide the reader with an in-depth investigation as to the system of cooperative governance in South Africa.
CHAPTER 2

THE SYSTEM OF COOPERATIVE GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

2.1 INTRODUCTION

As explained in the previous Chapter, effective intergovernmental coordination is critical for the South African Government to realise its developmental challenges such as poverty eradication, economic growth and sustainable development. In this respect, the national government may not achieve these development and delivery outcomes without effective contribution of the provincial and local spheres of government. As the revenue continues to shrink, coordination and integration among the spheres of government should be strengthened to ensure the best possible outcomes and effective use of resources. The internal efficiencies with regard to service delivery initiatives should improve to ensure that the whole of government operate in unison. The three spheres of government should move away from sphere-specific and silo-based to inter- and intra-sphere planning, budgeting and implementation of programmes. Thus, the challenges of poverty, marginalisation of vulnerable groups and underdevelopment can be adequately addressed if there is collaboration of the three spheres of government.

The purpose of this Chapter is to provide the theoretical and legislative context of the system of cooperative government in South Africa. The Chapter commences by providing an overview of the system of Government in South Africa, then provides the Constitutional, legislative and regulatory frameworks for cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. Before examining the intergovernmental structures, the Chapter will explore the principles as well as the purpose of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. Additionally, attention will be focused on the conceptual clarification of local government support, followed by the overview of national and provincial government support to local government. The Chapter will conclude by outlining the challenges in the implementation of the system of cooperative government.
2.2 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Barker (1964:226) indicated that service delivery by the state is not only a consequence of the rights of persons, it is simultaneously integral to the rights of persons. Wessels and Pauw (2008:29) remark in a similar vein that the functions of the state and rights of its citizens cannot be separated. Service delivery by the state is not only necessary for the enjoyment of rights, it also secures those rights. Venter and Landsberg (2011:85) also concur with this view and explain that the individual voluntarily gives up some of his or her freedom in order to be part of a greater whole and to receive collective benefits and this is known as a social contract theory. Wessels and Pauw (2008:44) further maintain that the essence of social contract theory is that people are born free with exactly the same inherent and inalienable rights and therefore being equal consent freely to the creation of the state. Plaatjies (2011:1) summed the scenario by showing that the obligations of the state trigger a whole range of demands which constitute reasons for its existence.

Goodwin (2010:336) shows in this respect that one justification for the state’s supremacy is its claim to promote the common good to the members of society. Cloete (2005:1) agrees with this assertion and shows that the generally accepted role of the state in society is to protect, regulate, develop, maintain and sustain its citizens, or see to it that this happens. This is consistent with the observation of Burnell et al. (2011:227) that since the early twentieth century the fundamental defining role and function of the modern state has been to promote, organise, protect and sustain the economic and social transformation. Hague and Harrop (2011:61) also add in this respect that the core task of the state is to secure the welfare of the citizens. Burnell et al. (2011:336) further support this view by elaborating that the central function of the modern state has been to establish the institutional framework and organisational capacity for the promotion, management and maintenance of economic transformation and growth.
Hague and Harrop (2010:271) articulate the argument that to achieve these ends, the modern state should consist of an intricate network of organisations typically consisting of the central government, its offices and representatives in the field, regional governments and local authorities. Heywood (2007:92) also maintains that the existence of the state is perpetuated by government.

Gildenhuys and Knipe (2007:157) simply view government as a transient instrument of the state. White (1947:84) defined government as the combined organs and mechanisms by and through which the state functions. This is consistent with Heywood's (2007:92) observation that government is the agent through which the authority of the state manifests itself by means of policy-making and implementation. Webster’s Dictionary of English (1971:134) adopts a more explanatory approach when defining government as a noun meaning political direction and control exercised over the actions of the members, citizens and inhabitants of communities, societies and states. Ranny (1987:31) also offers a broader perspective of the term when stating that government is the body of people and institutions that make and enforce laws for a society and it is arguable the oldest and almost universal institution related with humanity. Clearly, it may be concluded that government is the means through which the authority of the state is brought into operation.

Vile (1967:13) was of the view that it is essential for the establishment and maintenance of political liberty that the government be divided into three branches, namely, the executive, legislative and judiciary. Faga (2005:279) indicates that a very fundamental principle of the modern political system is that the various functions of the state are required to be performed by separate and independent organs of government and this is what is known as the doctrine of separation of powers.

A perspective by Faga (2005:279) is that the doctrine of separation of powers denotes the practice of dividing the political and legal duties of the government among the executive, legislative and judicial branches. Devenish (1998:12) was of the view that a central theory of the doctrine of separation of powers in South Africa is that the
excessive concentration of power in a single organ or person is an invitation for abuse or maladministration. La France (1989:30) argued that fundamentally the separation of powers can be conceived as a doctrine of democratic responsibility and functional specialisation. Adar (2008:56) explains that inherent in the concept of separation of powers is that power should not be centralised and accumulated in one branch of government and that the role of each branch should be strengthen and enhanced. Ackerman (2000:640) indicates that the separation of powers denotes power-sharing arrangements and responsibilities conferred on the three branches of the government typically by means of the Constitution with the object of preserving and promoting good governance.

According to Kahn et al. (2011:3) the doctrine of separation powers of government has led to a horizontal division of power into executive, legislative and judicial functions. Gildenhuys and Knipe (2007:6) indicate in this respect that it is the function of a Constitution to determine not only the authority and functions of these institutions at the various levels of government, but also their relationships with each other. A Constitution is a framework for political society that establishes law and permanent institutions with recognised functions and definite rights (Kahn et al. 2011:26). Kahn et al. (2011:26) continue to indicate that the relationships of institutions with each other at various levels of government concern their executive, legislative and taxing authority. They also concern the margins of their independence and autonomy as well as allocation of government functions to them. According to Hattingh (1998:3) a need also existed for the vertical division of powers and functions between government and community. Kahn et al. (2011:3) remark in similar vein that the vertical division took place on a geographical basis, resulting in the formation of regional and local authorities exercising powers and performing functions on behalf of central government.

In the above context, how a government is regulated by a “system” deserves closer examination. In this study attention is focused on the executive branch of government at national, provincial and local spheres. The executive branch of government is the extension of government that implements the policies contained in legislation, which
reflect the needs and desires of the public and which are directed at solving the ailments and problems of society (Gildenhuys & Knipe, 2007:155). The next subsection will, therefore, consider the levels of the executive branch of government and how they interact systematically with each other. It is significant that these levels of government should align, coordinate their efforts and plan together as a single machinery of the state.

2.2.1 Relationship between government levels: The nature of the system of government

Gildenhuys and Knipe (2007:6) contend that most constitutions provide for a multi-level government system. Smit and Cronje (1996:62) defined a "system" as a set of interrelated elements functioning as a whole. Gildenhuys and Knipe (2007:6) continue to emphasise that a multi-level government system means that government institutions of the same type are repeated, for instance, at national, regional and local levels. Van der Waldt et al. (2007:17) point to the fact that South Africa opted for a three layered system, namely, the national, provincial and local spheres of government.

The Oxford English Dictionary of Current English (1996:1493) defined a “sphere” as the field of action, influence or existence. Mathebula (2011:843) explains that the word “sphere” denotes a degree of equality between levels of government. Nkuna (2011:625) highlights that a sphere connotes a vision of non-hierarchical government in which each government sphere has equivalent status, is self-reliant, inviolable and possesses the constitutional latitude within which to define and express its unique character. Venter (2001:171) contextualised spheres of government as a South African system where each sphere of government is autonomous but interlocked with the other spheres and where each must operate in unison in the delivery of services.

Reddy (2001:26) postulated that a system of cooperative government implies that although each sphere is distinctive and has equal status, it is also interdependent and interrelated within the overall governmental structure. Coetzee (2010:86) elaborates
that the three spheres of government must provide effective, efficient, transparent, accountable and coherent government. Malan (2005:227) also indicates that the Constitution envisages a state that supports interaction and cooperation among the three spheres of government on a continuous basis and therefore provides a set of principles to direct the manner and quality of those interactions. The recurring theme in the practice of the system of cooperative government is the pursuit of an integrated and coherent government to achieve the objectives of the state.

Section 1 of the Constitution stipulates that South Africa is one, sovereign, and democratic state. Section 40 (1) further determines that government in the Republic is constituted as national, provincial and local spheres of government. In the light of these provisions of the Constitution, it is key to clarify whether South Africa is a unitary or federal state.

2.2.2 South Africa: Unitary or federal system of Government?

Du Toit et al. (1998:224) defined federal government as a government in which authority is decentralised to the subnational units. Hague and Harrop (2010:273) agree with this assertion and add that federalism is a form of multilevel government which shares sovereignty, and not just power, between governments with a single state. Thornhill et al. (2002:28) adopt a more political approach and elaborates that federalism refers to that system of political organisation which unites separate political units in an overarching political system in such a way that authority is distributed among constituent bodies. Heywood (2007:167) also concurs and develops a more holistic approach and argues that federalism refers to the legal and political structures that distribute power territorially within a state. Starling (2008:109) sums up the scenario by showing that a federal system divides power between central government and regional governments, where each government is legally supreme in its own geographically demarcated area of jurisdiction.
Strong (1963:80) simply defined a unitary state as the state characterised by the supremacy of the central government and non-existence of subsidiary sovereign bodies. Hague and Harrop (2011:282) add that a unitary state is the state in which sovereignty lies exclusively with the central government. Kahn et al. (2011:28) develop a more comprehensive view and emphasise that a unitary state can be defined as a state in which authority is centralised on a national level and the lower levels of government have little or no autonomy. Fox and Meyer (1996:132) also adopted a more cautionary approach and indicated that in a unitary state, although authority may be delegated, final decision-making remains with the central government. Mello and Maserumule (2010:285) confirm this articulation and explain that in a unitary state the power or authority is centralised in the hands of a national government.

Kahn et al. (2011:29) indicate that the South African government structure, in terms of federal and unitary government, has a basic unitary system with very strong and broad federal characteristics. Kahn et al. (2011:29) continue to point to the fact that a key reason for South Africa to have a basic unitary government and broad federal elements is that the Constitutional Assembly has conferred specific constitutional mandates on provinces and local authorities. This is consistent with Venter and Landsberg’s (2011:9) observation that the form of the South African state, in essence, is unitary with strong national government and legislature.

The geographic distribution of power to nine provinces does not necessarily mean that South Africa is a federal state. Venter and Landsberg (2011:10) further articulate the argument that the provinces in effect have delegated powers to administer the various regions of South Africa. Mello and Maserumule (2010:283) are also of the view that South Africa is a strongly decentralised unitary state with characteristics of a federal state. In spite of South Africa being constitutionally founded as a unitary state, federal imperatives are inherently embedded in its system of government.

Mello and Maserumule (2010:286) warn that in carrying out their functions and exercising their respective powers, the three spheres of government should give
cognisance to the fact that South Africa is one, sovereign and democratic state. According to Mello and Maserumule (2010:286) this necessitates that the national, provincial and local spheres of government should coordinate their relations to make a coherent contribution in their pursuit of the objective of promoting the general welfare of the citizens. This also means that the policies, legislation and activities of the three spheres of government should be coordinated to ensure that the action of one sphere is not in conflict, but rather in support of those of the other spheres.

Kahn et al. (2011:26) point to the fact that the specific type of state, as manifested in a state’s Constitution, is the main variable influencing the relationships between the various spheres of government. Depending on whether it is a unitary or federal state, the government institutions may be completely or partially independent and autonomous, or they may be completely controlled at the national level serving as decentralised agents of the central government. Venter and Landsberg (2011:88) also observe that the way in which the state is structured, whether federal or unitary, influences the way in which its functions are implemented and public services rendered, and which level of government is responsible for the implementation of such functions. In the context of South Africa, it may be deduced that the impact of the unitary and federalist debate on the system of government and political interaction is that power has remained firmly concentrated at the level of national sphere of government while certain prescribed powers have devolved to the provincial and local spheres. This overall governmental arrangement, it may be argued further, is in turn persuading the three spheres of government to cooperate and interact with each other to provide coherent government capable of achieving the objectives of the state.

Any discussion of the concept of “cooperative government” should be incomplete without reference to the contribution of good governance and, for this reason, the next subsection considers the effect of good governance on the system of cooperative government.
2.2.3 Influence of Good Governance on the System of Cooperative Government

Ashton et al. (2005:452) warn that in order for the functioning of a system of cooperative government to be effective, efficient and socially relevant, it should be directed by the principles of good governance.

Ashton et al. (2005:452) simply regard good governance as simply founded on the attitudes, ethics, practices and values of society. Roos and De La Harpe (2008:2) add a further dimension and define good governance as the respect of the rule of law, openness, transparency and accountability to democratic institutions, fairness and equity in dealings with citizens. Mhone and Edigheji (2004:3) offer a broader perspective of the term when stating that good governance refers to the way in which the government undertakes its tasks within a democracy and lives up to participatory and consultative requirements. Rooyen and Naidoo (2006:458) remark in a similar vein that good governance includes initiatives to strengthen the institutions of government and civil society with the objective to make government more accountable, open and transparent, more democratic and participatory, promoting the rule of law. Gildenhuys and Knipe (2007:291) agree with this assertion by concluding that good governance broadly refers to when government attains its ultimate goal of creating conditions for a good and satisfactory quality of life for each citizen.

Based on the above assertions of different authors, it may be contended that the principles of good governance are key for the effective functioning of the system of cooperative government. Principles are the unchanging, non-negotiable values that underlie a system (Levin, 2005:3). The principles of good governance which should assist cooperative government include coherence in policy formulation, efficient and effective services, and accountability by democratic institutions.

The South African government has developed policies and pieces of legislation to establish the framework for cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. It may be argued in this respect that a relative mature statutory and regulatory framework
is thus in place to facilitate cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. In the section that follows, therefore, the focus will be placed on the statutory framework for cooperative government and intergovernmental relations.

2.3 CONSTITUTIONAL, LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS FOR COOPERATIVE GOVERNMENT AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The following set of legislation and policy guidelines are examined in terms of the contribution to cooperative government and intergovernmental relations.

2.3.1 The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa

Chapter 3 of the Constitution outlines the principles according to which cooperative government and intergovernmental relations must be conducted. In this regard, section 41(h) of the Constitution stipulates that cooperation of the three spheres of government must be implemented with a view to coordinating their activities and supporting one another. Section 41(2) of the Constitution further states that an Act of Parliament must establish or provide for structures and institutions to promote and facilitate intergovernmental relations. A perspective provided by Friedman (1999:3) is that while the Constitution provides a general framework with regard to cooperative government and intergovernmental relations, it does not provide precise directions on how the national and provincial departments should coordinate and integrate their activities. Kahn et al. (2011:65) agree with this assertion and state that the Constitution thus provides an enabling, rather than prescriptive framework for cooperative government and intergovernmental relations.

In the light of the above, it can be argued that Chapter 3 of the Constitution reflects the broad guidelines and principles but lacks the details pertaining to implementation regarding cooperative government and intergovernmental issues. It may further be concluded that it is for this reason that section 41(2) of the Constitution envisaged the development of legislation which establish or provide for structures, appropriate
mechanisms and procedures to facilitate cooperative government and intergovernmental relations.

2.3.2 **White Paper on Local Government, 1998**

The preamble to the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 2005 appeals for the cooperation and integration of actions in government. The former Department of Provincial and Local Government (2007:36) states that the Act provides a framework to facilitate coordination in the implementation of policy and legislation including the effective provision of services. Mohale (2005:20) agrees and shows that the primary objective of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 2005 is to facilitate coordination between the three spheres of government with a specific focus on the implementation of policy and legislation by ensuring coherent government and effective provision of services. Sigidi (2006:43) points to the fact that the Act provides an institutional framework for national, provincial and local governments and all other organs of state within them to facilitate sound government. Venter and Landsberg (2011:127) provide a more explanatory view by maintaining that it seems as if the Act has two primary functions. Firstly, it creates a number of structures such as national, provincial and municipal intergovernmental forums to take on a facilitative role. Secondly, it sets a Protocol for Implementation as well as a Code of Conduct in Chapter 3 of the Act.

2.3.3 **Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Act 97 of 1997**

The White Paper on Local Government, 1998 stipulates that all the spheres of government are obliged to observe the principles of cooperative government put forward in the Constitution. The White Paper on Local Government (1998:23) further shows that governments can effectively meet the developmental challenges when their components function as a cohesive whole. It further determined that this involves collectively harnessing all public resources behind common goals and within a framework of mutual support as well as coordinating their activities to avoid wasteful
competition and costly duplication. The White Paper on Local Government (1998:14) identified the integrated development plans (IDPs) as tools for municipalities to achieve greater coordination and integration. The Integrated Development Plans are the management and planning instrument to achieve the development goals and objectives of municipalities (Theron, 2007:80). It may, therefore, be concluded that cooperative government is certainly key for the realisation of the developmental goals.

2.3.4 Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003

Section 35 of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003 (MFMA) stipulates that the national and provincial Departments and public entities must in their fiscal and financial relations with the local sphere of government promote cooperative government in accordance with Chapter 3 of the Constitution. Fourie and Opperman (2007:9) also confirm that Chapter 5 on cooperative government in the MFMA seeks to promote cooperative approaches to fiscal and financial management within sectors as well as to forge links with the other spheres of government and organs of state. It fosters a greater level of cooperation across the different spheres of government, based on systems of mutual support, information sharing and communication as well as coordination of activities. Its aim is to add value to the constitutional responsibilities of the other spheres with a view to improving outcomes for all.

2.3.5 The Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act 13 of 2005

The preamble to the Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Act 97 of 1997 provides that the Act was promulgated to promote cooperation between the national, provincial and local spheres of government on fiscal, budgetary and financial matters. According to Kahn et al. (2011:111), the Act gives effect to the principles of cooperative government as enshrined in Chapter 3 of the Constitution by establishing mechanisms for their enactment. It further opens up lines of communication between and among the three spheres of government. Kahn et al. (2011:111) further contend that probably the most
important aspect of the Act is the fact that it formalises the array of intergovernmental relations instruments such as the President’s Coordinating Council, Minister and Members of the Executive Council’s and the Premier’s intergovernmental forums. The purpose of these structures includes facilitating coordination among the three spheres of government. A perspective provided by Mufamadi (2005:1) is that the Act is a departure from intergovernmental relations that had been in the main informal and resulted in discretionary and ineffectively coordinated relations between and among the three spheres of government.

It may be argued that the ultimate goal of the South African government to develop the statutory framework for cooperative government was to establish an integrated government capable of achieving the objectives of the state. Against this background, some of the basic principles for cooperative government which should be complied with in pursuit of coherent government are discussed below.

2.4 PRINCIPLES OF COOPERATIVE GOVERNMENT

Mathebula (2011:840) explains cooperative government as simply governance philosophy based on a reciprocal obligation of spheres of government to trust, support and assist one another in coordinating service delivery to the communities. Levy and Tapscott (2001:44) indicate that a foundation for cooperative government in South Africa was a question of the extent and nature of the powers and autonomy of the provinces which dominated the Constitutional negotiations. Levy and Tapscott (2001:44) continue to point to the fact that the treatment of the provincial or regional powers in the final Constitution, 1996 promoted or sanctioned the current integrated system of government in which both the national and sub-national government are deeply implicated in each others’ functioning. This is consistent with the observation of Kanyane and Nazo (2008:138) that one view of the reason for the inclusion of cooperative government in the Constitution, 1996 is that it is a middle-position between having a unitary state on one hand and a federal state on the other.
Ashton et al. (2005:452) simply explain that at the highest level, principles are a statement of society’s values in relation to a specific issue. Gildenhuys and Knipe (2007:92) are of the view that the concept principle is a “fundamental truth or law forming the basis of reasoning or of action”. Fox and Meyer (1995:101) explained that principles refer to the existence of formal written procedures, generally not open to public scrutiny, which prescribe specific courses of action to be taken under specific situations and which bureaucrats must follow without regard to personal preferences for special interests. Levin (2005:3) also indicates that the principles are the unchanging, non-negotiable values that underlie a system. This implies that the success of any system is underpinned by certain values and procedures that should be satisfied.

As stated, the Constitution enumerates specific principles of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. According to Section 41(2) of the Constitution all spheres of government and organs of state in each sphere must comply with the following three basic principles:

- **A common loyalty to the Republic as a whole.** The three spheres of government must be committed to the secure well-being of the people of the Republic and, to that end, must provide effective, transparent, accountable and coherent government for the Republic as a whole. This is the objective of cooperative government.

- **The distinctiveness of the spheres should be respected.** A sphere must remain within its constitutional mandate, and when exercising the executive powers, must not do so in a manner that encroaches on the geographical, functional or institutional integrity of another sphere except where specifically directed otherwise.

- **Cooperative government must be realised.** The three spheres of government must take concrete steps to fostering friendly relations, assisting and support one another, inform one another of, and consult one another on, matters of common
interest, coordinate their actions and legislation with one another, adhere to agreed procedures and avoid legal proceedings against one another.

Gildenhuys and Knipe (2007:295) also contend that the following main principles should apply when ruling on the basis of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations:

- **Division of authority.** The division of authority, devolution and full autonomy within the limits of the Constitution is imperative for sound regional and local governance.

- **Allocation of functions.** The primary principle concerning the vertical allocation of functions is that they should be allocated to that sphere of government where they can be rendered most effectively and efficiently to satisfy the needs of the community.

- **Allocation of resources.** It is a basic principle of good governance that every government should be financially self-sufficient. Any government at whatever level cannot be autonomous if dependent on the good graces of other governments for financial resources by way of grants and subsidies.

Kahn *et al.* (2011:28) point to the fact that the main principles that form the basis of cooperative government in a unitary state is that the supreme power rests with central government and such power is indivisible and unlimited. According to Kanyane and Nazo (2008:137) a set of the principles of cooperative government is provided to govern interactions amongst the national, provincial and local government. The gist of these principles is to place an obligation on the three spheres of government to put the national interest first and to cooperate with each other.
Du Plessis (2009:109) advises that for cooperative government and intergovernmental relations to succeed, the political buy–in and leadership of political and administrative officials at all levels of government are needed. Therefore, the structures as instruments of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations require some consideration. However, before embarking on such an examination it is necessary to dwell for a moment on the purpose of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations.

2.5 PURPOSE OF COOPERATIVE GOVERNMENT AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Malan (2005:230) states that the government of South Africa has created a constitutional and institutional framework to encourage cooperation and interaction between the three spheres of government cooperating together or acting in concert with each other are more likely to address the challenges than if they were to act separately or in competition. Malan (2005:228) indicates that the system of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa is rapidly evolving because of the statutory commitment of the various spheres of government to the implementation of the principles of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. Malan (2005:227) further indicates that the principles of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations recognise the interdependence of the three spheres of government, namely, the national, provincial and local spheres of government. Interdependence of the spheres of government emphasises the co-relationship between the national, provincial and local government and may include aspects such as the duty of the spheres to empower one another as well as monitoring and intervention in the activities of a dependent sphere.

The Green Paper on Cooperative Governance (2010:9) issued by the former Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) states that cooperative government and intergovernmental relations must ensure that contestations due to different interests are pro-actively managed. The Review Report on State of
Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa (Presidency, 2008:10) issued by the Presidency highlights that cooperative government and intergovernmental relations add value as they promote the translation of development policy intent into actual service delivery outcomes. The Implementation of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act: An Inaugural Report (2007:1) shows that cooperative government is the foundation for the coordination across the three spheres of government of all of Government’s service delivery, development and policy initiatives. The importance of intergovernmental relations is to ensure that national and provincial governments are properly positioned to support local government. In the above context, it may be argued that cooperative government and intergovernmental relations are mainly about facilitating the coordination and integration of the activities of different spheres of government, including those of the organs of state such as Departments and municipalities within each sphere.

Levy and Tapscott (2001:84) explain that the effectiveness of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations depends on the quality of the instruments that guide the process. This is consistent with Yonatan and Steytler (2006:5) observation that formalising and assisting cooperative government and intergovernmental structures in facilitating viable and effective intergovernmental relations are the major objectives of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 2005. It is against the above background that the structures for cooperative government and intergovernmental relations are examined in the section below.

2.6 STRUCTURES AS INSTRUMENTS OF COOPERATIVE GOVERNMENT AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS: THE POLITICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE INTERFACE

According to Reddy (2001:21) there are approximately eighty structures and role players, statutory and non-statutory, responsible for cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa. In this study attention will be focused on
the following most significant national intergovernmental structures which promote interaction among the three spheres of government:

- **The President’s Coordinating Council (PCC).** This is the consultative forum for the President and is attended by senior representatives from all spheres of government. High on the list of responsibilities of the forum is the need for greater synergy between the national and provincial governments for the development of integrated rural strategies, greater provincial oversight of municipalities in regard to the financial management and delivery of social services.

- **The Minister and Members of the Executive Councils (MinMecs).** These are sector-committees comprising of the respective Minister and Members of Provincial Executive Councils. The responsible Minister for the specific sector is the Chairperson of the Committee and specialists may attend sittings of the forum by invitation if required. MinMecs are essentially sectoral forums where representatives discuss policy and strategic matters, gain clarity on complex aspects of legislation, inform policy and exchange experiences.

- **The National Council of Provinces (NCOP).** This is the second Chamber of Parliament and has 90 members comprising of delegations from each province. According to the Constitution, the task of the NCOP is to represent the Provinces to ensure that their interests are taken into account in the national sphere of government. It works with the National Assembly to make and pass new laws and also focuses on laws affecting the provincial sphere of government.

- **The Forum of South African Directors-General (FOSAD).** This is a technical support structure consisting of the national and provincial Directors-General. The Chairperson of the forum at national and provincial levels are the Directors-General in the Offices of the President and Premiers respectively. It is a non-statutory organ, essentially an advisory administrative body that provides regular
opportunity for Directors-General to share experiences around policy and implementation, exchange ideas and assist each other in the professional development and management of their respective Departments.

- **The South African Local Government Association (SALGA).** This is in essence “an association of municipalities” which exists to represent, promote and protect the interests of local government. The key services and products of the institution are policy formulation, advocacy, negotiations, international representation, supporting and strengthening municipal capacity. The organised local government is recognised in the Constitution as a legitimate voice for local government and is also afforded representation in key national institutions such as the PCC and FOSAD.

- **The Budget Council.** This comprises of the Minister of Finance and nine MECs for Finance. It serves as a platform where the national and provincial government consult on fiscal, budgetary or financial matters affecting the provincial sphere of government. The broad functions of the Council are to exchange information, coordinate financial legislation, identify matters for further investigation and make recommendations to Cabinet on the division of revenue.

The Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 2005 institutionalises a number of other interrelated structures such as the Premiers and Provincial and District Intergovernmental forums. The purpose is to promote interaction and coordination at all spheres of government.

According to the Practitioner’s Guide to Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa (2007:63), each intergovernmental forum can establish technical support structures comprising officials representing the organs of state that are in the political structure. The role of the technical support structure is to provide technical support which includes preparing reports for decision in the political structure. The technical support structures are consultative and not decision making bodies. The decisions taken by these
structures must be ratified or approved by the constituent organs of state before they can be binding on that particular organ of state.

The intergovernmental relations forums considered above play an important role in coordinating and streamlining activities of the three spheres of government and various government Departments. Levy and Tapscott (2001:88) indicate in this respect that the other function of intergovernmental structures in general include improving the synergy among leaders at national, provincial and local government spheres and identifying common areas of concern among provincial Departments and their linkages with the municipalities. Levy and Tapscott (2001:85) further show that the structures also promote cooperation on matters of mutual concern to all three spheres of government. However, Malan (2009:145) warns that it is not the mere existence of structures that is required as it is their effective functioning and total commitment which are key to developing the mindset of cooperation as well as promoting sound intergovernmental relations. The main purpose is to strengthen the coordination across government and encourage cross-sectoral integration.

According to the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Skills Programme Learner Guide (2006:96) the municipalities are unable to respond to the vast developmental challenges such as poverty, service backlogs and economic infrastructure without the contributions of other service agencies. In this respect, before delving into the overview of national and provincial government support to local government, in the section that follows focus is placed on what constitutes local government support.

2.7 CONCEPTUALISING LOCAL GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

As a preliminary step, it is essential to define the terms “support” and “local government” so as to provide clearer understanding of the concept of local government support.

The Practitioner’s Guide to Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa (2007:34) issued by the former Department of Provincial and Local Government explains “support"
as measures of assistance to ensure that another sphere is able to perform adequately. The former Department of Constitutional Development (1999:6) shows that support of municipalities in cooperative government and intergovernmental relations means that the national and provincial governments have a positive obligation to strengthen local government structures, powers and functions. The support, in the context of cooperative government, may include but is not limited to assistance in respect of the development of policy, integrated human settlements and local economy. In this study, a particular focus is placed on how the national and provincial governments coordinate and integrate their activities to support the municipalities by strengthening their capacity in the areas of finance, human resource, governance and infrastructure so as to enable them to achieve their developmental objectives.

The term “local government” refers to the ideas of self-help government by a local community (Faga, 2005:267). Ismail et al. (1997:2) developed the following definition which will be used as the operational definition of this study: local government refers to that level (or sphere) of government which is commonly defined as a decentralised, representative institution with general and specific powers devolved to it by a higher tier (sphere) of government within a geographically defined area. According to Meyer (1997:7), the character of local government in terms of its constitutional status and as an institution of government is threefold, namely:

- a local area and community formed and kept together by common interests;
- participation by a local community in the government of its local affairs and grassroots democracy; and
- a local political unit endowed with executive and legislative powers as the third sphere of government with powers of taxation to control, regulate and develop local affairs and render local services.

Meyer (1997:8) further adds that the constitutional status of local government has affirmed its role as a legal government structure functioning within the broader framework of cooperative government which has been constitutionalised.
Consequently, local authorities cannot be seen as just exercising delegated powers, but as a sphere of government in its own right and an integral part of the government system of the country.

Section 105 of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 stipulates that mechanisms, processes and procedures must be established to assess the support needed by municipalities to strengthen their capacity to perform their function. Botha (2003:11) also observes that the municipalities must be supported if they are to become the country’s primary development agents able to meet the challenges of poverty reductions and clearing of service delivery backlog.

According to the Annual Report (2010:52) issued by the former national Department of COGTA, the mandate of the Department is to coordinate cross-sectoral support aimed at enhancing the capacity of local government to deliver on their Constitutional mandate and to meet the socio-economic development needs of the communities. The Delivery Agreement for Outcome 9 (2010:7) issued by the Presidency, identifies the core national and provincial Departments such as Treasury, Water Affairs, Human Settlements, Energy, Rural Development and Land Reform, and Environmental Affairs which have a direct impact on municipalities. It further indicates that these Departments will have to establish a closer working relationship to jointly tackle the service delivery issues such as coordination of infrastructure funding, capacity building initiatives and integrated planning. The former Department of Provincial and Local Government has also developed the National Capacity Building Framework 2008/2011 which explains the role of stakeholders to accelerate the provision of targeted support to local government.

Van der Waldt et al. (2002:90) stress the fact that service delivery is not the responsibility of government alone. Gildenhuys and Knipe (2007:77) indicate in this respect that the private sector involvement, if properly regulated and managed, can assist local government and government in general to bring in greater investment and coverage as well as better quality services. According to the Integrated Development
Plan (IDP) Skills Programme Learner Guide (2006:96) the private sector can also support municipalities in their service delivery and development efforts through public-public and public-private ventures. This is consistent with the observation of Van der Waldt et al. (2007:88) that the shift from a traditional service delivery model to a more developmental strategic approach requires support for municipalities from the civil society organisations and private sector. Van der Waldt et al. (2007:88) continue to show that the private sector or business community offers the managerial expertise, financial resources, credit, training infrastructure and capacity to take over certain functions that a municipality is unable to perform. Some of the prominent alternative approaches and mechanisms that can be considered by the private sector or business community to support municipalities in service delivery include privatisation, outsourcing and public-private partnerships (Van der Waldt et al. 2007:113). Nonetheless, as stated above the intergovernmental support in this study will be limited to the assistance which the national and provincial governments should provide to local government.

Consistent with the discussion thus far, the next section will consider the actual support plans and programmes to assist local government to discharge its constitutional mandate.

2.8 NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT SUPPORT TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The State of Local Government Assessment Report (2009:70) issued by the former national Department of COGTA, points to the fact that in response to the numerous performance and viability failures amongst municipalities and deteriorating service delivery record, on 2 December 2009, the national Government approved a comprehensive Local Government Turnaround Strategy (LGTAS) which requires support plans of the national and provincial Departments until the next electoral cycle in 2014. The strategic objectives of the LGTAS are the following:
• **Ensure that municipalities meet basic needs of communities.** This implies that an environment is created, support provided and systems built to accelerate quality service delivery within the context of each municipality’s conditions and needs.

• **Build clean, responsive and accountable local government.** Ensure that systems and structures and procedures are developed and enforced to deal with corruption, maladministration and municipalities communicate and account more to communities.

• **Improve functionality, performance and professionalism in municipalities.** Ensure that the core administrative and institutional systems are in place and are operational to improve performance.

• **Improve national and provincial policy, support and oversight to local government.** This implies that the national and provincial government develop policies which are aimed at strengthening the capacity of municipalities so as to enable them to achieve their development objectives.

• **Strengthen partnerships between local government, communities and civil society.** Communities and other development partners are mobilised to partner with municipalities in service delivery and development (Local Government Turnaround Strategy, 2009:2).

According to the Practitioner’s Guide to Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa (2007:34) issued by the former national Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, the Government has launched a number of other support programmes to assist local government to discharge its constitutional mandate. The local government, consisting of municipalities, is an important sphere which carries substantial responsibility for the delivery of public services and development of the country. The following are some of the key interventions which were exercised jointly by the national and provincial governments to assist municipalities:

• **Free Basic Services and Infrastructure - launched June 2001.** The purpose of the programme is to strengthen local government capacity to increase access to
basic public services, including free basic service for all communities in order to enable municipalities to meet their constitutional mandate.

- **Urban Renewal and Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programmes (URP and ISRDP) – launched August 2001.** They are Presidential initiatives aimed at providing targeted support to 21 rural and urban areas. These 13 rural districts and 8 urban townships represent the largest concentration of poverty in South Africa. All agencies of government are encouraged to pay special attention to poverty alleviation in these 21 areas and Cabinet plays an oversight role in monitoring progress in these areas.

- **Local Government Leadership Academy – launched September 2002.** The programme seeks to improve the competencies of Councillors and Managers in areas such as leadership and management through targeted interventions based on skills audit findings.

- **Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) – launched June 2004.** The programme consists of infrastructure, environment and cultural as well as social and economic sectors. It is a government’s national initiative aimed at drawing a significant number of the unemployed into productive work.

- **Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG) – launched July 2004.** It is a conditional grant to support municipal capital budgets to fund municipal infrastructure and upgrade existing infrastructure primarily benefiting poor households. The MIG is also a transfer mechanism geared towards making the system of transfers to municipalities simpler, certain and direct.

- **Project Consolidate – launched October 2004.** It was a programme through which the former Department of Provincial and Local Government identified a number of municipalities experiencing a short-term need for intense, hands-on support. The high-calibre teams were assembled and deployed to work with municipalities to tackle the identified tasks. The programme extended not only to poorly performing municipalities, but also those in areas of high unemployment and poverty with considerable backlogs in service delivery. The problem areas were to be addressed by means of provincial project management units and
support structures and the affected municipalities working in partnership with business, labour, civil society and development agency.

- **Operation Clean Audit 2014 – launched October 2009.** The main objective of the programme is to improve the financial and administrative capacities of municipalities to achieve 100 percent unqualified audit opinions by 2014. Some of the goals of the programme are to support municipalities in achieving adequate leadership involvement and effective oversight, effective governance arrangements, systems to address previous audit findings, as well as conducive financial management arrangements.

The Green Paper on Cooperative Governance (2010:5) shows that the Intergovernmental Framework Act, 2001 was enacted to give effect to the cooperative government principles outlined in the Constitution. In practice, the implementation of the Act has not improved the integrated service delivery.

Kahn *et al.* (2011:115) also lament the fact that while the key objective of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations is to ensure a system in which the three spheres of government operate together, the reality is that this objective has not been realised to the extent envisaged by the Constitution, 1996. Levy and Tapscott (2001:2) further observe that to establish a system of cooperative government is a very complex process and its interactions are also very technical. From the assertions of these different authors, it should follow logically that the current limitations in the system of cooperative government experienced particularly by the local government, be explored briefly. In the above context, it is necessary to conduct some examination on the current limitations in the system of cooperative government in South Africa.

### 2.9 CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SYSTEM OF COOPERATIVE GOVERNMENT

The Working Together for Development: Understanding Intergovernmental Relations (2009:5) shows that the system of cooperative government is very important, especially
when the programmes of the national and provincial government must be implemented at local government. The effect of the weak system of cooperative government leads to poor coordination within and between different and spheres of government, creating the incapacity to implement national programme and a consequent failure to deliver basic services (Presidential Review Commission, 1998:35).

Mubangizi (2005:638) indicates in this respect that the new policies at national level are most often set without due consideration to the organisational, financial and service delivery implications for the provincial and local spheres of government. On the other hand, Du Plessis (2004:19) attributes the ineffective communication between different role players, lack of capacity to implement policies and programmes and misalignment of policies between local and provincial government as other factors limiting on the system of cooperative government. The Implementation of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act Report (2006/7:29) reveals that the unrealistic national policies do not take operational context, human resource and capacity constraints at sub-national governments into consideration. Coetzee (2010:91) also shows that the competitive forces and functions of the spheres of government impede the cooperation between the three spheres and cause unnecessary tension. The result is fragmentation, duplication, inefficient implementation and a lack of accountability. This also results in a negative influence on service delivery as was the case in various municipalities.

Clearly, the national, provincial and local government spheres comprising the machinery of the state should work together so as to fulfil the needs of the South African society. The coordination and integration between the spheres of government should be strengthened to mitigate the challenges in the implementation of the system of cooperative government.

2.10 CONCLUSION

The Chapter provided an overview of the nature of Government in South Africa as well as the Constitutional, legislative and regulatory frameworks for cooperative government
and intergovernmental relations. It further highlighted the principles and purpose of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. Before providing an overview of the national and provincial government support to local government, the Chapter clarified the concept of local government support and concluded with the challenges in the implementation of the system of cooperative government.

From the discussion in the Chapter, it can be seen that intergovernmental coordination and cooperation are critical for the realisation of the development agenda and acceleration of service delivery. In this respect, the Chapter highlighted that national government cannot realise its development and delivery targets without the contribution of provincial and local governments.

The purpose of the utilisation of the Monitoring and Evaluation system, particularly when the powers and functions of the state are distributed across the three spheres of government, should include the effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. Thus, in the next Chapter attention will be focused on Monitoring and Evaluation systems and its implementation in South Africa. Chapters 2 and 3 respectively serve as a contextual background to Chapter 4 where a link between Monitoring and Evaluation systems and intergovernmental support to municipalities will be established.
CHAPTER 3

MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The Government in South Africa is under significant pressure to address the development needs of the citizens. In addition to the inadequate delivery of services which include water, sanitation, refuse removal and housing, a major challenge is the need to demonstrate that development programmes are reaching intended targets and achieving desired results. The current state of affairs reflects that little is known about how well programmes are able to sustain the delivery of services over time and even less about the extent to which they produce their intended impacts. The development programmes make reference mainly to the programmes implementation stages in which infrastructure is constructed, equipment installed and service delivery systems established. The existence of a results orientation and the effective determination of success should be a critical component of the overall performance of Government. Thus, it becomes necessary that the Government should design delivery programmes and systems which contribute to the achievement of broad goals such as alleviating poverty, delivering quality health care and protecting the environment in a sustainable manner.

This chapter addresses monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems and its implementation in South Africa. An overview of monitoring and evaluation in South Africa will first be provided. The focus of the discussion will then be on the Constitutional, Legislative and Regulatory frameworks for monitoring and evaluation. An explanation will be provided on the reasons for developing the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (GWM&ES), the designing of M&E systems, performance indicators, as well as guiding principles for the implementation of M&E systems. The implementation of a M&E System, internal institutional arrangements for
monitoring and evaluation, key institutions in the South African monitoring and evaluation scene across government as well as their roles and responsibilities will also be explored. The chapter will conclude by reflecting on the best practices as well as challenges in the implementation of M&E systems.

3.2 AN OVERVIEW OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS IN SOUTH AFRICA

McNaughton (2000:1) narrowly defined the Public Service as part of the political system of a country. Venter and Landsberg (2011:82) elaborate further and contextualize Public Service as the term which is used primarily to denote the civil component of a state’s management and public administrative apparatus. Nengwenkulu (2009:344) agrees with this assertion and adds a further dimension by indicating that the Public Service is the "administrative machinery" through which governments deliver all kinds of services to their citizens. This definition is consistent with the observation of Levin (2009:943) that the Public Service is the "servant of the people" and must be accessible, transparent, accountable, efficient, and free of corruption. Draai (2010:132) developed the following definition which will be used as the operational definition of this study: the Public Service in South Africa is a vast, hierarchical, permanent structure that administers public services such as safety, security, health, social welfare and a range of other services that either directly or indirectly facilitate a quality of life.

Van der Waldt (2004:iii) formulates a view that the lack of an overarching performance management framework to manage inputs, outputs and outcomes still hampers the broader South African Public Service in respect of service delivery. The Presidential Review Commission of the Reform and Transformation of the Public Service in South Africa, 1998 also revealed that it is in the area of monitoring and evaluation where the Public Service in South Africa faces a serious challenge to the success of their policies and programmes. Cloete (2009:297) indicates in this respect that until 2005, the policy programme monitoring and evaluation were not undertaken, managed and coordinated systematically in the South African Public Service. These activities were undertaken
sporadically by line function Departments for purposes of the annual Departmental reports. Ijeoma (2010:343) remarks in a similar vein that until 2005, no coherent system of systematic policy monitoring and evaluation existed in South Africa. Only staff performance evaluations were done and during that time, the President committed to report bi-monthly on the implementation of the system that would monitor and evaluate government service delivery.

According to Cloete (2009:298) the following aspects are some of the considerations that motivated a Cabinet decision in 2005 to develop the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (GWM&ES):

- a need for regular national government report-backs to the International UN Millennium Goals Initiative on the progress with halving poverty in South Africa by 2014;
- the fact that South Africa was the host of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 and at that time did not have any national M&E system to assess sustainable development as required by the Rio Convention of 1992 and reiterated at the Johannesburg summit where South Africa was the host country;
- the undertaking by the South African President to regularly inform citizens about progress with the Government’s National Programme of Action;
- the fact that donors are increasingly requiring systematic monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes that they fund, in order to protect their investments; and
- the fact that institutionalising national M&E systems has for the reasons summarised above, proved to be an international good governance practice.

Figure 3.1 below contains the Presidency’s depiction of the envisaged operations in the GWM&ES.
Figure 3.1: Structural components of the Government–wide Monitoring and Evaluation System

Source: Cloete (2009:299)

Figure 3.1 above illustrates a model which explains the different roles of the various stakeholders in the GWM&ES. It describes the generic policy planning, implementation and assessment processes in government. The Presidency (2007: 19) maintains in this context that an important departure point of the GWM&ES is that existing monitoring and evaluation capacities and programmes in line function departments should as far as possible be retained, linked and synchronised within the framework of the GWM&ES.

Nevertheless, Ijeoma (2010:351) shows that the South African GWM&ES in its current form is nothing more than an emerging monitoring and evaluation framework based on the collection of disparate documents published by different departments, each from its own line function perspective. The Presidency (2008:15) also states that, as a result, this makes it difficult to compare the GWM&E system with other systems in more detail, since it is still a developing system that has not really taken root. Dassah and Uken
conclude that the late start after 1994 of monitoring and evaluation in South Africa owes much to the fact that the preconditions for introducing monitoring and evaluation, transparency and accountability did not exist. South Africa has experienced both a lack of any significant internal pressure at different times as well as weak external pressure.

In the next section the Constitutional, legislative and regulatory frameworks for monitoring and evaluation are discussed. The Constitutional, legislative and regulatory frameworks establish a basis and scope for the development and implementation of M&E system in the South African Public Service.

3.3 THE CONSTITUTIONAL, LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

The South African Government has developed numerous pieces of legislation and policies reflecting its commitment to performance management in the Public Service.

Ingen and Schneider (1991:73) simply defined performance as what a person or system does. Van Dooren et al. (2010:17) also narrowly regard performance as the outputs and outcomes of activities. Boyne et al. (2006:255) offer a broader perspective of the term when pointing to the fact that performance is the character and consequences of service provision by public institutions. Langdon (2000:13) explained performance as the actual work that is done to ensure that an organisation achieves its mission. Holbeche (2005:243) remarks in a similar vein and articulates the argument that performance can thus be seen as an integrated, systematic approach to improve organisational performance to achieve organisational strategic aims and promote the organisation's mission, vision and values.

Van der Waldt (2008:9) simply regards performance management as a method or set of techniques. Cayer (2004:110) elaborates further on the concept by indicating that performance management encompasses numerous activities to improve the efficiency
and effectiveness of organisations. Bouckaert and Halligan (2008:100) also add that performance management establishes a full programme of managing performance, where performance information is systematically and coherently generated and used. Kanyane and Mabelane (2009:60) confirm this view and show that performance management may be regarded as an ongoing process that determines planning, managing, reviewing, rewarding and development of performance. This definition is consistent with the observation of Van der Waldt (2004:39) that performance management refers to all those processes and systems designed to manage and develop performance at the level of the public service, specific organisations, components, teams and individuals.

Nonetheless, in this section the focus is placed on monitoring and evaluation applications in local government due to the research focus of the study. The purpose is to channel intergovernmental support to where it is most needed and will best accomplish service delivery priorities in municipalities. These mechanisms should assist in identifying areas of underperformance for appropriate intervention in municipalities so as to improve performance. Monitoring and evaluation initiatives and performance management efforts should both aim at improving performance in the Public Sector. To this end, the following set of legislation and policy guidelines are examined with reference to the monitoring and evaluation.

### 3.3.1 The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa

Dassah and Uken (2006:708) contend that monitoring and evaluation is considered so important in South Africa that the Constitution, 1996 has specifically mandated the Public Service Commission (PSC) to undertake all public sector evaluation, thus providing a model of how seriously monitoring and evaluation should be taken. Section 196 (4)(6) of the Constitution, 1996 stipulates in this respect that the powers and functions of the Commission are to investigate, monitor and evaluate the organisation, administration and personnel practices as well as proposing measures to ensure effective and efficient performance within the Public Service. It may be argued
therefore, that the main task of the Public Service Commission is to implement monitoring and evaluation policies and programmes in the Public Service.

3.3.2 Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000

Section 11 of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (as amended by Act 7 of 2011) obliges a municipality to exercise its executive authority by monitoring the impact and effectiveness of any services, policies, programmes or plans. Section 41 of the Municipal Systems Act, 2000 also provides that a municipality must in terms of its performance management system and in accordance with any regulations and guidelines that may be prescribed,

- monitor performance; and
- measure and review performance at least once per year.

In terms of Section 47 of the Municipal Systems Act, 2000 a member of the Executive Council responsible for Local Government must annually compile and submit to the provincial legislature and Minister a consolidated report on the performance of municipalities in the Province. It may be construed that the Act provides both the enabling and prescriptive framework for monitoring and evaluation.

3.3.3 Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System, 2007

The Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System Policy Framework published by the Policy, Coordination and Advisory Services in the Presidency in 2007, stipulates that monitoring and evaluation processes can assist the public sector in evaluating its performance and identifying the factors which contribute to its service delivery outcomes. It further provides that monitoring and evaluation helps to provide an evidence base for public resource allocation decisions and helps identify how challenges should be addressed and success replicated.
Ijeoma (2010:351) explains that the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System, 2007 is a comprehensive guideline for monitoring and evaluation which was produced after the Cabinet approved a process to plan a monitoring and evaluation system across government in 2004. According to Ijeoma (2010:352) this monitoring and evaluation framework provides a useful guide to the role of performance information in planning, budgeting and reporting as well as the roles and responsibilities in managing and using performance information. Ijeoma (2010:351) further contextualises the GWM&ES as an overarching system that aims to provide an integrated encompassing framework for Monitoring and Evaluation principles, practices and standards.

3.3.4 Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003 (MFMA)

Fourie and Opperman (2011:9) indicate that the Act introduces a performance-based system focusing on outputs and measurable objectives which will enable municipalities to maximise their capacity for service delivery. The National Evaluation Policy Framework (2011:1) also states that the MFMA provides a legal basis for undertaking the different types of evaluation in municipalities in order to maximise their capacity for service delivery. From a monitoring and evaluation perspective the Act ensures sound and sustainable management of the financial affairs of municipalities and other institutions in the local sphere of government.

3.3.5 Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information, 2007

The Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information was published by National Treasury in 2007 and outlines a set of agreed terms for performance information for use within the Public Service. According to this policy framework, the term “performance information” is used as a generic term for non-financial information about Government services and activities. Ijeoma (2010:352) notes that this monitoring and evaluation framework provides a useful guide to the role of performance information
in planning, budgeting and reporting as well as the roles and responsibilities in managing and using performance information.

The framework clarifies definitions and standards for performance information in support of regular audits of such information. The regular audits of performance information include the following:

- Improved integrated structures, systems and processes required to manage performance information.
- Defined roles and responsibilities for managing performance information.
- Promotion of accountability and transparency by providing Parliament, provincial legislature, municipal councils and the public with timely, accessible and accurate performance information (National Treasury, 2007:2).

3.3.6 Policy on Improving Government Performance: Our Approach, 2010

The Policy on Improving Government Performance: Our Approach (Presidency, 2010:4) issued by the Presidency, describes the Presidency's approach to performance management, monitoring and evaluation. It states that essential to the approach is a focus on the priorities agreed upon in the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF), derived in turn from the election manifesto of the ruling party. It further proposes a diverse range of performance measurement and management instruments, internal and external to Government. These include further strengthening of internal government systems (such as the planning systems and the GWM&E system) as well as enhanced citizen oversight through increased publication of outcomes data.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:5) issued by the former Department of COGTA, indicates that the document emphasises that as part of performance measurement process, it is key to understand the results chain of logic model approach which will assist in the achievement of the desired outcomes. The logic models / or results chain illustrates the logical sequence of
specific inputs, activities needed to produce outputs which will eventually contribute to the achievement of outcomes and impact.

3.3.7 The Green Paper: National Strategic Planning, 2009

The Green Paper: National Planning Commission, 2009 links the planning as well as the monitoring and evaluation functions towards achieving the long term developmental priorities of government. It states that effective planning should provide criteria to assess progress and, for this reason, the M&E function in the Presidency will have to be involved in finalising planning instruments such as Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) and Government Programme of Action (GPoA). The Policy on Improving Government Performance: Our Approach (2010:14) issued by the Presidency shows that policy coordination is at the interface of planning, performance management and M&E processes, and in practice these functions would tend to overlap. The Green Paper: National Strategic Planning (2009:2) indicates in this respect that Cabinet is to structure the relationship between the National Planning Commission (NPC) and Department of Monitoring and Evaluation so as to ensure complementaries as well as the implementation and measurement of the same objectives across government.

3.3.8 South African Statistical Quality Assessment Framework (SASQAF), 2010

The South African Statistical Quality Assessment Framework, 2010 issued by Statistics South Africa is one of the statistical tools at the centre of the statistical system, enabling the implementation process of statistical coordination and thus of the South African national statistics system. It is accordingly a driver of the monitoring and evaluation aspects of the work programmes of the organs of state and other agencies. For example, the Framework requires that when Statistics South Africa coordinates the quality of data used for monitoring and evaluation purposes in the systems, certain criteria be met prior to the assessment of such data. (SASQAF, 2010:2)

Ijeoma (2010:351) indicates that the Policy Framework is a comprehensive guideline for monitoring and evaluation which was produced after the Cabinet approved a process to plan a monitoring and evaluation system for use across government in 2005. The National Evaluation Policy Framework (2011:11) shows that the framework describes three "data terrains" which underpin the M&E system, namely, programme performance information; social, economic and demographic statistics, and evaluation. It is the overarching policy framework for monitoring and evaluation in the South African Government. The policy framework is applicable to all entities in the national, provincial and local spheres of government.


The manual makes a contribution in focussing attention on the critical M&E role of the Offices of the Premier by outlining how they feed into the overall GWM&E framework. It sketches certain broad over-arching principles, objectives, definitions, practices and standards that would integrate M&E across the three spheres of government and other organs of state. Engela and Ajam (2010:5) observe that this policy guideline addresses the complex M&E roles of coordinating structures in sub-national governments.

From the various pieces of legislation and policies discussed above it should be evident that there exist adequate legal provisions for monitoring and evaluation across the Government. These legislative stipulations and policy guidelines have laid a solid foundation for monitoring and evaluation practices in South Africa. Thus far, the Constitutional, legislative and regulatory frameworks for monitoring and evaluation in South Africa have been discussed. In the following section the purpose for developing GWM&ES will be explored.
3.4 PURPOSE OF THE GOVERNMENT-WIDE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

Hauge (2001:2) maintained that firstly and above all, the M&E system is intended to support the process of creating development results. It guides managers towards achieving their goals, whether their responsibilities are at the policy, programme or project level. Ijeoma (2010:357) indicates that the rationale behind the development of the GWM&ES was to be on par with international counterparts in terms of service delivery and good monitoring and evaluation standards and practices. Mackay (2006:6) highlights that governments build M&E systems because they directly support core government activities, such as the budget process, national planning, the management of ministries, agencies and programs or to provide information in support of accountability relationships. Lange and Luescher (2003:85) articulate the argument that a M&E system’s main purpose is to monitor and evaluate whether, how, to what extent, and with what consequences the vision, policy goals and objectives are being realised at a systematic and at an institutional level. Mackay (2006:8) emphasises that the objective of government M&E system is not only to produce large volumes of performance information or a large number of high-quality evaluation as this would reflect a supply-driven approach to a M&E system. Rather, the objective is to achieve intensive utilisation of whatever monitoring and evaluation findings which exist to ensure the cost effective M&E system utilisation in support of core government functions. A perspective provided by Hauge (2001:7) is that the real product of M&E system is not necessarily only the reports or facts, but a higher quality of decision-making. Critically, the M&E system needs to provide a continuous flow of actionable information about the interrelationship between operational activities, especially those of government, and the reality of poverty on the ground. The M&E system should provide a means for managers to know which programmes have any discernable impact upon poverty. Lange and Luescher (2003:82) are of the view that for M&E systems to have a function beyond mere accountability and resource allocation, they have to transcend the generation of baseline data and venture into the more complicated and contested terrain of explanation. For this to happen, M&E systems need to be deeply embedded
in the socio-political dynamics of the societies in which they operate both at the conceptual and design level.

The recurring theme from these assertions above by different authors is that a M&E system should not just be about the performance of programmes against pre-set objectives. It should also be an approach to value responses regarding the pressing issues facing the country. Furthermore, M&E systems should demonstrate, not only that government is doing work for the state at acceptable costs but also that it is running projects worth paying for. That is, the need to demonstrate efficiency and effectiveness.

Pena-Rosas et al. (2008:148) make a key observation that given its many potential purposes, it is important to understand that monitoring and evaluation is situation-specific and varies with the intended purpose, end-user of the findings and the intended use of the information. Odeghe (2006:126) also warns in this respect that since monitoring and evaluation issues may differ depending on the context, careful consideration must be made to consider the subject in a specific context. Odeghe (2006:126) elaborates that, for example, monitoring and evaluation indicators and indispensability may differ in regards to capital, projects, emergency health situations, conflict and internal displacement situations or the routine management of programmes.

In the light of these considerations above by the authors, it may be argued that the purpose for which a M&E system will be utilised determine the approach to developing such a M&E system. That is, in designing a M&E system it is key to take into account the actual or intended uses of the information which such a system will produce: whether to assist resource allocation decisions in the budget process, to help in preparation of national and sectoral planning, to aid ongoing management and delivery of government services or to underpin accountability relationships. From the foregoing it is key to explore the key steps in designing a M&E system.
3.5 STEPS IN DESIGNING MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

The Monitoring and Evaluation Module (available at: www.rhrc.org.resources) shows that there are six steps that should guide the development of a M&E system. In contrast, Kusek and Rist (2004:23) suggested that in designing a M&E system that responds to the results in an organisation's strategy is a ten-step process.

Kusek and Rist (2004:23) explained that although experts vary on the number and specific sequence of steps in designing a M&E system, all agree on the overall intent. For example, different experts propose four-or seven-step models. Hermann (1987:5) warned in this respect that if one lesson is clear from experience, it is that there is no single approach to or methodology in designing a M&E system that can be applied uniformly. The particular circumstances that include budgets, staffing and local conditions require that M&E systems be designed on a case by case basis. The Third International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results (available at: www.oecd.org) also indicates that there is not one "right" way of designing M&E Systems in government and organisations. There is a multitude of options and opportunities based on development stages in which countries find themselves, complexities of the national and local context, already existing capacities, immediate requirements and political choices. Görgens and Kusek (2010:5) agree with this observation and add that in designing a M&E system the main issue is to ensure that key strategies and activities are recognised, clustered together in a logical manner and then completed in an appropriate sequence. Görgens and Kusek (2010:4) further identify the following ten steps, that will be used as the approach of this study, to designing a M&E system. Whereas the authors have different perspectives on the number and specific sequence of steps in designing a M&E system, the following ten steps essentially accommodate the approaches identified by other authors:

**Step One: Conducting a Readiness Assessment** to determine the capacity and willingness of the government / organisation and its development partners to construct a M&E system. This assessment addresses such issues as the presence or absence of
champions, the barriers to building a system, who will own it, and who will oppose the M&E system.

**Step Two: Agreeing on Outcomes to Monitor and Evaluate** addresses the key requirement of developing strategic outcomes that then focus and drive resource allocation and activities. These outcomes should be derived from the strategic priorities (goals).

**Step Three: Developing Key Indicators to Monitor Outcomes**, so the degree to which the outcomes are being achieved can be assessed. Developing indicators is a core activity in building an M&E system and drives all subsequent data collection, analysis, and reporting functions. Both the political and methodological issues in creating credible and appropriate indicators are not to be underestimated.

**Step Four: Gathering Baseline Data on Indicators** involves describing and measuring the initial conditions being addressed by the outcomes. It is the first measurement of the indicators and defines the starting point.

**Step Five: Planning for Improvements** requires setting realistic targets and recognises that most outcomes are long-term, complex, and not quickly achieved. It is helpful to establish interim targets that specify how much progress towards an outcome is to be achieved each year (or other time period) and the resources needed. Measuring results against targets can involve both direct and proxy indicators and use of both quantitative and qualitative data.

**Step Six: Monitoring for Results** is the administrative and institutional task of establishing data collection, analysis and reporting guidelines; designating who will be responsible for activities; establishing quality control processes; establishing timelines and costs; working through roles and responsibilities; and establishing guidelines on transparency and dissemination of the information and analysis. It is emphasised that,
in constructing an M&E system, the challenges of ownership, management, maintenance, and credibility need to be addressed clearly.

**Step Seven: Evaluative Information to Support Decision-Making** focuses on the contributions that evaluation studies and analyses can make throughout this process to assess results and move towards outcomes. Analysis of program theory, process evaluations, outcome and impact evaluations, and evaluation syntheses are among the strategies discussed that can be employed in evaluating a M&E system.

**Step Eight: Analysing and Reporting Findings** is a crucial step, as it determines what findings are reported to whom, in what format, and at what intervals. This step has to address the existing capacity for producing the information, and focuses on the methodologies for accumulating and assessing information, and preparing analyses and reports.

**Step Nine: Using the Findings** emphasises that the crux of the system is not simply generating results-based information, but getting the information to the appropriate users in a timely fashion so that they can take the information into account in making decisions. This step also addresses the roles of development partners and civil society in using the information to strengthen accountability, transparency, and resource allocation procedures.

**Step Ten: Sustaining the M&E System** recognises the long-term process involved in ensuring the longevity and utility of a M&E system. Six criteria are seen as crucial to the sustainability of M&E system: demand, structure, trustworthy and credible information, accountability, incentives, and capacity. Each dimension needs constant attention over time to ensure the viability of the system.

These steps above to designing M&E system can also be summarised as follows:
Figure 3.2: Steps into designing a M&E system

Source: Adapted from Kusek and Rist (2004:25)

The model presented above in Figure 3.2 provides a summary of how to design a M&E system. The Third International Roundtable on Managing for Development Results (available at: www.oecd.org) shows that the ten steps in the model are not necessarily sequential or linear. Often one would need to be working on a combination of steps at the same time and one might have to go back and forth between steps. Kusek and Rist (2004:24) also add that though visually it appears as a linear process, in reality it is not. One will inevitably move back and forth along the steps, or work on several simultaneously.

From the above, it can be seen that designing a M&E system does not necessarily have to be done according to these number and sequence of steps. A more detailed number of steps or fewer could be defined depending on the purpose for which such a M&E system will be utilised. Furthermore, often one may work on a combination of steps simultaneously.
In this study, the purpose is to design a comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation by the national department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to support municipalities. A M&E system, in this context, should be able to monitor service delivery trends in municipalities and evaluate them in relation to policy goals in general, as well as to specific policy strategies and projects, implementation structures and instruments. Thus, the specific M&E system envisaged is that which can facilitate the flow of comprehensive performance information between municipalities and national Department and further establish procedures and systems for the utilisation of such information to improve intergovernmental support to municipalities. The aim is to enable the national Department to acquire performance information and use it for the coordination of appropriate intergovernmental support to municipalities. It will be established in the next chapter how a M&E system is linked to intergovernmental support for municipalities. It will further be explored how a M&E system should serve as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. The intergovernmental support focuses in this respect on building the capacity of municipalities in the areas of finance, human resource, infrastructure, local economic development and governance so as to ensure that there is service delivery.

Valadez and Bamberger (2000:25) observed that in view of the rapid proliferation of M&E systems, it is not surprising that many of them have had difficulty living up to the ambitious demands placed on them. Many M&E systems have been criticised for their inefficiency and limited utility where in some cases the information arrives too late, does not answer the right questions or is too costly to collect.

Ile et al. (2012:95) indicate that typically a M&E system should have two components and complementary parts. Chimwendo (2010:5) identifies the seven components for a M&E system. Görgens and Kusek (2010:7) identify the twelve components for a M&E system. Whereas the authors have different views, in this study the following are identified as the components of a M&E system, as shown in Figure 3.3 below. These components below take into account the opinions by different authors.
The components illustrated above in Figure 3.3 help to give a disaggregate view of the areas within the M&E system that may need attention so as to address the challenges. They are shown as interlocking and interdependent parts of a larger whole. The three rings which constitute the components are discussed below. The components are important as they constitute an organising framework for M&E system and address the challenges of M&E systems.

**People, partnerships and planning ring (Outer ring)**

1. **Structure and organisational alignment for M&E systems** – The staff in the organisation are clear on the overall goals and the strategies it has chosen to achieve and understand the role of monitoring and evaluation in helping the organisation to meet its goals.
2. Human capacity for M&E systems – There are adequately skilled monitoring and evaluation staff who can effectively and efficiently complete all activities defined in the monitoring and evaluation work plan.

3. Monitoring and Evaluation partnerships – Internal and external partnerships to strengthen the M&E system are established and maintained

4. Monitoring and Evaluation plans – A monitoring and evaluation plan is developed and addresses: data needs; national standardised indicators; data collection tools and procedures; and roles and responsibilities in order to implement a functional M&E system

5. Costed Monitoring and Evaluation work plans – A multi-partner and multi-year monitoring and evaluation work plan is used as the basis for planning, prioritising, and costing, mobilising resources and funding for all monitoring and evaluation activities

6. Advocacy, communications and culture for M&E systems – Knowledge of, and commitment to, monitoring and evaluation and the M&E system among policy-makers, programme managers, programme staff, and other stakeholders.

Collecting, capturing and verifying ring (middle ring)

7. Routine monitoring – Timely and high-quality routine data are used for routinely assessing programme implementation and taking decisions and actions to improve programmes.

8. Periodic surveys – Surveys that answer relevant questions and that are unbiased, accurate, generalised, ethical and economical are undertaken, or existing survey results are used, as required by the programme data needs.

9. Databases useful to M&E systems – Databases are developed and maintained that enable stakeholders to access relevant data for policy formulation and programme management and improvement.

10. Supportive supervision and data auditing – Data quality (valid, reliable, comprehensive and timely) and the thoroughness of all six data management processes are externally verified on a periodic basis, and actions implemented to address obstacles to producing high-quality data.
11. **Evaluation and research** – Research and evaluation results are used to inform policy, programming and intervention selection.

**Using data for decision making (inner ring)**

12. **Using information to improve results** – Stakeholders involved in the programme have learned from the data presented and gained knowledge about the programme, and are therefore able to make better decisions about how to achieve results (Görgens & Kusek, 2010:7).

As shown above, the emphasis is placed on people, partnerships and planning (outer ring); collecting, capturing and verifying (middle ring) as well as utilising data for decision making (inner component) as considerations for a functional M&E system. The components of a functional M&E system can be utilised to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of M&E systems. The M&E systems should be given continuous attention and support and, in this way, the factors contributing to their failure may be addressed.

Gumbi (2010:1) remarks that a functional M&E system needs to have a structured set of indicators. Van der Waldt (2004:53) also articulates the argument that to be able to monitor and evaluate policy processes, performance and outcomes, it is generally recognised that a set of key performance indicators will need to be put in place. Therefore, before delving into the implementation of M&E system, it is significant to discuss the performance indicators.

### 3.6 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Nel and Goldman (2005:6) conceptualise indicators as the means of knowing that the objective will be achieved. Minnaar (2010:68) concurs with this view and states that indicators help an organisation define and measure progress towards organisational goals. They reflect the success factors of an organisation. This is consistent with the observation of Kusek and Rist (2004:69) that an indicator is a quantitative or qualitative
variable that provides a simple and reliable basis for assessing achievements, change or performance. They are clues, signs or markers that measure one aspect of a programme and show how close a programme is to its desired path and outcomes. Van der Waldt (2004:53) strongly confirms this view when arguing that indicators are measures that describe how well a programme is achieving its objectives. They define the data to be collected, measure progress and enable actual results achieved over time to be compared with planned results. Thus indicators reveal and measure trends. The Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment Policy and Implementation Framework (2010:16) summed the scenario by showing that indicators are signals that reveals progress or lack thereof towards objectives. They are a means of measuring what actually happens against what has been planned in terms of quantity, quality and timelines.

The Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (2007:7) issued by the National Treasury explains that suitable performance indicators need to be specified to measure performance in relation to inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. It further shows that determining a set of appropriate performance indicators depends on the nature of the institution’s mandate. This means that manager’s need to be selective when defining performance indicators as that requires careful analysis of what is to be measured.

The Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (National Treasury, 2007:7) issued by the National Treasury further indicates that a good performance indicator should be:

- **Reliable**: the indicator should be accurate enough for its intended use and respond to changes in the level of performance.
- **Well-defined**: the indicator needs to have a clear, unambiguous definition so that data will be collected consistently, and be easy to understand and use.
- **Verifiable**: it must be possible to validate the processes and systems that produce the indicator.
• **Cost-effective**: the usefulness of the indicator must justify the cost of collecting the data.

• **Appropriate**: the indicator must avoid unintended consequences and encourage service delivery improvements, and not give managers incentives to carry out activities simply to meet a particular target.

• **Relevant**: the indicator must relate logically and directly to an aspect of the institution's mandate, and the realisation of strategic goals and objectives.

The Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (2007:7) uses the “logic” model to develop performance indicators as illustrated in Figure 3.3 below:

---

**Figure 3.4**: Indicators of Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Equity

Figure 3.4 above illustrates that performance indicators are relevant at all levels of the logic model. It also illustrates the way in which economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity are conceptualised. Prinsloo (2011:59) also indicates that the following are some of the types of performance indicators:
• **Economy indicators**: explore whether specific inputs are acquired at the lowest cost and at the right time; and whether the method of producing the requisite outputs is economical. Economy indicators only have meaning in a relative sense. To evaluate whether an institution is acting economically, its economy indicators need to be compared to similar measures in other state institutions or in the private sector, either in South Africa or abroad. Such indicators can also be compared over time, but then prices must be adjusted for inflation.

• **Efficiency indicators**: explore how productively inputs are translated into outputs. An efficient operation maximises the level of output for a given set of inputs, or it minimises the inputs required to produce a given level of output. Efficiency indicators are usually measured by an input: output ratio or an output: input ratio. These indicators also only have meaning in a relative sense. To evaluate whether an institution is efficient, its efficiency indicators need to be compared to similar indicators elsewhere or across time. An institution's efficiency can also be measured relative to predetermined efficiency targets.

• **Effectiveness indicators**: explore the extent to which the outputs of an institution achieve the desired outcomes. An effectiveness indicator assumes a model of how inputs and outputs relate to the achievement of an institution's strategic objectives and goals. Such a model also needs to account for other factors that may affect the achievement of the outcome. Changes in effectiveness indicators are only likely to take place over a period of years, so it is only necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of an institution every three to five years; or an institution may decide to evaluate the effectiveness of its different programmes on a rolling 3-5 year schedule.

• **Equity indicators**: explore whether services are being provided impartially, fairly and equitably. Equity indicators reflect the extent to which an institution has achieved and been able to maintain an equitable supply of comparable outputs across demographic groups, regions, urban and rural areas, and so on. Often
specific benefit-incidence studies will be needed to gather information on equity. The aim of such studies would be to answer the question: "Who benefits from the outputs being delivered?" Usually equity is measured against benchmark standards or on a comparative basis. Institutions may also use the results of opinion surveys as indicators of their performance. Such indicators should not replace the above two categories of indicators, but rather complement them. If an institution uses such surveys, it is important that they be professionally designed. In the light of definitions above, clearly all government institutions should be encouraged to pay particular attention to developing indicators that measure economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity using data collected through these indicators.

In the light of definitions above, clearly, all government institutions should be encouraged to pay particular attention to developing indicators that measure economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity using data collected through these indicators. Van der Waldt (2004:70) observes in this respect that the government is faced with increasing demand for services without an increasing revenue base.

In order to fully understand the implementation of M&E systems, it is important to understand, first, the guiding principles for their implementation. Consistent with this notion, the next section will outline the guiding principles for implementation of M&E systems.

3.7 THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

As explained in the previous chapter, principles are the unchanging, non-negotiable values that underlie a system. This implies that the success of any system is
underpinned by certain values and procedures that should be satisfied (Levin, 2005:3). According to the GWM&E system (2007:19) the following eight principles will guide the key stakeholders in crafting detailed implementation plans in their areas of responsibility:

(i) **The implementation plan should be clearly linked with prior public sector reform initiatives.** This will allow the monitoring and evaluation improvements envisaged by this Policy Framework to build upon, complement and consolidate previous reform efforts.

(ii) **As far as possible, the GWM&E framework should incorporate and consolidate existing monitoring and evaluation initiatives in the three spheres, aligning them to the overall aims of government.** Many national departments have taken the lead in fostering a culture of monitoring and intervention in sub-national spheres. The implementation of the GWM&E framework therefore does not start with a clean slate, but should recognise and build upon these initiatives. The implementation plan should thus be evolutionary.

(iii) **Roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder should be clearly defined and related to their mandate.** The monitoring and evaluation resources are extremely limited across the South African public service. It is very important that the scarce resources available are harnessed for optimal impact, avoiding both unnecessary duplication as well as omissions of key interventions. Effective coordination of efforts is of paramount importance.

(iv) **The implementation plan should adopt a differentiated approach across spheres and sectors.** Although all spheres of government have a common interest and objective in contributing whole-of-government performance, it must be borne in mind that the operating context of each sphere is very
different. In order to be feasible, any implementation plan has to be sensitive to these nuances.

(v) **The administrative burden of compliance across government should be minimised.** Implementation milestones must be linked to existing capacity and the ability to build capacity over the medium term. Overlapping responsibilities (for example in respect of concurrent functions) tend to result in multiple reporting lines. Provincial government departments and especially municipalities incur substantial compliance costs in reporting essentially the same information in many different formats to different stakeholders. To this end the streamlining of reporting lines and sharing of information is vital, although each data source should have a clearly designated owner. While the GWM&E Policy Framework sketches the ultimate destination at which all public sector departments will converge, it must always be borne in mind that capacity varies markedly across spheres and geographic jurisdictions. While capacity should not dictate the normative long term ideal for government, it must be factored into implementation plans and risk managed accordingly.

(vi) **Where M&E systems are supported by Information Technology solutions, the emphasis will be on systems integration and ease of data interchange.** The GWM&E Policy Framework seeks to embed performance a management system within public sector organisations which articulates with other internal management systems. The term system, in this context refers to the policies, strategies, structures, processes, information flows and accountability relationships which underpin the practice of monitoring and evaluation across government. This may or may not be supported by IT software and other tools.

(vii) **Monitoring and the development and enforcement of statistical standards are important pre-conditions for effective evaluation.** The sequence of implementation will focus firstly on creating a culture of
monitoring service delivery and then feeding back into managerial action. Simultaneously the definition of statistical standards will be concluded with interventions to enable departmental data to be converted into official data. Improvements in the quality of data and information and the creation of knowledge will then lay the foundations for more effective evaluation practices.

(viii) **Regular review of the implementation plan against milestones.** Implementing the GWM&E Policy Framework will no doubt be a learning process. Doubtlessly implementation challenges, unforeseeable at this time, will arise. There needs to be mechanisms to respond to these challenges, engage with relevant stakeholders and modify the implementation plan if required.

Having outlined the guiding principles for implementation of M&E systems and consistent with the discussion thus far, the next section will consider the actual implementation of M&E system within the South African Public Service.

### 3.8 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

Lane (1993:106) simply viewed the concept of implementation as the execution of policies. Van Niekerk *et al.* (2001:96) agree with this assertion by indicating that the implementation process entails the translation of decisions into actions. Starling (2010:385) introduces a slightly different dimension and explains that implementation is a process of assembling the elements required to produce a particular programme outcome. A more specific definition is provided by Cloete *et al.* (2010:183): “Implementation is the conversion of mainly physical and financial resources into concrete service delivery outputs in the form of facilities and services or into other concrete outputs aimed at achieving policy objectives. Bevir (2009:103) sums up the scenario by showing that implementation refers to the set of actions and interactions
involved in the execution of public policy. The task of implementation is mainly the responsibility of the executive branch of government, especially the Public Service.

The Role of Premiers’ Office in Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation: A Good Practice Guide (2008:22) shows that the current implementation of monitoring and reporting framework for municipalities has been heavily influenced by the Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003 (MFMA). The Act stipulates that municipalities must fulfil comprehensive reporting requirements which are outlined below:

### 3.8.1 Monthly Financial Reports

Section 71 of the MFMA requires municipalities to submit, on a monthly basis, information regarding actual expenditure and revenue collection. As such, these reports capture information regarding:

- actual revenue by source;
- actual borrowings;
- actual capital and operational expenditure by vote;
- allocations received;
- actual expenditure on allocations; and

The Role of Premiers’ Office in Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation: A Good Practice Guide (2008:22) further states that in all instances, the actual expenditure and revenue must be compared with the amounts projected in the municipal budget. This provides municipalities and other stakeholders with the needed information to monitor municipal expenditure and revenue collection.

### 3.8.2 Mayor’s Quarterly Reports
In accordance with section 52 of the MFMA the mayor must, on a quarterly basis, submit a report to the council regarding the municipal financial state of affairs and the implementation of the budget. This report combines elements of both financial and non-financial information monitoring.

3.8.3 Mid-Year Performance Assessment Reports

This Mid-Year Assessment Report compiled by the accounting officer, must be completed by the 25th of January of every financial year. This report assesses the performance of the municipality for the first half of the financial year, taking into account the section 71 monthly reports, the annual report and the municipal service delivery performance.

3.8.4 Annual Reports

The Role of Premiers’ Office in Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation: A Good Practice Guide (2008:22) indicates that the municipality’s annual report provides information regarding the activities of the municipality over the course of the financial year. The report assesses actual municipal performance against the budget and non-financial targets as set at the beginning of the year. The annual performance report, as required by the Municipal Systems Act (Section 46), is included in this report, as well as the Auditor-General’s audit report.

Cloete (2009:299) states that the GWM&ES is managed from the Policy Coordination and Advisory Unit in the Presidency. The unit draws on information gained from the municipalities, sector Departments and other agencies and interpret it in the context of the national government’s strategic Programme of Action in order to assess progress towards those strategic goals. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:14), issued by the former national Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) proposes that, due to the fact that reporting on performance of local government requires information from different
sectors at provincial and local level, DCoG will be responsible for coordinating information through its programme managers. The Framework, 2010 further explains that, at a provincial level, the Office of the Premier (OTP) has the responsibility of coordinating information from the provincial sector Departments as the former is responsible for monitoring the provisions of basic services by the municipalities. The provincial Departments of COGTA has to work in partnership with the OTPs in ensuring that reports are coordinated from municipalities.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:9) issued by the former national Department of COGTA reveals that the Presidency is yet to develop the overall implementation plan of the M&E systems across the three spheres of government. Nonetheless, Van der Waldt et al. (2007:124) make a key observation that monitoring and evaluation evolves from the Performance Management System (PMS) in municipalities. PMS is an integrated system to measure the performance of an institution and that of its personnel (Kanyane & Mabelane, 2009:60). Chapter 6 of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 also requires municipalities to implement PMS. The GWM&E provides macro-oversight over performance of the state and policy impact whilst a PMS is the micro management tool in municipalities to accomplish their developmental mandate.

Clearly, it can be seen that the linkage between the GWM&E system in the Presidency and performance M&E system of both the Office of the Premier and COGTA as well as its interface with PMS in municipalities require clarification in respect of implementation.

Nonetheless, the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:14) issued by the national Department of COGTA proposes the figure which is indicated below for the transmission of data:
According to the Framework (2010), Figure 3.5 above is a schematic representation of the path which data usually will travel as part of monitoring and reporting from the communities to Parliament.

The Presidency (2008:2) explains that when the GWM&ES was officially launched in 2007, it was envisaged that the successful implementation of the system would have a huge potential for improvement of the public policy outcomes and impacts in the country. However, Cloete (2009:299) observes that the updated GWM&ES implementation plan still contains no detailed implementation strategy and no time frames to fully establish the system in South Africa has yet been determined. It can thus be argued that the conceptualisation of monitoring and evaluation, specifically with regard to its implementation at a policy level in the South African Public Service, is still very limited and yet to mature.
Van Niekerk et al. (2001:65) stressed the fact that in order for government to comply with its purposes and objectives, it is essential that structures be created to give effect to the needs, wants and desires of the people. A structure is the hierarchical pattern of authority, responsibility and accountability relationships designed to provide coordination of the work of the organisation (Van Niekerk et al. 2001:64). In the section that follows consideration is given on how the internal institutional arrangements affect monitoring and evaluation.

3.9 INTERNAL INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS: STRUCTURES FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The Institutionalising Performance Management: A Toolkit for Municipalities (2007:17) issued by the former national Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs indicates that institutional arrangements refer to the structural mechanisms that have been established to assist with management of processes such as performance management within the institution. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:15) indicates that, in addition to the existing intergovernmental structures provided for in legislation, other existing structures such as M&E Forums will be used to support monitoring and evaluation. The Figure 3.6 below shows M&E Forums across the three spheres of government including civil society:
Figure 3.6: Monitoring & Evaluation Structures

As can be seen from Figure 3.6 above, the institutional arrangement for monitoring and evaluation provide evidence of community participation by cascading down monitoring and evaluation to lower levels through the Ward Committee M&E Forum. The functions of each Forum are explained here below:

- **National Local Government M&E Forum** – The Forum will allow national sector departments, provinces (Offices of the Premiers, provincial Departments COGTA), state owned entities and other key stakeholders for example, the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) to participate in the implementation and monitoring of the Local Government Turnaround Strategy (LGTAS). The national forum is a critical component in respect of ensuring enhanced coordination and the institutionalisation of monitoring, reporting and evaluation at a national level.

- **Provincial M&E Forums** – The Forum will support the coordination of the implementation, monitoring and reporting of the Municipal Turnaround Strategy
(MTAS). It will also ensure the participation of sector departments in the sharing of information on their plans. The Forum will also be used to validate information being submitted to the intergovernmental forum. The process of establishing the forum has to be led by the Offices of the Premier, supported by the provincial Departments responsible for local government. Representation will include sector Departments and District municipalities.

- **District M&E Forums** – The Forum at this level will support the implementation through knowledge sharing on experiences and information for continuous improvement. Including the coordination of information from local municipalities. The successful implementation lies not only in the identification of priorities, but in the coordination of implementation across and between the three spheres and sectors.

- **Local M&E Forums** – The local M&E forums will improve participation of civil society as a vehicle to achieve and magnify their voice and to put additional pressure on government to achieve higher levels of performance.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:16) states that the Forums will be used to improve monitoring and reporting through regular feedback to key stakeholders on performance of local government. These structures are meant to:

- Enhance transparency and provide essential evidence necessary to underpin accountability relationships across the three spheres of government including civil society.

- Improve participation of civil society as a vehicle to achieve and magnify their voice and to put additional pressure on government to achieve higher levels of performance.

In the above context, it should be seen that the effective implementation of monitoring and evaluation relies on appropriate internal institutional arrangements. Van Rooyen
Plaatjies et al. (2011:292) state that using outcome-based priorities for a system of government performance monitoring and evaluation requires a further rethink of the institutional arrangements between various levels of government in South Africa. This is necessary in order to align state institutions towards the use of performance information. In the section below, attention will therefore be focused on key institutions across the South African government contributing towards monitoring and evaluation. To examine these institutions is key as performance information is collected, collated and reported by different institutions within the Government to provide an overall picture of national performance.

3.10 KEY INSTITUTIONS IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN MONITORING AND EVALUATION SCENE: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Numerous institutions support monitoring and evaluation in South Africa. Van Rooyen (2004:566) indicates that with the term institutions, reference is made to the structures that are established through which to administer and facilitate development. The following section deals with some of the key institutions in the South African monitoring and evaluation scene.

3.10.1 The Presidency

Bosch (2011:3) indicates that the Presidency, through the newly established Department of Monitoring and Evaluation is responsible for driving the improvement in governmental performance through a focus on outcomes. The Presidency has in this respect developed policy frameworks that include the Improving Government

3.10.2 The National Planning Commission (NPC)

Bosch (2011:2) states that the National Planning Commission (NPC) was established in 2009 on the premise that achieving the outcomes depends on much more than good financial management. This realisation led to a paradigm shift from traditional monitoring and evaluation focus to outcomes-based approach. The Green Paper: National Strategic Planning (2009:23) issued by the Presidency shows in this respect that the NPC will from time to time contribute to reviews of implementation or progress in achieving the objectives of a national plan.

3.10.3 Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA)

The Policy Framework for the Government–wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (2007:18) issued by the Presidency argues that the Department acts as the custodian of public management frameworks, performance and knowledge management as well as service delivery improvement. Cloete (2009:299) also explains that the Department is responsible for staff performance evaluations. The Minister of Public Service and Administration is the co-chairperson of the Governance and Administration Cluster which is responsible for monitoring and evaluation policy issues. Dassah and Uken, (2006:713) note that the monitoring and evaluation function is located in the directorates of the national departments', therefore, Ministers have oversight and coordination responsibility for monitoring and evaluation in their departments.

3.10.4 Statistics South Africa (Stats SA)

Cloete (2009:301) is of the opinion that Statistics South Africa should coordinate the quality of data used for monitoring and evaluation purposes in the system. The South
African Statistical Quality Assessment Framework (2010:2) issued by Statistics South Africa indicates that statistics are eligible for designation as official statistics subject to periodic reviews by the Statistician-General in consultation with the head of the producing organ of state or agency. The purpose of official statistics is to assist organs of state, business, other organisations or the public in monitoring and evaluation of policies, decision-making or other actions.

3.10.5 National Departments responsible for concurrent functions

Prinsloo (2011:104) postulates that the national Departments responsible for concurrent functions need to monitor the performance information produced by their provincial counterparts and use it to evaluate delivery of services within their sector. The National Treasury (2007:18) also states that, for example, the national Department of Health has a responsibility to ensure the structures and systems used by provincial Health Departments to collect performance information are the same (or at least compatible) and that there is complete agreement on the types of information and definitions across the sector.

3.10.6 Public Service Commission (PSC)

The Basic Concepts in Monitoring and Evaluation (2008:vi) issued by the Public Service Commission states that the Commission’s mandate requires of it to monitor and evaluate the organisation and administration, and the personnel practices of the Public Service. Sangweni (2004:2) also indicates that, since assuming the mantle of being the leader and custodian of good governance in 1999, the Commission has faced the mammoth task of evaluating the President’s Office and all the national and provincial Departments with regard to service standards and Batho Pele principles.
3.10.7 Public Administration, Leadership and Management Academy (PALAMA)

The Strategic Plan (2012:19) issued by the Public Administration, Leadership and Management Academy (PALAMA) shows that one of the strategic priorities of the academy is to provide monitoring and evaluation training as part of its contribution towards the national outcomes. Ijeoma (2010:343) also states that the departments that are playing various roles in the GWM&ES include PALAMA.

As seen from the discussion above it is clear that there are numerous institutions in South Africa which play a role in monitoring and evaluation. However, additional institutions such as the Departments of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation, DCoG, Treasury as well as the Department of the Premier will be discussed in Chapter 4. These latter Departments are identified in this study as not only contributing to monitoring and evaluation but are critical in monitoring and supporting municipalities.

Nonetheless, Cloete (2009:299) makes a key remark that it seems as if the GWM&E system has more of an emerging network nature at the moment. Cloete (2009:299) elaborates in this respect that the structures of GWM&E systems are at this stage explained in a series of separate policy documents drafted by the respective stakeholders, each establishing one or more components of a comprehensive emerging regulatory framework that forms the backbone of the system. There is no integrated hierarchical structure and no indication of lines of authority and interlinking processes available yet.

The next section addresses the best practices for M&E systems. Thompson et al. (2010:361) indicate that a best practice is a technique for performing an activity or business process that at least one company has demonstrated works particularly well. The adoption of best practices is known as benchmarking (Kraukamp, 2007:22).
3.11 BENCHMARKING FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

Azevedo et al. (2010:1) note that benchmarking simply means comparing performance against standard. Epure et al. (2011: 608) add that benchmarking is the search and emulation of the industry’s best practices. Carpinetti and De Melo (2002:1) broaden the concept of benchmarking even more by stating that it is an instrument of continuous improvement in the context of total quality management and serves as a means of enhancing competitiveness. Lamming (1993:21) cautioned that benchmarking involves the detailed study of productivity, quality and value in different Departments and activities in relation to performance elsewhere. Kraukamp (2007:22) adopts a more explanatory approach and maintains that benchmarking is a systematic and continuous process to identify, determine, measure, compare, learn, adopt and implement the best practice obtained through internal and external evaluation of an organisation so that performance of a higher standard may be achieved and improved.

It may be deduced from the definitions provided above by different authors that benchmarking, therefore, influences organisations to look outside and appreciate how exemplary other organisations conduct their processes. Benchmarking thus allows an organisation to make an assessment of the gap between its own practice and best practices.

The Presidential Review Commission of the Reform and Transformation of the Public Service of South Africa, 1998 indicated that the international best practice suggests that effective monitoring and evaluation requires the conscious or deliberate creation of a system that can be fully integrated into the total function and activities of the Public Service. Boyle (1989:97) noted that for a M&E system to be fully operational in a Public Service context, the technical, cultural and political conditions must be taken into account and Ministerial commitment to the concept must be explicit. Mackay (2006:5) confirms that success factors for M&E systems include institutionalisation, that is, the creation of an M&E system which produces monitoring information and evaluation findings which are judged valuable by key stakeholders and used in the pursuit of good
governance. Mackay (2006:7) elaborates that another feature of the successful government M&E system is the stewardship of this process by a capable Ministry. It certainly helps to have an institutional lead of a M&E system close to the center of government such as the President’s Office or budget process.

Naidoo (2007:59) asserts that it is not sufficient simply to identify best practices of other organisations. These practices need to be mobilised, adapted and improved over time to the own specific situation of an organisation, involving creativity and innovation in applying the best practices from elsewhere. A perspective by Hauge (2001:3) was that the realities, opportunities and constraints facing any particular country will in many ways be unique. Efforts to strengthen M&E system functions must be tailored carefully according to the country circumstances, political, institutional, social and cultural, if they are to be successful.

In the context of this study, these assertions by authors mean that when a M&E system is utilised to support municipalities, it should be designed, for example, in a manner which recognises that municipalities have different capacities and varying social and economic contexts. Thus, the M&E system should be modified and adapted such that it is responding to the different Local, District and Metropolitan settings of municipalities.

### 3.12 CHALLENGES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

The Monitoring and Evaluation Systems - Approaches and Success Factors (available at: www.preval.org) indicate that understanding of M&E systems’ development and application as an administrative or compulsory function hampers its implementation. Ijeoma (2010:351) points to the fact that even through the GWM&ES was launched in 2007, currently there are still government Departments that are operating without a M&E system, thus making it difficult to determine whether they are able to perform or not. A procedure for implementing the programme was quite imperative in the sense that it should have provided guidelines on how the programme should be phased in.
Engela and Ajam (2010:20) are of the opinion that the strategy that was proposed for rolling out the system did not sufficiently take account of intergovernmental complexity, neither was there enough clarity about existing systems used for sectional and institutional monitoring. A review by the Office of the Public Service Commission and reporting requirements was not released until mid-2007. The delay meant that the central coordinating departments did not have a comprehensive view of the existing M&E practices across all spheres of government. The Third International Roundtable: Managing for Development Results (available at:www.oecd.org) identify one of the inherent challenges in the implementation of M&E systems as balancing attention with regard to the various levels of the results chain. These include inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, impact and their linkages. As outputs are easier to attribute to the activities performed, there is a tendency for management to focus on these aspects through performance monitoring, often leaving less resources for outcome monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment.

3.13 CONCLUSION

The primary aim of the chapter was to explore M&E systems and its implementation in South Africa. Following this objective, the chapter provided an overview of monitoring and evaluation in South Africa. It then discussed the Constitutional, Legislative and Regulatory Framework for monitoring and evaluation in South Africa. The chapter further explained the purpose of the GWM&ES, considered the steps in designing M&E systems, performance indicators as well as guiding principles for the implementation of M&E systems. Additionally, this chapter considered the implementation of a M&E system and highlighted the internal institutional arrangements for monitoring and evaluation. It also identified the key institutions in the South African monitoring and evaluation scene as well as their roles and responsibilities. Lastly, the chapter reflected on the best practices as well as challenges in the implementation of M&E systems.

From the discussion in the chapter, it can be seen that the implementation of M&E systems helps in assessing whether and how goals are being achieved over time. It
can further be realised that, when implemented properly, the M&E systems provide a continuous flow of information feedback into the system which may assist in guiding the South African Public Service towards achieving the desired results.

The next Chapter will focus on establishing a link between M&E system and intergovernmental support to municipalities. The utilisation of a M&E system should be aligned with the need to strengthen intergovernmental support to municipalities so as to improve service delivery and achieve the national development goals.
CHAPTER 4

MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL SUPPORT TO MUNICIPALITIES: A CONCEPTUAL AND PRACTICAL INTERFACE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The South African Government has adopted the principles of outcomes-based governance at the beginning of the current electoral cycle in 2009. This outcomes-based approach relates to achieving the results through the facilitation, monitoring and evaluation of the 12 outcomes identified by the Government in 2010. Each Ministry and department is responsible for a specific outcome through a performance agreement that became known as a Delivery Agreement. The approach has brought significant implications on the capacity of municipalities. As the new approach of governance emerges, a differentiated approach to national and provincial intervention for municipal support is also required. A criterion for targeted intergovernmental support to municipalities is necessary in ensuring the successful implementation of outcomes-based governance. In the above context, national and provincial governments should explore a mechanism aimed at strengthening the capacity of municipalities. The Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (GWM&ES) is such a critical mechanism to facilitate effective intergovernmental support to municipalities.

The purpose of this chapter is to explore how the GWM&ES is linked and serves as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. Establishing the link and showing how the M&E system serves as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities is critical in achieving the purpose of this chapter and study as a whole.

To realise the aforementioned aim, the chapter commences by conceptualising the concept of “outcomes-based governance”. The chapter then focuses on the developmental role of municipalities in South Africa. The evolution of economic
development policy in South Africa pre- and post-1994 is addressed, followed by the main paradigms associated with the concept of “development” in South Africa. Moreover, the chapter explains the M&E system as tool for development. The chapter further explores the relationship between the national planning and M&E system. Additionally, utilising the M&E system in the national planning process is considered. The chapter then focuses on the link between the M&E system and intergovernmental support to municipalities. To that end, the chapter discusses the utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities. The distinction between municipal performance management systems (PMS) and the GWM&ES as well as the use of the revised Balanced Scorecard (BSC) in municipalities are also explored. Before concluding by outlining the lessons for the M&E system utilisation to support municipalities, the attention of the chapter will further be focused on the national and provincial Departments responsible for monitoring and supporting municipalities.

4.2 CONCEPTUALISING AND CONTEXTUALISING OUTCOMES-BASED GOVERNANCE

Qiao and Thai (2002:90) showed that the phrase "reinventing government" entered the lexicon of government in the early 1990s and the ideas associated with it appears to have been extensively influential in the practices of government management at all levels. Heeks (2001:9) indicated that whilst the terminology and the examples were new, most of the concepts and processes were not since they drew on the longer tradition of public sector reform. The public sector reform is, if generally defined, change in the arrangements for the design and delivery of public services which seek to improve performance (Boyne et al. 2003:3). Hughes (1998:2) observed that a more positive perspective is that of Osborne and Gaebler in the United States of America deriving from their view that government needs to be "reinvented". Hughes (1998:3) further indicated that Reinventing Government was closely followed by the National Performance Review conducted by the former Vice-President Al Gore of the United States. This review was clearly influenced by Osborne and Gaebler (1992), in the
diagnosis of the problem as being too much bureaucracy, the solutions advanced and the language of reinvention used.

Young (1996:349) regarded the concept of reinventing government as containing an implicit theory about the nature and origin of change itself. Epstein (1993:360) pointed to the fact that the notion of reinventing government repeatedly stresses the importance of achieving leverage in solving problems and meeting public needs. Kettl (2000:15) elaborates further on this by indicating that reinventing government is a strategy to make government smarter, cheaper and more effective. It is creating a government that works better and costs less. Kellough (1998:8) postulated that reinvention is, quite frankly, a set of proposed reforms aimed at solving persistent challenges in government by promising that more can be done with less.

Minnaar and Bekker (2005:117) formulate a view that part of the drive towards reinventing government initiated in several countries and states around the world is the adoption of a comprehensive strategic and performance management framework. This approach requires outcomes-based control of the use of institutional resources in implementing and executing activities aimed at achieving the identified goals and objectives.

Molen et al. (2002:9) contextualised the outcomes-based approach as a new public management trend towards including outcomes-focused performance information and controls in the public management architecture. It involves asking how to ensure that government decision-making and government action take sufficient account of how those decisions and action impact on the nation. In a similar vein, Van der Waldt et al. (2004:19) point to the fact that a focus on outcomes denotes dissatisfaction with outputs for determining the effects of public policies, resource use and institutional behaviour. It signals a shift from institution centred to external effects in society. Minnaar and Bekker (2005:125) add that the key principle in the application of modern strategic management methodology is that it should enable organisational performance with such performance being measured in terms of the benefits produced for the client. Schalock (1995:5) also
asserted that the outcomes-based governance encompasses the central question of what a social programme ought to achieve for persons receiving them. It calls for demonstrating what is obtained from a social programme for the nation. Talbot (2005:39) concurs by indicating that the outcomes-based governance seeks to integrate public services and knowledge about them in several ways. These include emphasising results for users and producing useable knowledge about results for decision makers.

According to Matheson (2001:13), internationally, governments are embarking on outcomes-focused approaches to budgeting and management for the following variety of reasons:

- **Improving effectiveness and efficiency** - The hope is that the perspective of managers would change from being inwardly focused to being outwardly focused on public conditions, needs and problems. An aspect of this is a quest to increase public sector learning by feeding information about the performance of policies (outcomes) back into the policy-formulation process. It is believed that outcome-focused information can be used to ensure that Government and its officials are delivering services, benefits and products properly aligned to the public interest and with efficient use of resources.

- **Public awareness: transparency and accountability** - Another motive was to make government more transparent and government managers more accountable for the impact of their programmes. Managerial emphasis is thus shifted from the quantity of resources to the utilisation of resources. Governments purport to improve people's lives and national conditions (i.e. economic, social, environmental and safety).

- **Reallocation** - Resource allocation could be enhanced by matching programme costs with programme results, and by making comparative assessments of the relative worth of programmes in producing results. To support this purpose, the
budget could be structured around outcomes, rather than agencies, and outcome information could be integrated into the budgeting and reporting system.

- **Co-operation and coordination** - A fourth reason or motive was to bring about a cultural change supportive of cross-ministerial co-operation. Outcomes have the potential to provide coherent direction to related programmes across agencies where these programmes work towards common objectives, that is, minimise a silo or stovepipe approach to programme management.

The Improving Government Performance: Our Approach (available at www.thepresidency.gov.za) issued by the Presidency shows that the outcome orientation with a sectoral rather than institutional focus, coupled with strong monitoring and evaluation is a step in the right direction. It recommends in this respect that the departments and municipalities concentrate on monitoring outputs and immediate outcomes and use this as a platform for evaluation of outcomes and impacts.

As stated, the purpose of this Chapter is to explore how the M&E system is linked and serves as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. Section 153 of the Constitution stipulates that the local government must play a developmental role. The achievement of the national priorities such as decent work, food security and improved healthcare are also reflected at the local sphere of government. To this end, the section that follows will provide an overview of the developmental role of municipalities in South Africa.

### 4.3 AN OVERVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL ROLE OF MUNICIPALITIES IN SOUTH AFRICA

Mhone and Edigheji (2004:4) point to the fact that development, as it is generally accepted, has human, social, economic and environmental (natural) dimensions, all of which need to be promoted in a mutually sustainable manner. The Diagnostic Overview Report (2011:5) issued by the National Planning Commission (NPC) shows that
whereas South Africa is faced with developmental challenges of different dimensions, the high levels of poverty and equality remain the key factors constraining the country's development. The National Development Plan (2009:2) highlights in this respect that its strategic objectives over the next twenty (20) years are to eliminate poverty and sharply reduce inequality by 2030.

The Medium-Term Strategic Framework (2009:3) issued by the Presidency also indicates that the priority areas of the national government during the current electoral cycle include halving poverty and unemployment by 2014 and ensuring a more equitable distribution of the benefits of economic growth and reduce inequality. The Provincial Growth and Development Strategy Guidelines (2005:2) issued by the former Department of Provincial and Local Government shows that drawing on the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) and working within a development paradigm, the Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (PGDS) provides a collaborative framework to drive implementation at the level of provinces. Consistent with these national and provincial development initiatives, the Growth and Development Strategy (2011:20) issued by the Kwazulu-Natal Provincial Planning Commission shows, for example, that at local level the rise of unemployment and poverty has meant that the Province has to recalibrate its growth and development path. The objective is to shift towards job creation and share out the benefits of growth. The above discussion is depicted in Figure 4.1 below as follows:
The Figure 4.1 above illustrates South Africa's development framework at the national and provincial levels.

Swanepoel and De Beer (1997:43) defined development simply as the opposite of poverty. Chambers (1997: xiv) viewed development as "good change" in society. Human (2007:5) adopts a more explanatory approach when defining development as the process by which poverty is reduced, not only in monetary value, but also in terms of social inclusion and access to goods and services. Mhone and Edigheji (2004:4) indicated that development, as it is generally accepted, has economic, social, human and environmental dimensions, all of which need to be promoted in a mutually sustainable manner. Wessels and Pauw (2008:100) also concurred by stating that
development can be seen as constructive work aimed at improving human welfare. Fourie and Burger (2011:21) developed the following definition which will be used as the operational definition of this study: development can be understood as a decisive, comprehensive and integrated process that expands the range of choices that people have and improves their standards of living.

Steytler and De Visser (2007:28) simply argue that municipalities are the key site of development. Craythorne (2006:138) provided a clearer explanation by stating that municipalities are to participate in national and provincial development programmes. Development programmes refer to the broad range of programmes designed to improve the quality of life by improving the capacity of citizens to participate fully in social, economic and political activities at the local, provincial or national levels (Valadez & Bamberger, 2000:8). Ismail and Mphaisa (1997:10) also add that municipalities are provided with development duties in the sense that they are expected to participate in both national and provincial development programmes. Van der Waldt and Knipe (2002:133) also showed in a similar vein, that municipalities, given their closeness to the local community, are in an ideal position to cater for the developmental needs of the community. Van der Waldt et al. (2007: xi) agree with this view by stating that since local government is the level closest to the people, it would be an understatement in indicating that people's wishes, aspirations, needs and desires are important in municipal decision making.

De Visser (2005:72) articulates the argument that the White Paper on Local Government, 1998 translated the objects of sections 152 and 153 of the Constitution into the term "developmental local government".

The White Paper on Local Government, 1998 contextualised developmental local government as local government committed to working with citizens and groups within the community to find sustainable ways to meet their social, economic needs and improve the quality of their lives. Kotze and Taylor (2010:199) emphasise that the term "developmental local government" encapsulates a new mandate, which will be intrinsic
to the developmental role that municipalities are required to perform. The Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Skills Programme Learner Guide (2006:49) stated that the aim of the developmental role of local government is more about encouraging municipalities to find ways of executing their existing power and functions in a manner that maximises their impact on the social and economic lives of their communities. De Visser (2005:72) explains in this respect that the inclusion of a duty on municipalities to participate in national and provincial development programmes is based on the tenet that the experiences of people on the ground should inform development programmes not only at local but also at national and provincial levels. Coetzee et al. (2001:320) also indicated that the functions of post-apartheid local government were enhanced to include development functions over and above the traditional service delivery, regulation and control functions.

Nkuna (2011:627) remarks that the conceptualisation of developmental local government in South Africa must be regarded as a base of contextualisation of a unique form of a developmental state. Bagchi (2000:398) indicated that a developmental state is a state that puts economic development as the top priority of governmental policy and is able to resign effective instruments to promote such a goal. Venter and Landsberg (2011:180) articulate a similar argument that a significant body of literature on what constitutes a developmental state has focused on economic growth and development.

Wessels and Pauw (2008:113) remark that the overwhelming majority of governments, large development agencies and most theorists of development have viewed development as modernisation and growth of the economy. Mohr and Fourie (2008:521) indicate that economic growth is one of the components of economic development within the framework of the broader concept of development. Economic development refers to the improvement of living conditions and quality of life of the majority of the population as a result of economic growth (Mohr & Fourie, 2008:520). In the above context, it may be argued that any discussion of the concept "development" should be incomplete if it does not take into account economic development policy that spur economic growth. A policy is relatively stable, purposive course of action followed
by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern (Anderson, 2000:4). Against this background, attention will be focused in the section below on the evolution of economic development policy in South Africa pre- and post-1994.

4.4 THE EVOLUTION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY IN SOUTH AFRICA PRE- AND POST-1994

The historical course of economic development policy in South Africa will be discussed within the two timeframes as follows:

4.4.1 Economic Development Policy pre-1994

Loots (1996:28) explained that the first foundation for development policy in South Africa was laid in 1950 with the appointment of the Commission for Socio-economic Development for Bantu Areas in the Union of South Africa, also known as the Tomlinson Commission. The appointment of the Tomlinson Commission had a dual purpose: in the first place, it sought ideologically to justify the policy of separate development; and, secondly, it was intended to make proposals about the manner in which this policy could be attained. However, Loots (1996:51) further stated that up to and at the start of the 1980s, so-called development policy in South Africa consisted mainly of segregation measures which were given substance in the policies of separate development and industrial decentralisation. An economic growth pattern for development was thus advocated in which people and their development fulfilled a subordinate role.

Nattras (1994:517) indicated that since the unbanning of the African National Congress (ANC) in February 1990, attention has shifted from the analysis of past growth regimes to the construction of economic policy. Hentz (2000:212) showed in this respect that the National Party’s (NP) blueprint for post-apartheid South Africa was contained in "The Restructuring of the South African Economy: A Normative Model Approach, better known as the "Normative Economic Model" (NEM). It promoted a supply-side
monetarist approach to economic policy making. Habib and Padayachee (1999:248) also explained that in 1993, the ruling NP’s approach to development policy was codified in a document entitled "The Restructuring of the South African Economy: A Normative Model Approach (NEM)". The Central Economic Advisory Services (1993:1) stated that the NEM sets at its goal the structural adjustment of the market economy to achieve a 4.5% gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate and a 3% increase in employment by 1997. The GDP is the total value of all final goods and services produced within the boundaries of a country in a particular period which is usually one year (Mohr & Fourie, 2008:520).

Coetzee et al. (2001:226) noted that the ANC, as it prepared to assume power, set up the Macroeconomic Research Group (MERG) in 1991 to develop a new macroeconomic model for South Africa. Coetzee et al. (2001:226) continued to indicate that MERG was launched with the financial and technical support of the Canadian International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and its report appeared in 1993. Nattrass (1994:521) observed that the core of the MERG proposals is a two-stage plan to transform the economy. It consists of an "initial public-investment-led phase" between 1993 and 1999, and a "sustained growth phase" between 1999 and 2004. Padayachee (2005:554) also stated in this respect that MERG envisioned a two-phase, "crowding-in" approach to South Africa's development: a state-led social and physical infrastructural investment program as the growth driver in the first phase, followed by a sustainable growth phase that would see private sector investment kick in as growth picked up.

Habib and Padayachee (1999:245) concluded that the alternative growth strategy articulated in the MERG report essentially married the conflicting tensions in early debates around "growth through redistribution" through a development economic program comprising both supply- and demand-orientated reform.
4.4.2 Economic Development Policy post-1994

Wildenboer (2008:16) refers to the fact that the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) was the first comprehensive policy document relating to economic issues published by the new government. Aron et al. (2009:6) also confirm this by stating that the initial economic policy view of the South African government under democracy was contained in the RDP White Paper of 1994. The bulk of the macroeconomic proposals in the RDP White Paper of 1994 was focused on stabilisation policies, with the assumption that higher levels of investment would be encouraged by the commitment to macroeconomic stability, thereby promoting growth. Venter and Landsberg (2011:217) maintain that the RDP dealt with expectations that people had of government regarding the way in which wealth should be distributed. Padayachee (2006:111) explains that the RDP document advocated prudent fiscal policy. The underlying assumption in the RDP was that the government would either borrow or divest spending away from defence and inefficient demand so that investment would follow and employment would rise.

Fitzgerald et al. (1997:49) indicated that a new policy guideline, Growth, Employment and Redistribution: a Macroeconomic Strategy (GEAR) issued by the Department of Finance, appeared in mid-1996 and emphasises a vision for the twenty first century. Liebenberg and Stewart (1997:9) also added that from the middle of 1996 there has been extensive government coverage of the new economic strategy which has come to be known as GEAR. Coetzee et al. (2001:214) observed that according to this macroeconomic policy, the government should exert discipline by cutting back on its deficit and privatise more state enterprises more rapidly. Furthermore, the government should continue to integrate the South African economy into the global economy by further cutting back on trade barriers and removing the remaining controls on foreign exchange movement. Muiu (2008:158) shows that GEAR was introduced to address structural weaknesses in the economy that inhibited growth by increasing investment, labour demand, job creation and by carrying out a structural transformation. It also focused particularly on increasing social spending, fiscal reform and relaxation of
exchange rate. Padayachee (2006:113) concluded that the positive achievement of the GEAR strategy was that macroeconomic stability, as conventionally defined, has been achieved.

Aron et al. (2009:22) articulate the argument that in 1998 the Government was concerned that the nature of growth was unbalanced. The benefits of growth were not widely spread with a third of the population not benefiting directly from economic growth. Moreover, the Government had adopted the ruling ANC's 2004 manifesto with core objectives to halve poverty and unemployment by 2014. This prompted the Government's Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa (AsgiSA) plan.

The AsgiSA is a government's economic policy programme, issued by the Presidency, which was formally adopted in 2006. Venter and Landsberg (2011:217) explain that AsgiSA was a means of addressing the continuing constraints preventing South Africa from achieving its desired growth rate of higher than 5 per cent per annum. The constraints were, among others, the volatility of the South African currency, a shortage of suitably skilled labour and deficiencies in state organisations. Mears (2006:199) asserted that AsgiSA is not intended to cover all elements of a comprehensive development plan. Instead, it consists of a limited set of interventions to complement GEAR. Wildenboer (2008:26) also argues that AsgiSA does not depart from the overall objective of the RDP and GEAR strategies, which is to significantly reduce poverty and unemployment.

On 23 November 2010 the Minister of Economic Development outlined the New Growth Path Framework for South Africa. According to the New Growth Path Framework (available at www.policy.co.za) the new growth path is a strategic framework that lays out a dynamic vision for how South Africa can collectively achieve a more developed, democratic, cohesive and equitable economy and society over the medium term in the context of sustained growth. The Strategic framework sets out critical markers for employment creation and growth. It further identifies where viable changes in the structure and character of production can generate a more inclusive and greener
economy over the medium to long term. The National Development Plan (2011:10) issued by the National Planning Commission reveals that the New Growth Path aims to create 5 million new jobs by 2020. It seeks to do so by providing a supporting environment for growth and development, while promoting a more labour-absorptive economy.

In tracing the historical course of development policy in South Africa, it is clear that the country has explored numerous initiatives on economic development policy. The objective is to spur economic growth so as to achieve development. Development may not be achieved in a stagnating economy characterised by unemployment and poverty.

Venter and Landsberg (2011:217) make a key observation that, to some extent, these programmes represented a "mixed" economy - elements of free enterprise combined with state intervention in the economy. Peet (2002:62) also noted that in the last quarter of the twentieth century, in a widening sphere of societies, economic growth and development policies came to be formed by the same neo-liberal principles. Coetzee and Graaf (1996:227) further articulated an argument that development is a capitalist project and almost everything that happens within capitalist societies is linked to the global capitalist process. In the light of these remarks by the authors, it is key to clarify some of the main paradigms associated with the concept "development" in South Africa.

### 4.5 THE MAIN PARADIGMS ASSOCIATED WITH "DEVELOPMENT" IN SOUTH AFRICA

A Dictionary of Philosophy (1984:261) contextualises a paradigm as the accepted framework within which a given group of scientists normally work. The main paradigms associated with "development" in South Africa include, but are not limited to the following:
4.5.1 Capitalism

Leatt et al. (1986:6) remarked that the emergence of capitalism has to be understood within the context of the cultural development of western Europe from the eighteenth to the twentieth century. During this period, it came to be believed that each individual had the right and obligation to develop their own potential and the state should not interfere. The state was to be responsible only for order and security. Parekh (1975:4) also indicated that since individuals were considered national and responsible adults, the government did not have the right to interfere with their actions except to the extent necessary to maintain peace and order.

Leatt et al. (1986:8) formulated a view that a Laissez-faire capitalism was given its classical formulation in Adam Smith’s seminal work, The Wealth of Nations (1776). Laissez-faire is a policy in which the government should have no economic policy at all (Baradat, 2012:88). The state, argued Smith, should maintain order in society but keep its hands off the economy. Dowd (2004:30) also confirms that Smith’s The Wealth of Nations is regularly cited as a support for free marketry that now rules economics.

Bjork (1969:1) simply viewed capitalism as a term used to describe a system of economic and political arrangements. Myambo (2011:82) adds that capitalism is an economic system characterised by private, as opposed to government-controlled enterprise. Cudd and Holmstrom (2011:6) concur with this view and indicate that capitalism is an economic system whose core defining feature is private ownership of the means of production, that is, of capital inputs to production. This is consistent with the observation of Lacher (1999:316) that capitalism is a form of organisation of the economy. In capitalism, the institutionalised economic process becomes constituted as separate from other social relations through the commodification of land, labour and money. Leatt et al. (1986:3) stated that as an ideology, capitalism upholds private ownership of the means of production and the necessity of material incentives for maximum output. It further upholds the free enterprise, free competition on the basis of the market mechanism, sovereignty of the consumer and a minimum state intervention.
Leatt et al. (1986:15) argued that the economic growth of modern South Africa has taken place within a capitalist framework. Wessels and Pauw (2008:103) add that the South African economic context is that of global capitalism which has very different effects on different places. Peet (2002:66) adopted a more explanatory approach and indicated that the history of modern South Africa has been ably recounted in terms of the economic-discursive transition. In the late 19th century transition to industrial capitalism and discourses of innate racial differences were employed to limit the political enfranchisement of the black petty bourgeoisie and regulate the supply of African labour to the rapidly growing mining industry. Edigheji (2007:77) agrees with this assertion that in South African terms, the mode of development of the capitalist economy was based on the inclusion and exclusion of Africans as a source of cheap labour especially for mining. South Africa has a capitalist economy that was constructed to meet the needs of a minority, and Africans were included as a source of cheap labour. Arrighi et al. (2010:412) also added that South Africa has also served as a prism-in part, perhaps, because the extreme character of apartheid lays bare the underlying dynamic or racial capitalism and significant in this respect were the cheap labour. Buttler et al. (1987:204) summed the scenario and explained that the capitalist economic growth in South Africa has been "development" and not "underdevelopment". It has laid the material basis for a large-scale modern state. Within that political framework, despite a widespread assumption to the contrary, the modern South African capitalist economy has created rising average per capita incomes for black citizens.

On 2 May 2012, the South African Communist Party (SACP) released a statement indicating the organisation's main criticism against capitalism. According to the statement (available at www.sacp.org.za) the global capitalist economic crisis is impacting upon and reinforcing the key socio-economic challenges of poverty and inequality faced in South Africa. All of these features of the South African society are deeply related to the way in which the country was incorporated into the global capitalist economy with the mining revolution in the late 19th century. Over a hundred years of
skewed development has left South Africa with a hugely challenging and deeply embedded legacy.

4.5.2 Socialism

Parekh (1975:3) indicated that socialism began as a revolt against capitalism and its conception of man and society was initially developed as an alternative to the one which in the socialist view underlay and reinforced capitalist society. Williams (1998:81) added that Karl Marx, with his *Communist Manifesto* (1848) and *Capital* (1867) became the central figure of socialism, Marx saw an inevitable historical process leading from capitalism through socialism. Heywood (2007:53) remarked in a similar vein that the goal of socialism was to abolish a capitalist economy based on market exchange, and replaces it with a qualitatively different socialist society, usually to be constructed on the principle of common ownership. Wahl (2007:1) also explained that the strong exploitation of workers in the relatively unregulated *laissez-faire* capitalism of the 19th and first half of the 20th century spurred social confrontations. As a result, a big part of the labour movement turned politically to socialism as a means to end capital exploitation. Haddock (2009:212) agrees with this view by elaborating that what transformed socialism into a deadly threat to the liberal order was the supposition that meaningful change could not be achieved within the confines of a capitalist system. Consistent with this statement Baradat (2012:160) observed that socialism arose as a protest against the inhumanity of unregulated, raw capitalism.

Gorz (1994:30) viewed socialism as the positive response to the disintegration of social bonds ensuring from the commodity and competitive relations characteristic of capitalism. Heywood (2007:53) argues that the goal of socialism was to abolish a capitalist economy based on market exchange and replaces it with a qualitatively different socialist society, usually to be constructed on the principle of common ownership. Leatt et al. (1986:194) defined socialism as a political and economic theory according to which the means of production, distribution and exchange should be owned and controlled by the people. Everyone should be given equal opportunity to
develop their talents and the wealth of the community should be fairly distributed. Baradat (2012:160) adopts a more descriptive approach by arguing that socialism is founded on three principles: public ownership of production, the welfare state and improving the human condition by eliminating poverty. Feinstein (1969:165) explained that socialism's task is to end the special power of capitalists and open the road towards a classless society. This would also mean the end of an anarchic production for profit, the freeing of productive possibilities which could be used fully for the benefit of all mankind.

Vincent (2010:89) warned that there is no such single thing as socialism. There are, rather, socialisms which often overlap with other ideologies. In South Africa, the South African Communist Party (SACP) released a programme entitled the "South African Road to Socialism" (SARS). However, the emphasis of the SARS programme is that the road to the goal of socialism in South Africa is a radical national democratic revolution. Sachs (2007:49) shows that, aside from its rhetorical preface about transition to a classless society, the vision of socialism proposed by SARS is not significantly different from the principles underpinning the programme of most European social democratic parties.

Peet (2002:68) observed that in South Africa the Freedom Charter embraced European socialist policies in a radical economic statement about development, social control over resources and human liberation. Peet (2002:67) continued to state that the Freedom Charter is a document written by intellectuals working on behalf of oppressed peoples in South Africa. It was adopted on 26 June 1955 and became strategically important as a statement of radical opposition to the former South African apartheid government. Leatt et al. (1986:149) also indicated that the Freedom Charter advocates government by the people and a basic redistribution of land and wealth. Section 4 and 5 of the Freedom Charter, dealing with economic rights and land reform, provide for social transformation. Venter and Landsberg (2011:16) indicate that the South African government’s public spending policy is moderately socialist, which is hardly surprising, given that its power base is the impoverished and jobless Africans in the society. Leatt (1986:151) argued
further that in general, African States have chosen socialism as the most effective and rapid way to development. The choice of socialism has, besides economic motives, moral implications as well. African leaders react against the individualism, profit-seeking and ruthless competition of the free market as foreign to the basic values of African communalism. Leatt et al. (1986:149) continued to point out that many believed that, given the basic economic and political injustices of the system, socialism was the only morally acceptable alternative framework within which a just solution for all South Africans could be found. Van Aardt (1994:11) cautioned that the likelihood of full-scale socialism being adopted as the societal ideology in South Africa appears to be limited, particularly in light of the failure of socialist governments in Asia and Africa.

A perspective by Van Niekerk et al. (2002:27) was that the ultimate goal of the social nature of socialism is the creation of the welfare state. A welfare state is a state that takes primary responsibility for the social welfare of its citizens, discharged through a range of social security, health, education and other services, albeit different in different societies (Heywood, 2007:104).

Seekings (2006:2) points to the fact that by the late 1930’s, South Africa had created a basis of a remarkable welfare state. This means that the Government developed policies to provide services in the vital areas of social security, care, protection and sustainable livelihoods. The Annual Report (2011:7) issued by the national Department of Social Development shows, for example, that during the 2010 / 2011 financial year, 14,7 million people were receiving monthly social grants from the Government. Burger (2007:24) indicates that these grants help to prevent income distribution to deteriorate further, though a significant and sustainable decrease in the “skewness” of income distribution ultimately depends on employment creation.

### 4.5.3 Neo-liberalism

Coetzee et al. (2001:215) contextualised neo-liberalism as adherence to free-market principles. That means, *inter alia*, minimal government intervention in the economy,
privatisation of state enterprises, a balanced budget and interest rates. Heywood (2007:52) explains that the principal neo-liberal goal is to "roll back the frontiers of the state" in the belief that unregulated market capitalism will deliver efficiency, growth and widespread prosperity. Luccisano (2004:41) indicates that the neo-liberal model of social development is premised on the assumption that overall general well-being will be achieved by decreasing the role of the state and increasing the role of privatisation as a replacement for state services and responsibilities. Kilby (2008:350) argues that the main focus of government in a neo-liberal framework would be on national security and macro-economic management, part of which is freeing up labour markets and free movement of labour, but this is rarely mentioned in the neo-liberal debates.

The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (2009(b):19) shows that liberalism in its modern sense implies aspects such as individual rights, freedom of thought, restraints on power (especially of government), the rule of law and a transparent system of government to name but a few of the liberalist ideals. Chapter 2 of the Constitution contains the Bill of Rights that governs the relationship between the State and the individual. The South African Bill of Rights is founded on democratic values that endorse human dignity, equality and freedom vividly enshrined in section 7(1) thereof. Lester et al. (2000:145) stated that it is difficult to imagine that the South African state could have pursued an alternate course of action other than moving to a neo-liberal policy position given the neo-liberal discursive prescriptions of the global economic powers. Venter and Landsberg (2011:16) agree with this statement by expressing an opinion that since it came to power in 1994, the ruling African National Congress (ANC), has been heavily influenced by neoliberal economic ideas. This is consistent with the observation of Hentz (2000:204) that the ANC seemingly fully embraced neo-liberal orthodoxy after coming to power in 1994 and this would naturally include continuing the privatisation process begun by the National Party (NP).

From the above, it can be argued that the concept "development" in South Africa is currently associated with different paradigms. That is, development in South Africa is inherently underpinned by elements of capitalist, socialist and neo-liberalist thinking and
tendencies. Furthermore, it may be argued that the above body of opinions shows that politics and development are inextricably linked in modern society.

As stated earlier, the national and provincial governments are expected, in terms of the new outcomes-based approach, to explore innovative mechanisms to achieve development. The M&E system should be such a mechanism to achieve development. The following section therefore explores the M&E system as a tool for development.

4.6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM: A TOOL FOR DEVELOPMENT

Sartorius (2009:2) states that M&E systems are widely recognised for their potential to improve the performance of development and poverty alleviation programs. Seasons (2003:437) shows that a monitoring and evaluation system improves the effectiveness of development programs or policies by indicating issues that need to be addressed in program / policy design, processes, direction and products. Valadez and Bamberger (2000:7) elaborated that when properly applied, the information produced by a M&E system, facilitates development in at least three ways. Firstly, it improves the method of indentifying and selecting programmes and projects by ensuring that these endeavours are consistent with national development objectives. Secondly, it measures whether programmes and projects that are under way, are achieving their intended economic and social objectives as well as contributing to sectoral and national development objectives. Thirdly, it assesses the impact of projects on wider developmental objectives such as protecting the environment and managing natural resources as well as giving women full economic, social and political participation in all aspects of development.

Seasons (2003:430) laments the fact that planners need an improved sense of outcomes and impacts of their development interventions in communities. These could be provided by regular and consistent use of monitoring and evaluation processes. Yet, the exigencies of planning practice are such that monitoring and evaluation are often the forgotten stages in the planning process. This is consistent with the observation of De Coninck et al. (2008:201) that an increasing need is felt among the development
agencies to use well-defined M&E systems and incorporate them in their planning cycles. Khalifa (2011:56) articulates a similar argument that very few authors have tackled the issue of how to monitor activities and evaluate the quality of deliverables through the process of planning.

Given these observations by the authors, it is key to explore the relationship between the GWM&ES and national planning process as well as the utilisation of M&E system in the planning process. However, a preceding discussion on the national planning process in South Africa is necessary so as to deepen the understanding on how such GWM&ES and national planning process as well as the utilisation of M&E system in the planning process are interdependent and linked with each other.

4.7 THE NATIONAL PLANNING PROCESS IN SOUTH AFRICA

Hale (2004:2) simply defines planning as a process for setting goals or objectives. Alves and Curtin (1984:1) provided a more explanatory definition by stating that planning is charting the course of an organisation - how it will move from its current state towards a future condition. Griffin (1993:8) also indicated in a similar vein that planning means setting an organisation's goals and deciding how best to achieve them. Vermeulen (2008:22) agrees with this view and adds that planning is a process in which the future conduct is envisaged and established in the form of objectives that must be reached. Russel and Russel (2005:9) drew the conclusion that planning is focused on the analytical process of translating strategy into action. It involves analysing information, defining specific operational goals, and then breaking down each of these complex goals into a series of steps and actions.

Minnaar (2010:35) makes a key observation that there are three concepts central to performance planning that do not stand alone, but are rather sub-elements of a broader integrated process flow. They include planning and strategic planning. Minnaar (2010:35) explains the distinction between planning and strategic planning by stating that planning entails the formulation of goals within a specific environment context, while
strategic planning entails positioning an institution in relation to its environment by utilising planning applications. Van der Waldt and Knipe (2002:6) also remarked in a similar vein that planning assumes that the future is simply a continuation of the past whereas strategic planning takes into consideration the changing nature of the environment and continually adapts accordingly. In this chapter, the focus will be to explore the interface between the M&E system and national planning process within a specific municipal context.

In South Africa, the Government's national planning process can be explained through the following planning cycles:

### 4.7.1 Short-term (annual) planning cycle

According to the Green Paper: National Strategic Planning (2009:19) the current annual planning cycle is as follows:

The basic five-year Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) is adopted at the beginning of the new electoral cycle. The annual update of the framework is adopted by Cabinet at the July Cabinet Lekgotla and circulated to the national government Departments and Provinces. In December, the integration of detailed programmes for the following year commences. The programmes are then adopted at the January Cabinet Lekgotla and articulated at the President's State of the Nation Address in February. The product is the Programme of Action which outlines the government's priorities for the year.

Kahn et al. (2011:74) show that at national level the sectoral departments which are clustered into five (5) clusters within the Forum for South African Directors-General (FOSAD), give effect to the Government Programme of Action (GPoA). The sectoral departments are clustered around the following broad subject areas, namely, International relations, Governance and administration, Social development, Economic Growth and employment creation and Justice, crime prevention, peace and security.
The role of Premiers' Offices in Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation: A Good Practice Guide (2008:13) reflects that the Premiers' offices also oversee provincial Programmes of Action with cluster targets. The Premiers' offices further ensure alignment of provincial departmental plans with the annual State of the Province Address (SOPA) by the Premier. The provincial government departments develop and facilitate operational plans and the work of these departments is coordinated mainly through the provincial cabinet clusters. The GPoA is informed by the Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) and the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), deliberations of the January Cabinet Lekgotla (strategic planning session) and the State of the Nation Address (SONA). It can be deduced that the GPoA is the annual "business" plan indicating how the national Government intend to meet the short-term development objectives of the country. Boyle (1989:37) indicated that the annual business plan contains the targets to be achieved during the course of the coming year. These targets form the basis for performance monitoring allowing actual events to be compared with those planned.

4.7.2 Medium-term planning cycle

Boyle (1989:36) stated that a medium-term plan usually covers a three- to five-year period and is mainly notable for its brevity. The Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans (2010:4), issued by the National Treasury, shows that since 2004, the Government's programmes and policies have been set out at the beginning of each term of office in a Medium-Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) approved by Cabinet and published by the Presidency. The Green Paper: National Strategic Planning (2009:19) issued by the Presidency shows that the MTSF is a framework that identifies priority development programmes for five-year term of office of Government. The State of Local Government Assessment Report (2009:36) also indicates that currently the MTSF guides government's programmes over the medium term.

The Medium Term Strategic Framework (2009:1) issued by the National Planning Commission indicates that the national and provincial Departments develop their five-
year strategic plans and budget requirements taking into account the medium-term requirements. The Role of Premiers' Offices in Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation: A Good Practice Guide (2008:40) laments the fact that many of the Offices of the Premier have focused virtually on provincial departments' contribution to the realisation of provincial growth and development plans and other provincial and national plans. The MTSF (2009:1) issued by the National Planning Commission warns that municipalities are also expected to adapt their Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) in line with the MTSF.

In the case of local government, the IDP is the management and planning instrument to achieve development goals and objectives of municipalities (Theron, 2007:80). The National Evaluation Policy Framework (2011:5) also states that if Government's strategic priorities are to be achieved, these priorities should also be traceable across the levels of government through the different plans such as the departments' five-year strategic plans and municipal IDPs. The Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans (2010:7) also emphasises that a strategic plan should take into account the MTSF, PGDS, IDPs of municipalities, Performance Agreements between the President and Ministers and Service Delivery Agreements entered into in terms of the broad strategic outcomes and any other relevant long-term government plans.

The Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (2011:123), issued by the Kwazulu-Natal Provincial Planning Commission, shows in this respect that provincially, the Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (PGDS) is meant to be a reference point for planning and collaboration between the Province and municipalities. It further indicates that the key instrument for ensuring more practical alignment at implementation level is the local municipality's IDP. The Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (2011:123) issued by the Kwazulu-Natal Provincial Planning Commission continues to show that the objective indicators in this regard include the level of alignment and collaboration between the National and Provincial Planning Commissions as well as the alignment of the district municipalities' IDPs with the IDPs of their local municipalities. The Role of Premiers' Offices in Government-wide
Monitoring and Evaluation: A Good Practice Guide (2008:13) issued by the Presidency indicates that the purpose is to ensure that the IDPs feed into provincial planning processes and that the PGDS also influence the IDPs.

4.7.3 Long-term planning cycle

Van der Waldt et al. (2007:96) point to the fact that the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) was the first attempt post 1994 to introduce a new planning discourse in South Africa. Fitzgerald et al. (1997:43) argued that the RDP vision reflected a social democratic, basic agenda which was strong on vision, but weak on mechanisms. In essence, rapid delivery of the RDP vision was extremely difficult to achieve as it required policy and institutional commitment to a more co-ordinated and cooperative approach.

Liebenberg and Stewart (1997:15) also indicated that whereas GEAR replaced the RDP, the document displays confidence in the government's achievement of the RDP-related goals. All government references to the GEAR explained it as a long-term strategy to achieve the aims of the RDP. The Department of Finance (1996:1) strongly confirmed this view by stating that GEAR professed a commitment to and continuity with the RDP.

The Diagnostic Report (2011:1) issued by the National Planning Commission indicates that the President of the Republic of South Africa appointed the National Planning Commission (NPC) in April 2010. The Green Paper: National Planning Commission (2009:2) views the establishment of the NPC as the embodiment of government's efforts to improve long-term planning and rally the nation around a common set of objectives.

On 11 November 2011 the NPC introduced the National Development Plan - Vision for 2030. It articulates the national growth development aspirations and goals over the long-term, providing focus and direction to national endeavours. The National Development Plan sets out how Vision 2030, which is aiming at eliminating poverty and
sharply reducing inequality, can be achieved. It further indicates in this respect that all the elements of the plan must demonstrate their effect on these two goals. The Vision 2030, building on the approach of the New Growth Path, proposes to create 11 million jobs by 2030. It proposes to create jobs through numerous initiatives which include promoting employment in labour-absorbing industries as well as raising exports and competitiveness.

Sebahara (2004:5) emphasises that when designing measures in support of local government it is important to link with national authorities and take full account of the national plan. Such an embedded approach has at least three advantages:

- It makes it easier for deconcentrated state agencies to provide technical support to local authorities.
- It encourages synergy between local authority development policies and sector-wide policies formulated and implemented by central government.
- It encourages local and national authorities to capitalise on and share relevant experiences.

It can be deduced from the discussion above that the purpose of the planning cycles is to facilitate the developmental agenda of the Government. It can further be seen that the development of the long-term national plan does not remove the need for the national and provincial departments as well as municipalities to continue with their respective planning. However, their sector planning must take into account the broader national long-term plan and define what role they would play in achieving the specified outcomes. It is through short- and medium-term planning that the objectives of long-term planning are achieved.

Having outlined the national planning process in South Africa, the next section will explore the relationship between the national planning and M&E system. Exploring the relationship between the national planning and M&E system is necessary as these
functions should be linked so as to ensure complementaries, implementation and measurement of the same objectives across government.

4.8 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM AND NATIONAL PLANNING

Khalifa (2012:60) points to the fact that ensuring the successful enabling local development and high probability of implementation during planning is the core focus of the M&E process. The Green Paper: National Strategic Planning (2009:29) issued by the National Planning Commission adds that the planning and monitoring and evaluation functions interact at two levels. Firstly, the monitoring and evaluation function is involved in finalising planning instruments such as the MTSF and Government Annual Programme of Action. Secondly, the processes and results of monitoring and evaluation are critical to planning and may result in modified sequencing of programmes. If the challenges are systematic or successes extraordinary, the products of monitoring and evaluation could even lead to the adjustment of medium and long-term plans. Thus, there is a feedback loop between monitoring and evaluation, and planning. There needs to be a systematic and ongoing relationship between the planning system and M&E system. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:17) also indicates in this respect that the monitoring and evaluation reports must be synchronised with the overall planning cycle and reporting of Government. Monitoring and evaluation reports should constitute inputs to the planning cycle, on the basis of which adjustments are made to the priorities, programmes and budgets of government across all three spheres as they impact on service delivery.

It is evident from the literature that there is significant correlation between the M&E system and national planning processes. Therefore, the interface between the M&E system and national planning should be managed to much greater advantage. That is, the performance information generated from the M&E system should be the driving force of decisions and actions in the national planning processes. Consistent with the
discussation thus far, in the following section focus will be placed on utilising the M&E system in the national planning process. The positive relationship between the M&E system and national planning should be exploited so as to achieve development.

4.9 UTILISING THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM IN THE NATIONAL PLANNING PROCESS

Minnaar (2010:74) indicates that an executing institution must formulate strategies as a response to the requirements of its policy mandate and associated demands from its external management environment. It formulates goals for inclusion in its strategic plan which guides and drives the identification of objectives and activities. Minnaar, (2010:74) further states that these goals, objectives and activities are then linked to performance indicators and targets, and included in a performance plan. Thus, the executing institution has a framework for managing and measuring actual performance. This framework is a structure for the M&E system. Artley and Stroh (2011:11) also maintained that performance M&E system is effective when the organisation’s strategy and performance indicators are in alignment.

If the performance indicators provide progress towards pre-established targets, the need is only to compare the measured data with the desired targets to know if actions are needed. The performance indicators may address the type or level of programme activities conducted (process), direct products and services delivered (outputs) and / or results of those products and service. A programme may be any activity, project, function or policy that has an identifiable purpose or set of objectives. Artley and Stroh (2001:11) further indicated that in order to identify effective corrective actions to improve products and services, results of all key processes must be measured. In this way, specific processes that need to change can be identified when progress is not satisfactory.

The key issue emanating from the discussion above is that when performance indicators are aligned with the targets, performance information that is generated should
feed into the performance review and update efforts. The performance information from the M&E system should be used to help understand why policies and implementation approaches work, or more importantly, not work so as to address them. The data and insights from monitoring and evaluation should loop back into the planning process.

The next section considers the connection between M&E system and intergovernmental support to municipalities. To show the link between M&E system and intergovernmental support to municipalities is critical in achieving the purpose of this chapter and study as a whole.

4.10 THE LINK BETWEEN MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL SUPPORT TO MUNICIPALITIES

The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:13) indicates that the performance data generated from the M&E system informs the coordination of support to municipalities in enabling them to perform their functions. This means that the performance information flowing from the M&E system should guide the provision of technical support to municipalities. The performance information indicates, for example, whether a particular municipality needs either the skills or financial support. In this way, the potential challenges in the main function areas such as finance, human resource, infrastructure, local economic development and governance in municipalities are detected and corrected timeously. The purpose is to enable the Government to pre-empt the collapse in service delivery within the municipalities while ensuring the achievement of wider developmental objectives. It is also to provide the national and provincial governments with accurate and timely information about the progress that municipalities made with achieving Government's key performance aims.

It can be deduced that the main objective of the M&E system is never to produce large volumes of performance information from municipalities per se, rather to achieve the intensive utilisation of such information to support municipalities to perform their core
service delivery functions. Given that the link between the M&E system and intergovernmental support to municipalities has been established, the discussion that follows will focus on the actual utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities.

4.11 UTILISATION OF THE M&E SYSTEM TO SUPPORT MUNICIPALITIES: PRACTICAL APPLICATION

As a result of the State of Local Government Report informed by municipal assessments, on 2 December 2009, the national Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) facilitated the approval of a comprehensive Local Government Turnaround Strategy (LGTAS) by the Government. The key interventions of the LGTAS, that are a result of poor service delivery in most municipalities over the period of five years preceding 2009, include effective national and provincial support to municipalities. Gqobana (2010:2) indicates in this respect that the multiple support programmes being implemented to build the capacity of local government have not brought about the desired change at local government sphere. The support programmes have in the past usually reflected developing generic interventions and then cascaded them to all municipalities. The LGTAS emphasises tailor-made municipality support. Therefore, the LGTAS is a shift away from the one size fits all approach to local government support, towards a differentiated approach to supporting municipalities. The implementation of the LGTAS is premised upon the methodology that there must be a differentiated and targeted support for municipalities. The purpose is to build the capacity of municipalities in the key focus areas such as human resource, finance, infrastructure, local economic development and governance and thus turn them into development hubs. The complicated social, economic and environmental issues are identified, analysed and addressed at the municipal government level.

The Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (2007:19) indicates in this respect that the former Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) is responsible for developing and implementing an integrated M&E system to support municipalities. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support
of Cooperative Governance (2010:11) further outlines a process which the national and provincial Departments of Cooperative Governance should embark upon to utilise the M&E system to support municipalities. It further indicates in this respect that the former national Department of GOGTA has developed a set of general key performance indicators that address the reporting requirements for the municipalities at national level. Performance indicators provide the basis for assessment of progress towards the achievement of stated goals and objectives (Seasons, 2003:430). The national Department has also developed an integrated reporting template against which reporting on indicators by municipalities is done. The reporting by the national Department of Cooperative Governance focuses on the various programmes within the Department which include LGTAS.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:13) further indicates that a limited number of performance indicators will be selected from the whole set of general key performance indicators for the Early Warning System. The system is meant to enable the identification of where interventions are required as early as possible to pre-empt the collapse in service delivery within municipalities. The Framework (2010) further states that the steps to be taken to develop the Early Warning System are the following:

- the identification of the critical key performance indicators to be monitored and evaluated;
- the identification of information sources and information that are readily available;
- decide on the critical performance data to record; and
- assign weights to the data, including the levels of acceptability (tolerance) for the different key performance indicators.

Based on the agreed weighting and tolerance level, a score will be calculated for each municipality. This is the information which will inform the coordination of support by the national and provincial government. This will help ensure that interventions do not only happen where there is a complete collapse in service delivery, but issues are identified
through regular monitoring and support is brought in timeously. Therefore, a good database is essential for developing an early warning system.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:14) states that the line function national and provincial Departments will still need to continue to monitor their programmes as required by their mandates. Similarly, the municipalities may still develop their own set of indicators which help measure the programmes or projects which are unique to their situation. Figure 4.1 below illustrates this process of monitoring and reporting requirement process by the three spheres of government.
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**Figure 4.2 Monitoring and Reporting requirements for the three spheres of government**


In Figure 4.2 above, the triangle represents the national Departments' indicators, the diamonds represent provincial Departments indicators, the ovals represent District municipalities indicators, and a rectangle represents Local municipalities indicators. The District Programme of Action (DPoA), Provincial Programme of Action (PPoA) and Government Programme of Action (GPoA) should as far as possible be synchronised in
all spheres of government towards ensuring the achievement of wider developmental objectives. The performance reports generated from the GWM&E system should assist the Government in directing support to where it is most needed and will best accomplish service delivery priorities. The M&E system should also ensure that a single window of coordination for the support in municipalities is created.

The Performance Management Guide for Municipalities (2001:25) issued by the former Department of Provincial and Local Government stated that performance monitoring and evaluation is an ongoing process that runs parallel to the implementation of the municipal IDP. Section 41 of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 (as amended by Act 7 of 2011) also stipulates that a municipality must in terms of its performance management system (PMS) set appropriate key performance indicators as a yardstick for measuring performance with regard to the municipality's development priorities and objectives set out in its IDP. In the light of the above stipulations, it is key to clarify the distinction between municipal PMS and GWM&E system.

4.12 THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND GOVERNMENT-WIDE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM

The Performance Management Framework (2012:08) issued by Umdoni Municipality shows that PMS is an implementation tool of the municipality’s IDP. Van der Waldt et al. (2007:124) state that a PMS should be the primary mechanism to plan for performance management, and monitor, review and improve the implementation of a municipality’s IDP. Kraukamp (2007:21) confirms this and points out that one mechanism to ensure the establishment of a PMS at local government sphere may be found in the legal obligation of municipalities in South Africa to prepare and implement IDPs. The Performance Management Framework for Mtubatuba Local Municipality (www.dplg.gov.za: online) also indicates that the overall strategic objective of the PMS is to improve the performance of municipalities, using tools such as monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. It is also developing early warning signs for any internal or
external threats, financial viability, the capacity of the municipality to fulfil its constitutional and developmental mandates and for meaningful and timely intervention. Fourie and Opperman (2011:322) add that a municipality’s PMS entails a framework that describes and represents how a municipality’s cycle and processes of performance planning, monitoring, measurement, review, reporting and improvement will be conducted, organised and managed, including the roles and responsibilities of the different role-players.

Kusek and Rist (2004:xi) state that the M&E system is a powerful public management tool that can be used to improve the way governments and organisations achieve results. Görgens and Kusek (2009:149) indicate that the purpose of the M&E system is to measure the achievement of the objectives of a programme, be it a country’s educational goals or the programme of a specific organisation. Valadez and Bamberger (2000:7) showed that, when properly applied, the M&E system measures whether projects and programmes, that are under way, are achieving their intended economic and social objectives, as well as contributing to sectoral and national development objectives. Ijeoma (2010:351) argues that the GWM&ES was introduced in South Africa to establish a uniform system of monitoring and evaluation across all spheres of government. The GWM&ES is an overarching system that aims to provide an integrated encompassing framework for monitoring and evaluation principles, practices and standards. Ijeoma (2010:352) further concludes that it was envisaged that the effective implementation of the framework would have significant potential for policy outcomes and impacts. The Strategic Plan (2011:8) issued by the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation shows that the purpose of GWM&ES is the coordination and management of the outcomes approach. The outcomes-based approach relates to achieving the results through the facilitation, monitoring and evaluation of the 12 outcomes identified by the Government in 2010. The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance (2010:8) issued by the former national Department of COGTA reveals that the GWM&ES should enable the Department to effectively and efficiently monitor, report and evaluate on the work
undertaken either directly by the Department or through the line-function sector departments that provide the necessary support to local government.

It can be seen from the above that a PMS is a micro management tool in municipalities assisting with the accomplishment of the municipal priorities contained in the IDP. On the other hand, it can further be seen that GWM&ES provides generic information such as the performance of Departments and municipalities with regard to the implementation of Governments programme of Action (GPoA) across the three spheres of Government. That is, the GWM&ES provides the overall performance management in the country.

The Performance Management Guide for Municipalities (2001:26) issued by the former DPLG, shows that a municipality is expected to develop a framework for undertaking performance measurements. Performance measurement is essentially the process of analysing data provided by the monitoring system in order to assess performance (Fourie & Opperman, 2011:324). The Performance Management Guide, 2001 further identifies different scorecard models usually used in the private sector but can be adapted to the public sector for performance measurements. Whereas the objective is not to evaluate the different models or to make recommendation as to the most appropriate one, in this study attention will be placed on Kaplan and Norton’s Balanced Scorecard (BSC) as adapted for public sector use. Jantjes (2008:29) emphasises the fact that this model is suited to an environment where profit is not the primary objective. The next section, therefore, considers the use of the revised BSC in municipalities.

4.13 THE APPLICATION OF THE REVISED BALANCED SCORECARD IN MUNICIPALITIES

Kaplan and Norton (1996:2) contextualised the BSC as proposing a balanced approach to the management and measurement of performance. Chiang and Lin (2009:1153) regard the BSCs as a formal management system that provides a realistic framework linking performance measurements to strategic objectives. Galloway (2010:38) agrees
with this observation and states that the BSC is a management and measurement system that allows organisations to clarify the strategy and implement it by offering feedback for internal processes and external outcomes. Gering and Rosmarin (2002:23) remarked in a similar vein that the BSC is a tool that uses indicators to communicate strategy and measure it’s successes by operationalising strategic discussions, and by assigning accountability for well-defined results. Van der Waldt (2004:187) adds a further dimension and argues that a BSC is a set of measures that could give public managers a fast but comprehensive view of a department’s performance and include both process and results measures.

According to Kaplan and Norton (1996:2) the emphasis in the BSC is shifted away from finances as the only determinant towards an approach that measures five aspects, namely, the finances, customers, internal business processes, learning and growth. Sedosheva (2011:67) adds in this respect that their fundamental premise is that the evolution of a company should not be restricted to a traditional financial evaluation, but should be supplemented with measures concerning customer satisfaction, internal processes and the ability to innovate. The results achieved within these additional perspective areas should assure future financial results and drive the organisation towards its strategic goals while keeping all four perspectives in balance. Minnaar (2010:158) argues that although the format designed by Kaplan and Norton focused on the private sector content, the underlying principle of a balanced model to measure performance in terms of organisational value drivers (mission and strategy) is generic and universally acceptable.

Item 26(6) of the Regulations for Performance Management of Municipal Managers and Managers Directly Accountable to the Municipal Managers, 2006 requires that the performance of municipal managers must be measured in terms of the following five key performance areas (KPAs):
Table 4.1 Key Performance Areas and Description of Typical Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Areas(KPAs) for Municipal Managers</th>
<th>Description of typical issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Basic service delivery</td>
<td>• Water, sanitation, electricity, refuse removal, roads and storm water, public transport, land etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local economic development</td>
<td>• Local investment initiatives, tourism promotion, support for survivalist or livelihoods programmes etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal institutional transformation and development</td>
<td>• Internal policies dealing with national priorities (equity, gender), organisational redesign to match IDP requirements, general management practices and skills development etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Municipal financial viability and management.</td>
<td>• Policies relating to revenue collection, dept and credit management, assets and liability control, supporting strategies to fund priorities etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good governance and public participation</td>
<td>• Strengthening wards, ensuring effective participation mechanisms etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DPLG (2006:163)

Minnaar (2010:159) shows that these prescribed KPAs could rightfully be regarded as “balanced indicators of performance categories” that are generally applicable for all South African municipalities, and could replace the four categories suggested by Kaplan and Norton’s balanced scorecard. They could also be used supplementarily to the four categories identified by Kaplan and Norton. Minnaar (2010:159) warns that, however, it remains a sound principle for government institutions to identify their own KPAs, with the intention to utilise them as key measurement areas or categories.
It is worth noticing from the discussion above that the BSC may be effectively utilised to reflect the scores in respect of each key municipal performance area. In this way, the BSC should serve as the instrument for performance measurement in municipalities. Accordingly, the performance scorecard of the BSC will enable the municipality to compile performance reports that reflect the actual performance of the institution against its performance plans.

In Chapter 3 of this study, a number of institutions as well as their roles and responsibilities in the monitoring and evaluation scene were discussed. The GWM&E system is a cross-cutting mechanism and the national and provincial departments should work together to ensure effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. The next section considers the activities of specific national and provincial government Departments which do not only contribute to but are the lead Departments in monitoring and supporting municipalities. It is necessary that the efforts of such lead Departments are streamlined to achieve optimal support to municipalities.

4.14 THE NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL DEPARTMENTS RESPONSIBLE FOR MONITORING AND SUPPORTING MUNICIPALITIES

The following are the national and provincial Departments responsible for monitoring and supporting municipalities:

4.14.1 The national Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation

The Strategic Plan of the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (2012:8) issued by the Presidency points to the fact that the Department is responsible for supporting government institutions including municipalities to identify and address blockages in achieving outcomes. The Department has a whole-of-government mandate that relates to all three spheres of government. The strategic plan (2012:8)
adds that it is therefore essential that the Department has a sub-national regional presence to extend its reach to provincial and local government levels.

4.14.2 The national and provincial Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs

The Delivery Agreement for Outcome 9 (2010:35) issued by the former national Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs indicates that the Department is responsible to regulate and support municipalities. The Local Government Turnaround Strategy (2009:20) identifies one of the key interventions to support municipalities as establishing a single window and entry point for the coordination of local government support and monitoring in the national Department of Cooperative Governance.

The Provincial Department will also align with the national Department's approach and similarly undertake the applicable actions at a provincial sphere. According to Delivery Agreement for Outcome 9 (2010:14) the concept of a Single Window of Coordination is invoked to forge cohesion and alignment between key sectors that are primarily and jointly responsible for specific outcomes. The LGTAS (2009:24) further states that the concept of a single window of coordination will drive the approach to the LGTAS. A single window of coordination is an organisational form intended to bring key Departments together to facilitate cross Departmental collaboration partnerships to impact more decisively on municipal performance. This means that there is a single entry point, through DCoG for any government programme, policy directive or other initiative for support that moves into a municipal area. This will provide for a more focused oversight and support role for Provinces. The Strategic Plan (2010:27) issued by the former national Department of COGTA shows that the Department is expected to monitor and evaluate municipal performance in accordance to the six thematic areas of LGTAS.
4.14.3 The national and provincial Treasury

The Review Report State of Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa (2008:57) indicates that in order to strengthen municipal monitoring through the Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan (SDBIP), the national Treasury has released guidelines on the compilation and implementation of the SDBIP. Pauw et al. (2009:286) state that an SDBIP can be seen as the operational plan of the municipality based on the strategic direction provided by the IDP. Van der Waldt (2004:322) emphasises in this respect that the indicators and targets in the SDBIP should be similar to those included in the IDP of the municipality. The MFMA Circular No.11 (2005:2) issued by the National Treasury also confirms that the IDP and SDBIP should be similar and consistent to enable the linkage between plans and actual performance.

According to the MFMA Circular No. 13 (2005:3), issued by the National Treasury, the SDBIP is considered to be a “layered” plan. The top-layer SDBIP contains the consolidated service delivery targets and in-year deadlines, and links such targets to top management. The next or lower layer is a detailed departmental SDBIP, which is focused on operational performance and must be prepared for each municipal department. This SDBIP provides more detail on each output for which top management is responsible and it serves as the portfolio of evidence for the top-layer SDBIP. The top-layer SDBIP is therefore the summary of all the departmental SDBIPs.

The Annual Performance Plan (2012:59), issued by the provincial Department of Treasury - Free State, indicates that one of the strategic objectives of the Department is to promote the implementation of Generally Recognised Accounting Practices (GRAP) in municipalities. The GRAP Implementation guide for Municipalities (2008:1) issued by the national Treasury indicates that the accounting principles, concepts and disclosure requirements are included in the standards of GRAP, also referred to as the accounting standards. Fourie and Opperman (2011:531) explain that the overall objective of GRAP is to fairly present financial information on the reporting entity based on recognised accounting concepts and principles. The application of GRAP should ensure uniformity
in the preparation of financial statements. The Annual Performance Plan (2012:59) issued by the provincial Department of Treasury-Free State indicates in this respect that the Department prepares assessment reports on GRAP compliance by municipalities and issues the guidelines on annual financial reporting cycle and procedures.

4.14.4 The Department of the Premier

The GWM&E: A Good Practice Guide (2008:46), issued by the Presidency, indicates that the M&E units established within the Departments of the Premier are responsible for the monitoring of municipal performance against the Government Programme of Action and Provincial Growth and Development Strategy. It states that close cooperation between the Provincial Treasury, Department of COGTA and Department of the Premier is essential in order to ensure a coordinated, efficient and effective M&E system for municipalities. In this manner, reporting processes for municipalities can be streamlined and duplication prevented by ensuring that information needs are covered in existing reporting requirements of both the Provincial Department of Treasury and Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs. These reports can then be used by the Department of the Premier for monitoring purposes. Close cooperation would further address possible confusion between the Departments.

The GWM&E: A Good Practice Guide (2008:26) further makes a key observation that an emerging role for the Department of the Premier relates to reporting from the municipalities. This implies that the M&E unit in the Department of the Premier should facilitate the interface between the local and provincial level reporting. Finally, the unit is expected to put in place and manage a provincial M&E framework which is supported by an M&E information technology solution.

It can be deduced from the above discussion that, while the structural and functional flow of performance monitoring and reporting upholds the intergovernmental system, it locates performance monitoring and evaluation within the Office of the Premier at
provincial level. As a result, performance, especially its reporting, has to be first a provincial obligation and thereafter a responsibility towards the national government.

It is key to note that there are other core national and provincial Departments that have a direct impact on municipalities and should form a close working relationship with DCoG. These Departments include Agriculture, Public Works, Water Affairs, Human Settlements, Energy as well as Rural Development and Land Reform. DCoG is responsible for supporting municipalities, strengthening cross-Departmental initiatives and addressing coordination challenges. Whereas attention in this section is placed on the lead Departments that support municipalities, the information on these other Departments is important in view of a model which will be developed in Chapter 6 of this study. The information shows that such model should be able to provide information that indicates where other Departments which have direct impact on municipalities are under-performing in executing their duties. It means that the model should take into consideration the performance monitoring interventions and support that currently exist within other national and provincial Departments and are aimed at strengthening intergovernmental support to municipalities. DCoG will then through the implementation of its single window of coordination, liaise with affected sector Departments alerting them to improve in areas of underperformance. This recognises the inter-related nature of government service delivery that the efforts of more than one organ of state may be needed to achieve a particular policy outcome within municipalities. The pressing challenges facing municipalities do not fit into neat Departmental boundaries as they are often cross-cutting and inter-sectoral in nature.

4.15 LESSONS FOR M&E SYSTEM UTILISATION TO SUPPORT MUNICIPALITIES

Kusek and Rist (2002:153) observed that introducing and sustaining an M&E system is essentially a political rather than a bureaucratic or technical act. A precondition for starting a results-based M&E system seems to be an unambiguous and sustained political commitment, from officials at the highest levels, to a performance-based ethos
in the public sector. Influential and visible champions can play a crucial role in mobilising support for M&E systems implementation.

Sebahara (2004:4) also views the following as the lessons for utilisation of M&E system to support municipalities:

- **The importance of ensuring that actors adhere to M&E rules and practices** - The M&E system can work and the conclusions and recommendations made from the performance information generated can effectively be followed up only if its goals and principles are accepted by all those involved.

- **The importance of coordination** - The provision of vast amount of disjointed support does not encourage the optimum use of allocated funds, coherent action or even a minimum of necessary coordination. The different criteria and procedures imposed by donors hamper any attempts to harmonise their procedures and make it far more complicated for municipal authorities to monitor progress. Actors involved in local development should ensure coordination and consultation, particularly with regard to the strategic plans addressing national priority issues such as poverty reduction and unemployment in providing support to municipalities.

- **Recognition that many different actors and roles are involved at a local authority level** - When reforms are being implemented, certain tasks are performed simultaneously by actors at different spheres of government. For instance, in a context, where the transfer of competencies, resources and decision-making powers from the national to the local sphere has not yet been completed, both national and local authorities may take initiatives in local development. This makes it difficult to determine who is responsible for a M&E system and hence the importance of consultation frameworks and coordination between all those involved at a local authority level.

Clearly, whereas the above observations by different authors may not be exhaustive, they demonstrate that there should be ongoing dialogue between municipalities and role
players involved in local development and consequently utilisation of a M&E system to support municipalities. Negotiation and regular consultation between actors are critical to the success of M&E system utilisation to support municipalities. They enable the actors to agree both on goals and mechanisms of attaining them.

4.16 CONCLUSION

The main objective of this chapter was to explore how a M&E system is linked and serves as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. In order to achieve this objective the issues outlined below were addressed.

The chapter commenced by conceptualising the concept of "outcomes-based governance". The chapter then focused on the developmental role of municipalities in South Africa. The evolution of economic development policy in South Africa pre- and post-1994 was addressed, followed by the main paradigms associated with the concept of "development" in South Africa. Moreover, the chapter explained the M&E system as a tool for development. The chapter further explored the relationship between the national planning and M&E system. Additionally, utilising the M&E system in the national planning process was considered. The chapter then focused on the link between the M&E system and intergovernmental support to municipalities. To that end, the chapter discussed the utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities. The distinction between municipal performance management systems (PMS) and the GWM&ES as well as the use of the revised Balanced Scorecard (BSC) in municipalities were also explored. Before concluding by outlining the lessons for the M&E system utilisation to support municipalities, the attention of the chapter was further focused on the national and provincial departments responsible for monitoring and supporting municipalities.

From the discussion of the chapter it can be seen that the information generated by the M&E system, assists in identifying areas for potential intergovernmental support within municipalities. The next chapter will focus on the research to be conducted in the
national Department of Cooperative Governance on its utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities in South Africa.
CHAPTER 5

UTILISATION OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM TO SUPPORT MUNICIPALITIES IN SOUTH AFRICA: EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In chapter 2 of the study the principles, practices and realities of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa were explored. Chapter 3 addressed the origin, statutory and regulatory framework as well as the implementation of M&E systems in South Africa. Chapter 4 explored how the GWM&E system is linked and serves as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. These preceding chapters have laid the foundation to the empirical investigation that follows in this chapter.

It is the main objective of this chapter to conduct an empirical investigation and present the findings on the utilisation of a M&E system by the national Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) for municipal support. The literature review conducted in the previous chapters and empirical investigations that follow in this chapter are aimed to investigate and meet the objective of this study, namely, to propose a comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation to support municipalities.

Towards realising the main objective of the study, the following has been achieved thus far in the preceding chapters. From the discussion in chapter 2, it was established that intergovernmental coordination and cooperation are key for the achievement of the development agenda and acceleration of service delivery. The chapter highlighted that the national Government may not realise its development and delivery targets without the contribution of the provincial and local governments. Chapter 3 further highlighted that the implementation of M&E systems helps in assessing whether and how goals are being achieved over time. It was further realised that, when implemented properly, the M&E systems provide a continuous flow of information feedback into the system which
may assist in guiding the South African Public Service towards achieving the desired results. Chapter 4 showed that the information generated by the M&E system assists in identifying areas for potential intergovernmental support within municipalities. It will also be explained in subsection 5.4.1 of this chapter how the content of these chapters was utilised to develop the interview schedule.

This chapter commences by providing an overview of DCoG as locus of the study. It further considers the realities and practices on the utilisation of M&E system in the Department to support municipalities. The focus of the chapter is further placed on the research methodology used and discusses the method of data collection, sampling, explaining also the reliability and validity of the data measuring instruments. Finally, the chapter concludes by presenting the data that was gathered as well as analysing the findings.

5.2 AN OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL DEPARTMENT OF COOPERATIVE GOVERNANCE

The Annual Report (2011:16) issued by the former national Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs shows that the former Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) was initially renamed the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA). It elaborates that later on, in December 2009, the components of cooperative governance and traditional affairs were further split into two departments, namely, the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) and Department of Traditional Affairs (DTA) under the Ministry of COGTA.

As stated in chapter 1, a particular focus in this study is placed on how the national and provincial governments coordinate and integrate their activities to support municipalities. Accordingly, attention will thus be focused on the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG). Figure 5.1 below illustrates the organisational structure for DCoG.
As can be deduced from Figure 5.1 above that DCoG has a dedicated branch responsible for provincial and municipal government support. The creation of this branch can be regarded as a measure that increases the capacity of the Department in providing support to municipalities.

The Annual Report (2011:16) issued by the former national Department of COGTA, shows that the primary mandate of DCoG includes the promotion of sustainable
development by providing support to local government. The Annual Report (2011:16) further indicates that the purpose of this branch responsible for provincial and municipal government support in DCoG is to provide evidence-based regulatory mechanisms as well as oversight and support initiatives for provincial and municipal government.

In chapter 4 (section 4.11) it was highlighted that DCoG facilitated the approval, on 2 December 2009, of a comprehensive Local Government Turnaround Strategy (LGTAS) by the Government. The LGTAS emphasises tailor-made municipality support.

The initiatives of the Department to support municipalities further include the introduction of the Monitoring, Support and Intervention Bill, 2012 in the National Assembly by the Minister of COGTA. Carrim (2010:1) observes that the purpose of the Monitoring, Support and Intervention Bill, 2012 includes the monitoring of municipalities to identify those that are experiencing difficulties with the fulfilment of their executive obligations and, where necessary the provision of targeted national or provincial support in order to avert defaults on service delivery. The kinds of targeted support which the national or provincial executive may provide to a municipality includes, in addition to financial support, key professional, technical or administrative support, specialised guidance and access to technical resources and facilities.

The Draft Report: Barometer to differentiate municipalities for support (2012:1) issued by DCoG also indicates that the Department has commissioned a project entitled: "Development of a barometer and proposals for institutional arrangements to support the implementation of a differentiated approach to municipal support". It states that the purpose of the project is to assess and analyse municipalities, taking into account separately their contextual differences and varying performance levels. It further notes that a system of profiling municipalities for different remedial support and intervention responses needs to differentiate municipalities on the basis of performance.
From the foregoing exposition of the case, it can be seen that the Department has attempted to comply with its mandate of providing support to municipalities. In the next section utilisation of the M&E system by the Department will be examined.

5.3 UTILISATION OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COOPERATIVE GOVERNANCE TO SUPPORT MUNICIPALITIES: REALITIES AND PRACTICES

As indicated previously in chapter 4 (section 4.1) of this study, the South African Government has adopted the principles of outcomes-based governance at the beginning of the current electoral cycle in 2009. The first significant formal process by DCoG, since the adoption of this outcomes-based approach, towards utilising a M&E system to support municipalities was the development of the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework in Support of Cooperative Governance, 2010.

The Annual Performance Plan (2010:18) issued by DCoG indicates in this respect that the Department has developed the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework that was adopted by the Minister and Members of provincial Executive Councils (MinMec) on 7 December 2010. The framework proposes the structures and systems that need to be in place at national, provincial and local government spheres so as to monitor and evaluate the performance of local government. In chapter 3 (section 3.9) consideration was given to the fact that, in addition to existing intergovernmental structures provided for in legislation, other existing structures such as M&E forums be used to support monitoring and evaluation. In chapter 3 (subsection 3.8.4) a further reference was made to the fact that, at a national sphere, DCoG will be responsible for coordinating performance information through its programme managers. At a provincial sphere, the Office of the Premier (OTP) has the responsibility of coordinating performance information from the provincial sector departments as the former is responsible for monitoring the provision of basic public services by the municipalities in their respective geographical municipal area of jurisdiction.
Nonetheless, the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (2010:8) issued by COGTA reveals that it only provides the parameters and process that will be followed to fully institutionalise monitoring, reporting and evaluation within all the three spheres of government. It indicates that DCoG therefore needs to establish an integrated M&E system that will enable the Department to effectively and efficiently monitor, report and evaluate on the work undertaken either directly by DCoG or through the line-function sector departments. The Framework 2010 further reveals that the Presidency is yet to develop the overall implementation plan of the M&E systems across the three spheres of government. The Draft-Refined Agreement (2011:16) issued by DCoG also identifies one of the reasons for the lack of coordination and ineffective support to municipalities as performance information that is dispersed across different entities. The Draft-Refined Delivery Agreement, 2011 shows in this respect that the National Treasury has financial information, while sector Departments such as Water Affairs, Public Works and Human Settlements have service delivery performance information. It elaborates that there is no mechanism that brings together various pieces of key information to form an integrated and holistic picture of the municipality with a view to facilitating coordinated responses in terms of either support or other interventions.

As stated in Chapter 1, the main objective of this study is to identify the core challenges associated with the M&E system as far as municipal support is concerned and to explore the variables that should be incorporated in a comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation by DCoG for intergovernmental support to municipalities. An approach to operationalise this objective should be the development of a comprehensive M&E system utilisation model.

It was emphasised in chapter 4 (section 4.11) that the M&E system of DCoG should rank the performance of municipalities against key indicators. The system should, therefore, incorporate a limited number of selected national performance indicators that address the reporting requirement for municipalities at national government sphere. The M&E system should then routinely collect data within municipalities that can be used to measure the actual progress in achieving the identified national objectives.
(priorities) and programme outcomes. It was further highlighted in chapter 4 (section 4.11) that by periodically gathering data to measure and compare actual progress with the targets or expected results on identified national objectives (priorities), DCoG can obtain "early warnings" indicating that programmes are not progressing as planned. The gaps between the actual and target performance should alert DCoG to the need for more in-depth evaluations explaining why programmes are succeeding or failing. These assessments would then lead to the identification of the entity responsible for intervention and this should include other national and provincial sector departments impacting on local government.

From the discussion above, it is clear that DCoG should utilise a M&E system to improve its role of supporting municipalities. In the next section, the research methodology for this study will be determined. The purpose is to conduct an empirical investigation and present the findings on the extent to which DCoG utilises a M&E system for municipal support.

5.4 Research Methodology

Brynard and Hanekom (2006:35) contextualised research methodology as the "how" of collecting and processing data within the framework of the research process. Fox and Bayat (2007:7) indicate in this respect that various types of research methodologies can be divided into two broad categories or paradigms, namely, qualitative and quantitative research.

Maree et al. (2009:51) simply state that qualitative research typically studies people or systems by interacting with and observing the participants in their natural environment (in situ) and focusing on their meanings and interpretations. De Vos et al. (2011:308) remark in a similar vein that qualitative research is concerned with the understanding (verstehen), naturalistic observation and subjective exploration of reality from the perspective of an insider. This is consistent with the observation of Brynard and Hanekom (2006:37) that qualitative methodology refers to the research that produces
descriptive data - generally the participant's own written or spoken words pertaining to their experience or perception. Usually no numbers or counts are assigned to these observations. Maxwell (1996:17) adopted a more descriptive view and observed that the strengths of qualitative research derive primarily from its inductive approach, its focus on a specific situation or people and its emphasis on words rather than numbers. Maree et al. (2009:51) agree with this view and shows that the emphasis in qualitative research is on the quality and depth of information and not on the scope or breadth of the information provided.

Struwig and Stead (2010:4) viewed quantitative research as a form of conclusive research involving large representative samples and fairly structured data collection procedures. A clearer perspective is provided by Brynard and Hanekom (2006:37) when indicating that in quantitative research methodology, the researcher assigns numbers to observations. By counting and measuring "things" or "objects", data is produced. Fox and Bayat (2007:7) concur with this view and state that quantitative research concerns things that can be counted. One of its most common disciplines is the use of statistics to process and explain data and to summarise the findings. Mare et al. (2009:255) added that in quantitative research, an investigation relies on numerical data to test the relationships between the variables. O'Leary (2010:105) concludes in a similar vein that quantitative research is often characterised as an objective positivist search for singular truths that relies on hypotheses, variables and statistics and is generally large scale but without much depth.

It can be deduced from the body of opinions above that the central ideas and typical features guiding qualitative and quantitative research are different. For example, in qualitative research the researcher is trying to see through the eyes of the participants. The emphasis is thus placed on the participants' frame of reference and how they see things. There is little or no use of numerical data or statistical analysis. In quantitative research, the measurement and quantification, that is turning the information or data obtained into numbers, is central. Accuracy and precision of measurement is sought.
De Vos et al. (2011:433) articulate the argument that qualitative and quantitative approaches are not mutually exclusive - that a researcher must always choose to use one or the other approach for a specific study. Maree et al. (2009:51) remark in a similar vein that although most researchers do either qualitative or quantitative research work, some have suggested combining (mixing) one or more research methods in the one study. Mouton (2009:40) also adds that at the methodical and technical level, most researchers accept that the choice for their inclusion in a particular project is determined by the specific research problem.

Consistent with these views of the authors above and taking into account the research objectives of this study, a combined approach incorporating both qualitative and quantitative research designs was followed in this study. The reason for combining (mixing) these research designs is that whereas this study is qualitative in nature, a questionnaire which is seen as a quantitative data collection method was utilised. Furthermore, the questions in the questionnaire were qualitatively designed and the statistics were used in analysing data. The statistics provided were only descriptive in nature as the sample size was not large. Having discussed the approaches that were followed for the empirical survey, the focus in the next section is placed on the data collection methods.

5.4.1 Methods of data collection

Mouton (2009:67) expresses a view that data collection involves applying the measuring instruments to the sample or cases selected for the investigation. Struwig and Stead (2010:98) indicate that there are numerous ways of collecting data and they depend on the purpose and aims of the study. Brynard and Hanekom (2006:38) are of the opinion that most frequently used methods of data collection within the two basic research methods (qualitative and quantitative) include interviews and questionnaires. In this study, semi-structured interviews and questionnaires were used to obtain the data relevant to the research.
Struwig and Stead (2010:98) indicate that a semi-structured interview is a combination of the structured and unstructured interviews. Predetermined questions are posed to each participant in a systematic and consistent manner but the participants are also given the opportunity to discuss issues beyond the questions’ confines. De Vos et al. (2011:352) add that with semi-structured interviews the research will have a set of predetermined questions on an interview schedule, but the interview will be guided rather than dictated by the schedule. This statement is consistent with Maree et al. (2009:87) that a semi-structured interview usually requires the participant to answer a set of predetermined questions. It does allow for the probing and clarification of answers. Robson (2011:280) supports this view by explaining that in a semi-structured interview the interviewer has an interview guide that serves as a checklist of topics to be covered and order for the questions. The wording and order are often substantially modified based on the flow of the interview, and additional unplanned questions are asked to follow up on what the interviewee says.

Babbie (2007:246) defines a questionnaire as a document containing questions and other types of items designed to solicit information appropriate for analysis. Neuman (2000:517) also viewed a questionnaire as a written document in survey research that has a set of questions given to respondents or used by an interviewer to ask questions and record the answers. Fox and Bayat (2007:88) added that a questionnaire is a list of questions on a specific topic compiled by a researcher and to which answers and information are required.

The research procedure consisted of the following chronological stages, namely the ethical considerations and design of the interview schedule.
5.4.1.1 Ethical considerations

The researcher followed three principles of ethical social research (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010:85):

- **Full disclosure**: the researcher revealed his full identity and research purpose to the respondents.
- **Informed consent**: the researcher ensured that the respondents’ participation was voluntary and informed, based on the understanding of what the study is about, what its risks and benefits are, how the results will be used, and the fact that particulars are voluntary and can be stopped at any time, and that identity will be protected.
- **Moral integrity**: the researcher ensured that the research process and the research findings were trustworthy and valid.

Accordingly, in adhering to the above ethical considerations, the researcher sought permission to conduct research from the Acting Director General of the national Department of Cooperative Governance. Permission was granted and it was further indicated that the approval includes permission to conduct research in the provincial departments of COGTA and municipalities as the Department granting such permission is responsible for these institutions.

5.4.1.2 Designing the interview package

The interview package consisted of the following documents, namely, the informed consent letter and interview schedule.

An informed consent letter is aimed to protect the privacy of the participants and describe the nature of the research study, as well as the involvement of the participants (Mertler, 2008:90). As a minimum, it contains the following (Mertler, 2008:90):
- a description of the research topic and research study.
- a description of what participation would involve.
- an indication that participation was voluntary and can be terminated at any time without penalty.
- a guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity.
- an offer to provide the summary of the findings to the participants.
- A place for the participants to sign and date the form.

As stated earlier, the semi-structured interviews and questionnaires were used by the researcher in order to gather information. It was explained on the questionnaires and interview schedules of the semi-structured interviews that information obtained would be used only for the study and names or any identifying data would not be revealed. Given that the information was obtained from a wide geographical area and within a short period of time, the questionnaires were e-mailed to the respondents. The questionnaires were accompanied by the letter of permission from the national Department of Cooperative Governance. The questionnaire that was e-mailed to the respondents is that which was used during the semi-structured interviews as the interview schedule. This was done to ensure that all the respondents were asked the same questions. The reporting of results will follow the format of the interview schedule administered. The relevance of the findings will again be discussed in chapter 6.

The reasons for the utilisation of these research techniques were twofold. Firstly, to obtain the opinions and perceptions of the relevant officials in DCoG and COGTA respectively regarding the utilisation of a M&E system for the effective intergovernmental support to municipalities, and secondly to ascertain opinions and perceptions of officials from the local municipalities on the level of support they receive from the national and provincial governments. The support by the national and provincial governments to local government should be adequate so as to enable municipalities to discharge their statutory obligations.
It is believed that the literature review, semi-structured interviews and questionnaires will provide a balanced perspective on the progress and shortcomings in the utilisation of M&E system to support municipalities. The triangulation of results was undertaken through the systematic comparison of data from these multiple sources. The combined outcomes of the above research methods serve as a foundation for the identification of a comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation to support municipalities.

5.4.2 Sampling

According to Maree et al. (2009:79) sampling refers to the process used to select a portion of the population for study. Brynard and Hanekom (2006:54) define sampling as a technique employed to select a small group (the sample) with a view to determining the characteristics of a large group (population). Population is the object of research and consists, among others, of individuals, groups, organisations, events or the conditions to which they are exposed (Fox & Bayat, 2007:51). The researcher used purposive sampling in this study to select a sample.

Babbie (1995:225) observed that purposive sampling is the selection of a sample on the basis of the researcher’s own knowledge of the population, its elements and the nature of research aims. Maree et al. (2009:79) point to the fact that purposive sampling simply means that participants are selected because of some defining characteristics that make them the holders of the data needed for the study. Sampling decisions are therefore made for the explicit purpose of obtaining the richest possible source of information to answer the research questions. Kumar (2005:179) also noticed that the primary consideration in purposeful sampling is the judgement of the researcher as to who can provide the best information to achieve the objectives of the study. As a result, the researcher in this study obtained data from respondents who were likely to have the required information and share it.

The sample of the study drawn from the national government consisted of the Directors in the Provincial and Municipal Government Support branch of DCoG. The selected
members of the population from the provincial government consisted of Directors within
the COGTA Departments and are responsible for municipal performance management.
As stated in chapter 1, there are 4 classes of municipalities derived from spatial, social,
municipal capacity and economic indicators. A sample of 36 local municipalities was
selected from the total of 230 local municipalities. As indicated in chapter 1, there are
four classes of municipalities derived from spatial, social and municipal capacity and
economic indicators. They are class 1: very high vulnerability, class 2: high
vulnerability, class 3: medium vulnerability and class 4: low vulnerability. Considering
this classification of municipalities, it meant that 4 local municipalities comprising of
Class 1, Class 2, Class 3 and Class 4 were selected from each of the 9 provinces. Data
were then obtained from the managers responsible for Performance Management
Systems or managers responsible for Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) where the
former was not present in a specific municipality.

5.4.3 Reliability and validity of the questionnaire

As highlighted earlier in this chapter, the semi-structured interviews and questionnaires
were used by the researcher in order to gather information. It was further indicated that
the questionnaire that was e-mailed to the respondents is that which was used during
the semi-structured interviews as the interview schedule. It was important to determine
the validity and reliability of the questionnaire so as to ensure credibility of the data
collected.

Gray (2009:363) viewed reliability as simply a measure of consistency. Mitchel and
Jolley (2001:115) indicated that reliability is the extent to which a measure produces
stable and consistent scores. Dooley (1990:82) made a similar statement that reliability
refers to the degree to which observed scores are “free from errors of measurement”.
Babbie (2010:188) argues more theoretically and agrees that in the abstract, reliability is
a matter of whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, yields
the same result each time. Brynard and Hanekom (2006:48) remarked in a similar vein
that reliability pertains to the accuracy and consistency of measures. The same
instrument must be able to produce the same results at a later stage under similar conditions.

Struwig and Stead (2010:136) indicate that validity refers to the extent to which a research design is scientifically sound or appropriately conducted. Dooley (1990:82) added by explaining that validity refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the specific inferences made from measures. Babbie (2010:191) also agrees with this statement by indicating that validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration. Daymon and Holloway (2003:274) remarked in a similar vein that validity indicates the extent to which research findings are accurate, reflect the purpose of the study and represent reality. This is consistent with the observation of Worhen et al. (1998:199) that validity is when the instrument measures what it purports to measure and the degree to which the instrument accomplishes the purpose for which it is being used.

In this study, the Cronbach-Alpha test was used to assess and determine the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. Cronbach-Alpha is a test for a survey's internal consistency (Maree, 2007:216). Malhotra (1999:126) noted that it estimates the reliability of a test based upon the number of items in the test and the average inter-correlation amongst items. It further yields internal consistency estimates, represented by the mean reliability coefficients that would be obtained from all possible split halves.

The validity of the questionnaire as reliable measuring instrument and the consistency of the respondents were established and descriptive statistical analysis of the data was conducted. Averages and one-way analyses of variance were also determined. Table 5.1 below provides the mean and standard deviation of responses to questions regarding the extent of utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities.
### Table 5.1  Reliability of measuring instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 5.1 above, the Cronbach-Alpha scale achieved for the questionnaire items under the concept "utilisation of the M&E system" is 0.72. According to the Cronbach-Alpha test any scale larger than 0.5 is regarded as being reliable and therefore the questionnaire, which was also used as interview schedule, was tested to be reliable.

### 5.5 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Four responses comprising of 2 interviews and 2 questionnaires were received from DCoG while 9 responses consisting of 2 interviews and 7 questionnaires were received from the provincial COGTA departments. Furthermore, 27 responses comprising of 15 interviews and 12 questionnaires were received from the 36 targeted municipalities. The sample total of 40 responses is representative of the population in the national and provincial departments as well as municipalities. These responses constitute an adequate sample from which meaningful deductions could be made.

The questionnaire was divided under the following main headings, namely, Biographical information, Municipal information, Municipal support and Utilisation of a M&E system. The views of the national and provincial governments as well as municipal officials will
be presented mainly on the municipal support and utilisation of M&E system. However, for analysis the issues were only identified as crucial when they represented the opinions, perceptions and views of the majority within each sphere of government.

5.5.1 Biographical information

On the question regarding the years of service of the respondents in DCoG the outcome was as follows:

![Figure 5.2 Years of service of officials in DCoG](image)

The figure shows that 33% of the participants were less than 5 years while 67% were between 5 and 10 years employed within DCoG.

The rationale to obtain data on the years of service of the officials in DCoG was to draw attention to the work experience of the respondents. Clearly, figure 5.2 above shows that the majority of the respondents have a fairly long work experience in DCoG. Given their experience, the opinions, views and perceptions of these participants in this investigation are likely to be trustworthy.
In the question regarding the years of service of the respondents in COGTA the outcome was as follows:

The figure shows that 13% of the respondents were more than 20 years, 62% between 11 and 20 years while 25% were between 5 and 10 years as employees in COGTA. None of the respondents were employed in COGTA for less than 5 years. It can be concluded that the respondents had adequate work experience in COGTA. Therefore, the perception of these respondents could be useful in this investigation.

In the question regarding the years of service of the respondents in Municipalities the outcome was as follows:
Figure 5.4 Years of service of officials in sampled municipalities

The figure shows that 41% of the respondents were less than 5 years, 33% between 5 and 10 years, 19% between 11 and 20 years employed employees in the municipalities selected for the empirical study. It is clear that the respondents had sufficient work experience and, like the respondents in DCoG and COGTA Departments, may be suitable to express opinions and views in the investigation of this study.

5.5.2 Municipal information

In the question regarding the classification of the municipality and the province in which such municipality is situated, the outcomes were as follows:
Of the 27 responses received from the municipalities, 11% was from class 1, 31% from class 2, 29% from class 3 and 29% from class 4. Under subsection 5.4.2 above, it was pointed out that there are 4 classes of municipalities derived from spatial, social, municipal capacity and economic indicators. From the above responses, it is evident that data was collected from the 4 classes of municipalities and this has ensured representivity.

5.5.3 Municipal support

The respondents were asked the question: “How effective do you regard the current system of co-operative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa in terms of strengthening the intergovernmental support to municipalities?” The responses were as follows:
The above figure illustrates that 5% of the respondents in municipalities felt that the system is not effective. 20% was of the view that the system is significantly effective. 75% responded that it is moderately effective.

Concerning the responses from the provincial government, 40% of the participants indicated that the system is significant and fully effective. Each category of respondents constituted 20%. Furthermore, 60% responded that the system is moderately effective.

The views of the respondents in the selected municipalities and provincial COGTA Departments that the system of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations is moderately effective, coincides with the theory of the literature review in chapter 2 of this study. It was noted in chapter 2 (section 2.8) that while the key objective of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations is to ensure a system in which the three spheres of government operate together, the reality is that this objective has not been realised to the extent envisaged by the Constitution. Nonetheless, it was highlighted in chapter 2 (section 2.2.3) that coordination and cooperation amongst the three spheres of government in South Africa is fairly effective.
Furthermore, it was elaborated in chapter 2 (section 2.6) that coordination and cooperation are enhanced by the establishment of the technical support structures comprising of officials representing the organs of state that are in the various political structures.

The figures from the national Government reveal that 20% perceived the system as greatly effective, 30% as moderately effective and 50% as fully effective.

It was further established, through probing by the researcher, that another reason for the officials in the selected municipalities and provincial COGTA Departments to express a view contrary to this of DCoG is largely as a result of their concerns regarding low levels of municipal support by the latter.

The results were as follows concerning how effective do the respondents regard the statutory and regulatory frameworks for provincial and national government support in enabling local government to achieve its developmental objectives:

![Statutory and regulatory frameworks](image.png)

**Figure 5.7 Statutory and regulatory frameworks**
It may be clear from the above figure that of the respondents in municipalities, 5% agreed that the systems are fully effective, 10% indicated that the systems are effective. Furthermore, 18% moderately agreed and 67% of the respondents fully agreed that the systems are effective.

In the provinces, 10% of the respondents viewed the systems as greatly effective, 30% as fully effective and 60% as moderately effective. With probing by the researcher during the semi-structured interviews, it was determined that this perception was not based on the effectiveness of the statutory and regulatory frameworks *per se*, it was influenced by their unhappiness regarding the level of support municipalities receive from the provincial COGTA Departments and DCoG.

The national responses were as follows: 38% of the respondents saw the systems as moderately effective and 62% saw them as greatly effective.

The majority of the respondents in the three spheres of government indicated that the statutory and regulatory frameworks are moderately effective and greatly effective. This is to be expected because as with the system of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations, in chapter 2 of the study it was concluded that a relatively mature statutory and regulatory frameworks are in place to facilitate cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa.

When asked: "Do you think that the provincial and national Departments of COGTA and DCoG respectively constantly monitor and review the progress made by municipalities in achieving their developmental objectives," the results were as follows:
Figure 5.8 Monitoring and review of municipal progress

According to the above graphical data, 10% of the participants in municipalities indicated that the DCoG and COGTA constantly monitor and review the progress made by municipalities in achieving their developmental objectives. Thirteen percent were of the opinion that this is done in less than 50% of the cases. Thirty eight percent expressed the view that the monitoring and review are seldom done. Thirty eight percent also represented the respondents whose opinion was that this is done in between 50% and 75% of the cases.

The respondents in the provinces also had different views. Ten percent were of the view that the monitoring and review of progress in municipalities happen in less than 50% of the cases. Ninety percent stated that these are done in between 50% and 75% as well as in more than 75% of the cases. That is, 45% for each category of respondents.

In the national Government, 20% believe the monitoring and review of the progress being made in municipalities regarding the achievement of developmental goals are being done in more than 75% of the cases. Thirty percent disagreed as the observation
is that the occurrence is in less than 50% of the cases. However, 50% perceived the occurrence as existing in between 50% and 75% of the cases.

It can be seen that the majority of respondents across at all spheres of government viewed monitoring and review of municipal progress as taking place between 50% to 75% of the cases. However, during the semi-structured interviews with the researcher, the respondents added that whereas monitoring is done and gaps are being identified, the corresponding support is seldom provided by DOGTA and DCoG.

When asked: "Over the last five years, how would you describe the support of the provincial and national Department of COGTA and DCoG to municipalities?" the participants responded as follows:

![Bar chart showing support levels](image)

**Figure 5.9 Provincial and national support**

Firstly, 5% of the respondents in the selected municipalities viewed the support as having worsened over the last five years (2007-2012). This response was contradicted by another 5% who viewed the support as having improved significantly. Furthermore,
13% were of the opinion that it stayed the same, while 77% indicated that it has improved.

Secondly, the participants in the provinces responded in the following manner. Twenty percent stated that the municipal support has worsened while another 20% responded that it has improved significantly. The rest of 60% of the participants perceived the support to municipalities as having improved.

Thirdly, the responses of the participants in the national Government were as follows. Fifteen percent saw considerable improvement, 25% observed normal improvement and 60% did not see any change in the existing situation.

The majority of the respondents' view was that over the last five years (2007 - 2012), the national and provincial government's support has improved.

This perception of the majority of the respondents that the support has improved is consistent with chapter 2 (2.8) that DCoG has launched a number of support programmes to assist local government to discharge its constitutional mandate. However, and as elaborated in chapter 4 (4.11), the support programmes have usually reflected developing generic interventions and then cascading them to all municipalities. Hence in chapter 4 (4.10) it is pointed out that performance information flowing from the M&E system should guide the provision of technical support to municipalities. The performance information should indicate, for example, whether a particular municipality need either the skills or financial support.

The research participants were also requested to rate the overall effectiveness of DCoG and its provincial departments of COGTA in supporting the municipalities. They answered as follows:
The responses in the municipalities were that the support is totally ineffective, ineffective, effective and extremely effective; that is, 5%, 8%, 40% and 47% respectively.

The responses in the provincial departments were that 25% viewed the support as being ineffective and 75% it as effective. In the national Government the participants stated that the support is ineffective while 50% indicated that it is effective.

The respondents were also asked to list any constraint(s) that is, according to them, hampering the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG to effectively support municipalities.

Whereas the respondents in the selected municipalities, provincial COGTA Departments and DCoG identified a number of constraints, some limitations appeared to be more critical than the others as they were stated more often. The constraints that the frequency response highlighted most were the shortage of skilled personnel as well as the fact that when the monitoring has been conducted and diagnosis of the
challenges has been completed, feedback is not provided to the affected municipalities. The other constraints listed by the respondents in the three spheres of government included the following:

- Ever-changing / different performance templates are issued by DCoG and COGTA to municipalities.
- Inadequate budget at all spheres of government.
- Poor coordination of activities at all spheres of government.
- Political interference in the administration, particularly in municipalities.
- Non-compliance with legislation at all spheres of government.
- Lack of integrated planning processes and strategies.
- Lack of communication mechanisms and strategies.
- Top-down approach.

5.5.4 Utilisation of Monitoring and Evaluation System

The respondents were requested to indicate the extent to which they agree / disagree with the following statement. "I believe that the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should utilise the M&E system to support municipalities." They showed their choices as follows.
From the above figure, it could be seen that, in municipalities, 13% strongly disagreed, 30% agreed and 57% strongly agreed. In the provinces, none of the participants disagreed because 25% agreed and 75% strongly agreed. In the national Government 50% agreed and another 50% strongly agreed.

The study discovered that the majority of the respondents strongly agreed to the utilisation of M&E system by DCoG. As highlighted earlier in chapter 3, the objective of M&E system is not only to produce large volumes of performance information. Rather, its objectives include higher quality of decision-making.

On whether the M&E system for utilisation by DCoG to support municipalities should be designed in a manner that takes into account the fact that municipalities have different capacities and varying social and economic contexts, the research participants answered as follows:
The above statistics make it clear that 10% of the respondents in municipalities strongly disagreed whereas 17% agreed and 73% strongly agreed. The responses in the provinces show that 35% agreed and 65% strongly agreed as none of the participants disagreed. The figures of the responses in the provinces are more or less the same as those in the national Government because, in the national sphere of government, 40% agreed and 60% strongly agreed.

The average 66% of respondents strongly agreed that the M&E system utilisation should take into account the varying capacities and unique environments of municipalities as this is critical for targeted support.

Regarding whether they think that the managers in DCoG have sufficient knowledge to utilise the M&E system as a mechanism to support municipalities, the responses of the respondents can be displayed as follows.
In the municipalities the responses were as follows: Firstly, 10% disagreed and another 10% strongly disagreed that the managers of DCoG have sufficient knowledge for utilising the M&E system. Secondly, 45% of the participants agreed while 35% strongly agreed. The numbers of the respondents in the provincial sphere of governments reveal that 20% disagreed and 40% agreed and another 40% strongly agreed. In the national Government, the responses were that 100% believed that DCoG managers at national level were sufficiently knowledgeable about utilising the M&E system to support municipalities. That is, 50% agreed and another 50% strongly agreed.

When the respondents were asked whether the data that would be generated through the M&E system of DCoG should inform the type of support required by municipalities, their responses were as follows:

Figure 5.13 Knowledge of DCoG officials
Figure 5.14  Data for municipal support

It should be clear from the above figure that the responses across the three spheres of government reveal that there was no research participant who did not agree that the data which would be generated should contribute in supporting municipalities. In municipalities, 83% strongly agreed and 17% agreed. Whereas 95% strongly agreed and 5% agreed in the provinces, 20% strongly agreed and 80% agreed in the national Government.

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree / disagree with the following statement: "The utilisation of the M&E system by DCoG to support municipalities would be effective when it takes into account the monitoring and support responsibilities of other provincial and national departments." The responses were as follows:
All the participants in the three spheres of government responded that the utilisation of the M&E system by DCoG to support municipalities would be effective when it takes into account the monitoring and support responsibilities of other provincial and national departments. In municipalities, 45% agreed and 55% strongly agreed. The responses in the provincial departments were that 52% strongly agreed and 48% agreed. The participants in the national Government felt as follows: 80% strongly agreed and 20% agreed.

The research participants were requested to show the extent to which they agree / disagree with the following statement: "The M&E system should enable DCoG to detect early indicators of underperformance by municipalities." The responses were as follows:
Figure 5.16 Early indicators

All the respondents concurred that the M&E system should enable the DCoG to detect early indicators of underperformance by municipalities. 12% of the participants in municipalities agreed and 88% strongly agreed. Whereas 25% of the respondents in the provinces agreed, 75% strongly agreed. Majority of the participants in the national Government agreed and strongly agreed. The figures are, 20% and 80% respectively.

Regarding whether the key performance indicators incorporated in the M&E system of the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should be agreed upon with municipalities, the respondents' choices were as follows:
The above figure illustrates that no participants disagreed. Sixteen percent agreed and 84 % strongly agreed in municipalities. On the one hand, 45% agreed and 55% strongly agreed in the provinces while on the other hand, the figures regarding the responses in the national Government show that 80% agreed and 20% strongly agreed.

The respondents were also requested to list what they consider to be the key challenges for DCoG to utilise the M&E system to support municipalities. The respondents identified the following constraints:

- Financial distress in municipalities.
- Non alignment of planning and monitoring tools.
- Lack of political buy-in to M&E that is resulting in non-reporting on performance.
- Only the national and provincial officials seem to understand M&E. It is not ensured that there is common understanding of utilisation of the system at all spheres of government.
- Poor-institutionalisation of M&E. For example, when the Minister leaves office, the programme is also terminated and in this way there is no ownership of the process.
- Non-compliance with legislation, unavailability of performance information and lack of political oversight.

These findings in this chapter conclude the investigation concerning perceptions of the officials in the national and provincial departments of COGTA and DCoG respectively as well as municipalities on municipal support and utilisation of the M&E system. It is believed that the totality of responses provided a balanced perspective of the respondents' views and opinions regarding municipal support and utilisation of the M&E system.

5.6 CONCLUSION

The main objective of this chapter was to conduct an empirical investigation and present the findings on the utilisation of M&E system by DCoG for municipal support. The views, opinions and perceptions of the respondents gathered in this chapter are significant and will be considered during the development of the model in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: A COMPREHENSIVE MODEL FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM UTILISATION TO SUPPORT MUNICIPALITIES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This final chapter will begin by discussing how the research objectives and research questions proposed in chapter 1 of the study were realised and answered. The chapter will then make recommendations regarding a model for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system utilisation to support municipalities. It is the main objective of this study to propose a comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation to support municipalities. To realise the aforementioned aim, the chapter will explore the elements of the proposed M&E system utilisation model. It will further provide critical success factors regarding the implementation of the model. The chapter will then draw this study to a close by recommending areas for further research.

6.2 REALISING THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND OPERATIONALISING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This section presents the research objectives and research questions respectively as they were proposed in Chapter 1 of this study. The section further discusses how each objective has been realised and the corresponding research question operationalised. The following were the research objectives and research questions of the study:
6.2.1 Objective 1: To explore the principles, practices and realities of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa

The following research question was posed in chapter 1: "What are the principles, practices and realities of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa?"

In order to determine the achievement of this research objective and provide answers to the corresponding research question, the views of different authors in chapter 2 of this study should be considered. Section 2.2 provided an overview of the system of government in South Africa. This included a discussion of the relationship between government levels - the nature of the system of government. Section 2.4 outlined some of the basic principles for cooperative government which should be complied with in pursuit of coherent government while section 2.5 focused on the purpose of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. Firstly, it was established that a relatively mature statutory and regulatory framework is in place to facilitate cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa. Secondly, an observation was made that the essence of the basic principles for cooperative government is to place an obligation on the three spheres of government to cooperate with each other and put the national interest first. Cooperative government is key for the realisation of the country's developmental goals. The ultimate goal of the South African government to develop the statutory framework and attempt to comply with the basic principles for cooperative government is to establish an integrated government capable of achieving the objectives of the state.
6.2.2 Objective 2: To investigate the statutory and regulatory frameworks for national and provincial government support to enable local government to achieve its developmental objectives

A question was asked in chapter 1 as to what constitutes local government support and what are the statutory and regulatory frameworks for national and provincial government support to local government?

Chapter 2 of the study dealt with national and provincial government support to local government. Section 2.7 conceptualised local government support. It was pointed out in this respect that section 105 of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 stipulates that mechanisms, processes and procedures must be established to assess the support needed by municipalities to strengthen their capacity to perform their function. The initiatives by the former Department of Provincial and local Government which include the development of the National Capacity Building Framework 2008 / 2011 were also highlighted. Other policy guidelines such as the Local Government Turnaround Strategy (LGTAS) which requires support plans of the national and provincial government to assist municipalities were also elaborated upon. It was further elucidated that support of municipalities in cooperative government and intergovernmental relations means the national and provincial governments have a positive obligation to strengthen local government structures, powers and functions.

6.2.3 Objective 3: To provide a theoretical overview of the concept of performance monitoring and evaluation systems in South Africa

The following research question was posed in chapter 1: "What are the principles, theories and practices associated with monitoring and evaluation systems in South Africa?"

Towards achieving this research objective and providing answers to the corresponding research question, the views of different authors in chapter 3 of this study should be
taken into account. Section 3.2 provided an overview of M&E systems in South Africa. Section 3.3 outlined the constitutional, legislative and regulatory frameworks for monitoring and evaluation in South Africa. Section 3.7 reflected on the guiding principles for implementation of M&E systems while section 3.8 discussed the implementation of M&E system. From the various pieces of legislation and policies discussed, it was found that there exist adequate legal provisions for monitoring and evaluation across the Government. It was further established that while the concept of performance monitoring and evaluation systems is still developing and has not really taken root, the legislative stipulations and policy guidelines have laid a solid foundation for its practices in South Africa. Nonetheless, it was also noted that monitoring and evaluation practices were not undertaken, managed and coordinated systematically in the South African Public Service. The activities were undertaken sporadically by line function Departments.

6.2.4 Objective 4: To analyse how does the M&E system serve as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support to municipalities in South Africa

A question was asked in chapter 1: "How does the M&E system serve as a mechanism for effective intergovernmental support by DCoG to support municipalities?"

Chapter 4 (section 4.10) established a conceptual and practical interface between M&E system and intergovernmental support to municipalities. Section 4.11 concentrated on the utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities - a practical application. The main finding was that the performance data generated from the M&E system determine the type of support required by municipalities. That is, the performance information flowing from the M&E system guides the provision of technical support to municipalities.
6.2.5 **Objective 5:** To conduct empirical research on the utilisation of M&E system within the national Department of Cooperative Governance as well as determining the effectiveness of intergovernmental support to municipalities

The following research question was posed in chapter 1: "What are the current realities and practices within DCoG regarding the utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities?"

Chapter 5 (section 5.2) provided an exposition of the case, namely, Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) as it is the locus of the study. Chapter 5 (section 5.3) of the study examined the realities and practices of monitoring and evaluation within DCoG. This chapter also determined the extent to which the Department utilises M&E system in supporting municipalities (section 5.3). The extent to which DCoG utilises M&E system to support municipalities was established through the use of semi-structured interviews and questionnaires. The key findings are highlighted by section 6.4 below in this chapter.

6.2.6 **Objective 6:** To propose a comprehensive model for M&E System utilisation by the Department of Cooperative Governance to provide intergovernmental support to municipalities

A question was posed in chapter 1: "What should be included in a comprehensive model for the utilisation of the M&E system to enhance intergovernmental support to municipalities?"

In the section that follows a comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation to support municipalities is recommended.
6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS: A MODEL FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM UTILISATION TO SUPPORT MUNICIPALITIES

Stave (2003:308) regards a model as simply containing several simplifying assumptions. Barlow (2005:18) remarked in a similar vein by indicating that a model is a simplified representation of a real situation. This is consistent with the observation of Mouton and Marais (1990:143) that a model attempts to represent the dynamics of a phenomenon in that it provides a simplified indication of relations between the main elements in a process. Kriel (1995:196) further added that a model indicates the relationships that exist between the components that are researched. Vermaak (1999:207) concluded that models represent the complexity of information to an understandable appearance of reality.

Valadez and Bamberger (2000:78) made a key observation that a model can take the form of a matrix, graph, network diagram or a series of mathematical or statistical equations, among other formats. Valadez and Bamberger (2000:80) continued to observe that some of the common approaches to social modelling include process models, systems analysis and logical framework analyses. Whereas a number of different types of models exist, in this study the type of model that will be developed is the process model. This is mainly due to the qualitative and social sciences nature of the research.

Nzewi (2012:39) regards process models as simply being based on a logical sequence of planning, implementing and reviewing. Redding et al. (2008:17) provide a clearer definition by stating that process models are structured in terms of activities, events, control and data-flow dependencies and associations between activities and resources. Mahring and Keil (2008:240) added that process models focus on the sequences of events in processes and include theorising about how and why the process evolves in a certain way. Valadez and Bamberger (2000:81) explained in a similar vein that process models are simple graphic methods used to define the factors affecting the outcome of
particular project components and to assess the contribution of various factors to these outcomes.

It may be deduced from the definitions above that the most distinctive feature of a process model is its concentration on the process aspects relevant for a task at hand. A process model provides a guide through the formulation of a tailored process of change. In other words, it explicitly describes how its variables interact to produce impacts.

Plant (2008:26) argues more fundamentally from a model-building point of view and indicates that a model is not developed in isolation, but within the full context of environmental and organisational dynamics. This statement may be construed to mean that, in a research context, when constructing a model, care should be taken that such a model does not stand separate from the research findings, but it is essentially the product of the research results. These theoretical underpinnings should be included in the proposed model in line with the research results of this study. To this end, triangulation will be utilised to identify the elements (content) of the model.

6.4 ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSED M&E SYSTEM UTILISATION MODEL

In identifying the elements of the proposed M&E system utilisation model, it is key to take into account the statutory framework and theory of cooperative governance and monitoring and evaluation as highlighted in chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4 as well as the data obtained from the empirical survey conducted in chapter 5 of the study. The results derived from these chapters are critical in determining the content of the proposed model.

It was established in chapter 3 (section 3.9) of the study that the effective implementation of M&E system relies on appropriate internal institutional arrangements. That is, the utilisation of M&E requires the identification of structures and their responsibilities between the various spheres of government. These range of structures help in receiving, analysing and submitting performance information reports to other
higher structures. It was further found in chapter 2 (subsection 2.2.3) of the study that the South African government has developed policies and pieces of legislation to establish the framework for cooperative government and intergovernmental relations. It was also concluded that a relatively mature statutory and regulatory framework is thus in place in South Africa to facilitate cooperative government and intergovernmental relations.

Chapter 3 (subsection 3.8.4) highlighted the significance of drawing information gained from municipalities, sector departments and other agencies and interpreting it in the context of the national government’s strategic programme of action. Furthermore, a schematic representation of the path which data usually will follow as part of monitoring and reporting from the communities to parliament was provided. In chapter 4 (section 4:10) it was further emphasised that the performance information drawn from municipalities should guide the kinds and levels of support and interventions to be facilitated for municipalities. That is, the performance data generated from the M&E system should inform the coordination of support to municipalities in enabling them to perform their functions.

During the empirical survey, the respondents in the three spheres of government also identified the following causal conditions for the ineffective utilisation of M&E system to support municipalities (chapter 5, section 5.5).

- Monitoring and evaluation is poorly institutionalised and, as a result, a M&E system is not adequately utilised at all levels of government.
- Municipalities are not adequately capacitated on M&E systems and it is only the national and provincial government officials that fairly understand the concept.
- It is not clear whether performance information reports are analysed as feedback is not provided to municipalities.
- The provincial and national departments of COGTA and DCoG respectively are currently unable to timeously detect areas of underperformance timeously in municipalities.
• There is inadequate political oversight in municipalities regarding the achievement of the developmental objectives.

The level of intergovernmental support to municipalities was also gauged through the use of semi-structured interviews and questionnaires and the following key findings were also made (section 5.5).

• Municipalities do not receive feedback in terms of intergovernmental support that is required in areas of underperformance.
• Intergovernmental support to municipalities is inadequate, not provided timeously and not addressing appropriate challenges.

From a holistic perspective, a number of conclusions may be drawn from the discussion above. Firstly, there exist relatively adequate statutory and regulatory frameworks to facilitate cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa. That is, the practice of the system of cooperative government is fairly mature to pursue integrated and coherent government so as to achieve the objectives of the state. To this end, there are also fairly appropriate intergovernmental structures in place to fulfil the monitoring and evaluation function. Secondly, there are weaknesses within the national and provincial departments of COGTA and DCoG respectively regarding utilisation of the M&E system to support municipalities. It is these weaknesses within these spheres of government regarding utilisation of the M&E system that hamper the prospects of effective intergovernmental support to municipalities. Against this background, a comprehensive M&E system utilisation model that provides solutions on how to eradicate these weaknesses and achieve effective support to municipalities is proposed. The proposed model should be based on the basic premises that each sphere of government should have specific managerial responsibilities to fulfil and the M&E system is utilised effectively. The main purpose is to ensure effective intergovernmental support to municipalities.
Given the above results, the proposed model should consist of three main elements. These elements are the structures and their responsibilities in the national, provincial and local spheres, gathering and flow of performance information and providing support to municipalities. A process model will therefore be suitable in identifying the structures and presenting how M&E system utilisation will be implemented within these structures to support municipalities. The new M&E system utilisation model will also be discussed chronologically as it could occur within the various spheres of government. A comprehensive M&E system utilisation model to support municipalities should implement the three elements as they are interrelated and interdependent. Any other department can utilise the model by adapting it to suit its requirements. The model provides a reference point against which any institution can consider its own practice and identify areas for improvement in terms of process and outcomes.

Figure 6.1 below illustrates the proposed comprehensive model for M&E system utilisation to support municipalities, after which each element is discussed in more detail.
Figure 6.1: A comprehensive model for Monitoring and Evaluation system utilisation to support municipalities
As can be seen from Figure 6.1 above, the M&E system utilisation model is divided into macro-, meso- and micro-levels. The macro-, meso- and micro-levels represent the national, provincial and local spheres of government respectively. In the following subsections, each element of the model is discussed within these three levels. The purpose is to clarify the context of the model.

(A) Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG)

The Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) is responsible for the following:

- **Develop national policies and legislation** - The Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) has the responsibility to monitor the performance and support the provinces and local government. It should therefore embark on processes to developing new legislative solutions to the identified challenges hampering provinces and municipalities in achieving their developmental objectives. For example, it was highlighted in chapter 5 (section 5.2) that the Department has in this respect introduced the Monitoring, Support and Intervention Bill, 2012 in the National Assembly. The main objective is to strengthen the Department in monitoring and supporting the provinces and municipalities.

- **Assess the overall achievement of the national development objectives** - It was explained in chapter 4 (subsection 4.7.1) that at national sphere, sector departments give effect to the Government Programme of Action (GPoA) in the short-term. To this end, DCoG should take responsibility for the assessment of local government contribution towards achieving the identified national objectives.

- **Define and coordinate the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy** - DCoG should describe the approach the institution is to follow to create and
operate its M&E system that produce credible, accurate information on an ongoing basis. For example, its M&E strategy will outline how the M&E findings may inform strategic and operational planning, budget formulation and execution as well as in-year and annual reporting. That is, M&E should be integrated with other management processes. It should further describe the purpose of the M&E system, the data the system will collect and how the system will operate. The strategy should also include the list of indicators to be measured.

- **Supervise the M&E system** - It was emphasised in chapter 3 (section 3.5) that the specific M&E system envisaged in this study is that which can facilitate the flow of comprehensive performance information between municipalities and DCoG. The system that further establishes procedures and systems for the utilisation of such information to improve intergovernmental support to municipalities. In this context, DCoG should therefore supervise the M&E system. Its supervision should include developing a standard performance reporting template on performance of municipalities and determining the timelines for submission of performance reports.

- **Ensure capacity and allocate resources** - The capacity and resources need to be strengthened by DCoG so as to enable it to effectively fulfil its mandate. For example, it was discovered from the empirical data of this study that shortage of skilled personnel is one of the constraints that hamper both COGTA and DCoG to effectively utilise the M&E system. DCoG should therefore ensure that there is adequate capacity and resources within itself and COGTA for the effective utilisation of M&E system.

- **Promote and foster interlinking role of the spheres of government** - The utilisation of a M&E system to support municipalities is dependent on effective intergovernmental relationships between the three spheres of government. It is therefore imperative that DCoG plays a role of ensuring that the spheres of government are able to effectively interlink on the vertical and horizontal levels.
Interlinking on a horizontal level entails effective communication and cooperation between the provincial and local spheres of government. Interlinking on a horizontal level means effective communication between different national government departments, between provincial governments and between local authorities.

(B)  **Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA)**

The responsibilities of the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) are as follows:

- **Consolidate and disseminate performance information of municipalities** - The various provincial Departments of COGTA will consolidate the quarterly reports received from municipalities in their respective provinces into a provincial report and forward such report to DCoG. Additionally and as indicated in chapter 4 (subsection 4.14.2), this Department will also align with the national DCoG's approach and similarly undertake the applicable actions at a provincial sphere.

  As indicated above, these actions include:
  - Assessing the overall achievement of the national development objectives.
  - Defining and coordinating the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy.
  - Supervising the M&E system.
  - Ensuring capacity and allocating resources.

(C)  **Municipalities**

The key responsibilities of municipalities will be the following:

- **Capture performance information** - The data to be collected will be captured at the local municipal sphere. In other words, each local municipality will ensure that the performance information reporting template is populated with
performance information. Municipalities will therefore serve as a point of data collection.

- **Consolidate and submit performance information** - A performance information report of the local municipalities in the district will be consolidated and submitted by the district municipality to the provincial COGTA.

(D) **National, Provincial and District Monitoring and Evaluation Fora**

The responsibilities that the national Forum will fulfil at national level include the following:

- **Ensure participation of the national sector departments and other stakeholders** - The forum will ensure participation of the national sector departments, provinces (Offices of the Premiers, provincial Departments of COGTA), state owned entities and other key stakeholders such as the South African Local Government Association (SALGA). As was emphasised in Chapter 3 (section 3.9), participation at this level will mean that the sector departments and other stakeholders are able to share information and experiences.

- **Validate information** - A number of national departments have responsibilities over the functional areas in respect of which municipalities are providing performance information reports. The Forum, therefore, serves as a platform for such departments to validate the performance information provided by municipalities. The provincial and district fora will fulfil similar responsibilities at provincial and district levels.

(E) **National and Provincial Intervention Units**

The main responsibilities of the national Intervention Unit are as follows:
- **Analyse performance reports of municipalities** - The Unit will analyse the performance reports so as to profile municipalities for differing, remedial support. The Unit will further embark on rapid responses and interventions in municipalities that will be informed by the findings from the performance reports.

- **Identify responsible sector departments and coordinate support to municipalities** - The line units in the national departments have responsibilities over the functional areas for which municipalities could be underperforming. They are also ultimately accountable for monitoring and supporting municipalities in their respective areas. The Unit will be responsible to identify, based on the performance reports, the responsible department(s) and coordinate their support to the identified municipalities. The provincial Intervention Unit will fulfil similar activities at the provincial level.

### 6.4.1 The gathering and flow of performance information

This element of the model describes the collection and path which data could follow within the M&E system. It is imperative that this element places strong emphasis on "process" as the collection, flow, analysis of data will be operated as a continuous process within the micro-, meso- and macro- levels of the model. This element should also be where the bulk of the resources, time and activity are invested as it is critical that the performance information collected is reliable.

As explained above in this chapter (subsection 6.4.1), DCoG will define and coordinate the monitoring and evaluation strategy. It was also pointed out in chapter 4 (section 4.11) that DCoG has developed a set of general key performance indicators that address the reporting requirements for municipalities at national level. The Department has further developed and integrated a reporting template against which reporting on indicators by municipalities is done.
In the above context, data will be collected at the level of the local municipalities. That is, the integrated reporting template will be populated by the local municipalities in each district municipal area. A consolidated performance report will then be submitted quarterly by each district municipality to the department of COGTA in the province and other structures such as the M&E forum in the district. The various provincial departments of COGTA will also consolidate the performance reports received from the district municipalities into a provincial quarterly performance report and forward it to the DCoG, the M&E forum and Intervention Unit in their respective provinces.

6.4.2 Providing support to municipalities

The focus of this element of the model is twofold. Firstly, the element seeks to ensure effective utilisation of performance information received from municipalities so as to support them in performing their core service delivery functions. Secondly, it further ensures that intergovernmental support to municipalities is channelled to where it is most needed and will best accomplish service delivery priorities in municipalities.

Taking into account the above considerations, the performance information emanating from the performance reports of municipalities will determine the type and level of support to be facilitated for the underperforming municipalities. It is key to indicate that whereas the kind of support that may be required by municipalities is, from time to time, determined from the performance reports, it may include strengthening the capacity of municipalities in the areas of finance, human resource, governance and infrastructure.

The performance information will further assist the Intervention units in identifying the national and provincial departments responsible for the functional areas in respect of which municipalities require support. In this way, the Units will also help in establishing a single window and entry point for the coordination of intergovernmental support to municipalities.
From the above discussion of the three elements, it can be seen that they have interlinking relationships and each contributes to the final outcome of the model. Firstly, the structures that are set up across the spheres of government promote the use of performance information. Secondly, continuous gathering and flow of performance information takes place within the identified structures. Thirdly, the performance information that is received and analysed assists to design and implement targeted support and appropriate interventions in areas of underperformance within municipalities. Furthermore, it is key that the identification of structures and their responsibilities in the three spheres of government, gathering and flow of performance information and providing support to municipalities occur in a continuous cycle to ensure the successful implementation of the model.

6.5 CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE MODEL

Based on the literature and research findings of this study, the successful implementation of the M&E system utilisation model to support municipalities, relies on the following factors:

6.5.1 Adequate human resource capacity - This M&E system utilisation model may not be utilised effectively without skilled personnel who effectively execute M&E tasks for which they are responsible. Therefore, understanding the skills needed and capacity of people involved in the M&E system (undertaking human capacity assessments) and addressing capacity gaps (through structured capacity development programmes) are critical for M&E system utilisation model. In chapter 3 (subsection 3.5) the issue of human capacity for M&E systems was discussed. For example, it was emphasised that it is key to ensure that there are adequately skilled monitoring and evaluation staff who can effectively and efficiently complete all activities defined in the monitoring and evaluation work plan.
6.5.2 Stakeholders - A M&E system only serves its purpose adequately when the system is accepted by all those who bear certain responsibilities in it or require information from it. Therefore, it is key to ensure participation of the stakeholders during the development of a M&E system. If the system is created on the basis of a participating approach, then those who made contributions in building the system are likely to take ownership and therefore support it. In chapter 3 (section 3.5) it was highlighted that it is critical to establish and maintain partnerships with internal and external stakeholders so as to strengthen the M&E system.

6.5.3 Organisational culture - A negative organisational culture with respect to data management and information dissemination may make it difficult for the M&E system utilisation model to be effective. The culture of the organisation should therefore be taken into account so as to achieve effective implementation of the model. Chapter 3 (section 3.5) elucidated the fact that databases which enable stakeholders to access relevant data be developed and maintained. In this way policy formulation and programme management are improved and organisational culture is enhanced.

6.5.4 Sufficient authority - It is key for an institution at each sphere of government to create a senior post to lead the M&E unit. This gives the M&E unit sufficient authority and its findings may influence public decision making, policy changers and resource allocation. In this way, effective implementation of the model could be achieved.

6.6 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study concentrated mainly on coordinating support to municipalities from the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG), Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) and other sector departments. However, the challenges confronting municipalities are complex and may not be resolved by the
Government alone without the involvement of the private sector and other actors such as community-based organisations, non-governmental organisations and public entities. Despite assertions about cooperative government, there are challenges of cooperation and support to municipalities that include intergovernmental fiscal relations, section 139 of the Constitution interventions and shortage of skilled personnel in the Public Service.

The national sphere of government in South Africa holds vastly more financial power than the provincial and local spheres. The current revenue assignment allocates a disproportionate share of revenue to the national government (Khan et al. 2011:91). While this is the norm in a unitary system of government discussed in chapter 2 (subsection 2.2.2), it presents complexities in a country such as South Africa. The challenges that it presents include the fact that implementation of significant number of programmes happens in municipalities without the accompanying financial means. In other words, there is a mismatch between the revenue-raising sources of municipalities and their service delivery obligations. Conditional grants from the national government to local government, which are another element of intergovernmental fiscal relations, have also some weaknesses. The weaknesses include the fact that in many instances such funds remain unspent. The evidence provided suggests that a significant proportion of underspending may be resulting from the late transfers of funds from the national government. It may further be resulting from poor coordination between provincial line departments and municipalities.

Sections 139 of the Constitution, 1996 and 30 of the Monitoring, Support and Intervention Bill, 2012 respectively provide for provincial government intervention in municipalities. That is, the provincial executive may intervene in the affairs of a municipality when a municipality cannot or does not fulfil an executive obligation. The intervention includes assumption of municipal responsibilities or dissolution of municipal council by the provincial government. Nonetheless, Carrim (2010:1) laments the fact that the provincial governments are currently intervening when a municipality is teetering on the brink of collapse in respect of service delivery. The Local Government Turnaround Strategy (2009:27) issued by the former national Department of
Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs indicate that it may be necessary to review current practices and allow for "early-warning" systems in respect of municipal failures and provide for sharper and more preventative interventions.

A number of challenges relating to the complexities of support to municipalities is further heightened by the fact that there is shortage of skilled personnel in the Public Service defined in chapter 3 (section 3.2). While there may be sufficient number of personnel employed, many of the individuals in the sector lack the critical skills, knowledge and experience to ensure effective delivery of services to communities. This challenge of shortage of skilled personnel in the Public Service is reflected particularly at the point of service delivery in local government. For example, in chapter 5 (subsection 5.5.2) of this study the respondents listed shortage of skilled personnel in the provincial departments of COGTA as one of the constraints hampering these Departments to support municipalities effectively. That is, the shortage of skilled personnel in the provincial departments of COGTA has resulted in the Departments' inadequate support to municipalities.

Given the examples of the challenges regarding cooperation and support to municipalities in the above discussion, the private sector and other actors such as community-based organisations, non-governmental organisations and public entities should take a more active role in supporting municipalities. Further research is recommended on the possible systematic coordination of support to municipalities in South Africa from the private sector and civil society organisations. The purpose is to ensure that municipalities achieve the developmental objectives and serve citizens more effectively and efficiently.

6.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter provided an account of how the research objectives and research questions proposed in Chapter 1 of the study were realised and answered. Subsequently, the statutory framework, literature review and research findings derived
from chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were used to explore the elements (context) of the proposed model. To this end, the elements of the proposed model were identified and a new model was presented. Before providing a recommendation for further research, the critical success factors for the implementation of a comprehensive model were highlighted.
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ANNEXURE A

Monitoring and Evaluation System utilisation for municipal support

Officials of the Department of Cooperative Governance

(Questionnaire A)

Kindly take note that the information obtained through this questionnaire will be used only for research purposes and no names or any identifying data regarding the participant will be revealed. Furthermore, participation is voluntary.

SECTION A

Biographical Information

A1 Your current position? ________________________________

A2 Number of years in current position? _________________

A3 How long have you been working for the national Department of Cooperative Government (DCoG)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>11 – 20 years</td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SECTION B:

Municipal Support

B1. How effective do you regard the current system of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa in terms of strengthening the intergovernmental support to municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td>Effective to a moderate extent</td>
<td>Effective to a great extent</td>
<td>Fully effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain:

B2. How effective do you regard the statutory and regulatory frameworks for national and provincial government support in enabling local government to achieve its developmental objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td>Effective to a moderate extent</td>
<td>Effective to a great extent</td>
<td>Fully effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate why you say so:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

B3 Do you think that the national Department of Cooperative Governance and provincial departments of COGTA constantly monitor and review the progress made by municipalities in achieving their developmental objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Less than 50% of the cases</td>
<td>50-75% of the cases</td>
<td>More than 75% of the cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

B4 Over the last five (5) years, how would you describe the support of the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG to municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved significantly</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>Worsened</td>
<td>Worsened significantly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please justify your answer and, if possible, provide some examples of support or lack thereof by the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG:

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

B5  Rate the overall effectiveness of the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG in providing support to municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally ineffective</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Extremely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain:

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

B6  List any constraint(s) that are, according to you, hampering the national and provincial departments of COGTA to effectively support municipalities.

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________
SECTION C

Monitoring and Evaluation System

Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree with each of the following statements.

C1 I believe that the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should utilise the M&E system to support municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

C2 The M&E system for utilisation by the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to support municipalities should be designed in a manner that takes into account the fact that municipalities have different capacities and varying social and economic contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C3  I think that the managers in the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) have sufficient knowledge to utilise the M&E system as a mechanism to support municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please substantiate:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

C4  The data that will be generated through the M&E system of the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should inform the type of support required by municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
C5 The utilisation of the M&E system by the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to support municipalities would be effective when it takes into account the monitoring and support responsibilities of other provincial and national departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C6 The M&E system should enable the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to detect early indicators of underperformance by municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please elaborate:


C7 The performance indicators incorporated in the M&E system of the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should be agreed upon with municipalities?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain:


C8 List what you consider to be the key challenges for the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to utilise the M&E system to support municipalities:


THANK YOU!
ANNEXURE B

Monitoring and Evaluation System utilisation for municipal support.

Officials of the Provincial Department of Cooperative Governance and
Traditional Affairs

(Questionnaire B)

Kindly take note that the information obtained through this questionnaire will be
used only for research purposes and no names or any identifying data regarding
the participant will be revealed. Furthermore, participation is voluntary.

SECTION A:
Biographical Information

A1 Your current position? ________________________________

A2 Number of years in current position? __________________

A3 How long have you been working for the provincial Department of
Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>11 – 20 years</td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION B:

Departmental Information

B1. In which province is your Department situated?

|---|----------------|---------------|------------|------------------|------------|

SECTION C:

Municipal Support

C1. How effective do you regard the current system of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa in terms of strengthening the intergovernmental support to municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td>Effective to a moderate extent</td>
<td>Effective to a great extent</td>
<td>Fully effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C2. How effective do you regard the statutory and regulatory frameworks for provincial and national government support in enabling local government to achieve its developmental objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td>Effective to a moderate extent</td>
<td>Effective to a great extent</td>
<td>Fully effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate why you say so:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

C3. Do you think that the national Departments of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) and provincial Departments of COGTA constantly monitor and review the progress made by municipalities in achieving their developmental objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Less than 50% of the cases</td>
<td>50-75% of the cases</td>
<td>More than 75% of the cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate why you say so:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Please elaborate:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

C4 Over the last five (5) years, how would you describe the support of the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG to municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved significantly</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>Worsened</td>
<td>Worsened significantly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please justify your answer and, if possible, provide some examples of support or lack thereof by the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

C5 Rate the overall effectiveness of the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG in providing support to municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally ineffective</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Extremely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please explain:

_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

C6 List any constraint(s) that are, according to you, hampering the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG to effectively support municipalities.

_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

SECTION D

Monitoring and Evaluation System

Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree with each of the following statements

D1 I believe that the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should utilise the M&E system to support municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The M&E system for utilisation by the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to support municipalities should be designed in a manner that takes into account the fact that municipalities have different capacities and varying social and economic contexts.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Agree} & \text{Disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

I think that the managers in the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) have sufficient knowledge to utilise the M&E system as a mechanism to support municipalities.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Agree} & \text{Disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
The data that will be generated through the M&E system of the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should inform the type of support required by municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please justify:


The utilisation of the M&E system by the Department of Cooperative Governance to support municipalities would be effective when it takes into account the monitoring and support responsibilities of other provincial and national departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please explain:

D6  The M&E system should enable the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to detect early indicators of underperformance by municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate:

D7  The performance indicators incorporated in the M&E system of the Department of Cooperative (DCoG) should be agreed upon with municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please explain:

____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________

D8 List what you consider to be the key challenges for the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to utilise the M&E system to support municipalities:

____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
ANNEXURE C

Monitoring and Evaluation System utilisation for municipal support.

Municipal Officials (Questionnaire C)

Kindly take note that the information obtained through this questionnaire will be used only for research purposes and no names or any identifying data regarding the participant will be revealed. Furthermore, participation is voluntary.

SECTION A

Biographical Information

A1 Your current position? ________________________________

A2 Number of years in current position? _________________

A3 How long have you been working for the municipality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>11 – 20 years</td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION B:

Municipal Information

B1 Name of Local Municipality? ________________________________

B2 Classification of the Local Municipality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1:</td>
<td>Class 2:</td>
<td>Class 3:</td>
<td>Class 4:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>High vulnerability</td>
<td>Medium vulnerability</td>
<td>Low vulnerability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B3** In which province is your municipality situated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern Cape</th>
<th>Free State</th>
<th>Gauteng</th>
<th>KwaZulu-Natal</th>
<th>Limpopo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>North West</td>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION C:**

**Municipal Support**

**C1** How effective do you regard the current system of cooperative government and intergovernmental relations in South Africa in terms of strengthening the intergovernmental support to municipalities?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td>Effective to a moderate extent</td>
<td>Effective to a great extent</td>
<td>Fully effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C2. How effective do you regard the statutory and regulatory frameworks for national and provincial government support in enabling local government to achieve its developmental objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td>Effective to a moderate extent</td>
<td>Effective to a great extent</td>
<td>Fully effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate why you say so:

C3. Do you think that the national Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) and provincial Departments of COGTA constantly monitor and review the progress made by municipalities in achieving their developmental objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Less than 50% of the cases</td>
<td>50-75% of the cases</td>
<td>More than 75% of the cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please elaborate:

_________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

C4 Over the last five (5) years, how would you describe the support of the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG to municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved significantly</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>Worsened</td>
<td>Worsened significantly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please justify your answer and, if possible, provide some examples of support or lack thereof by the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG:

_________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

C5 Rate the overall effectiveness of the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG in providing support to municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totally ineffective</td>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Extremely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please explain:

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

C6 List any constraint(s) that are, according to you, hampering the provincial Departments of COGTA and DCoG to effectively support municipalities.

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________

SECTION D

Monitoring and Evaluation System

Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree with each of the following statements.

D1 I believe that the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should utilise the M&E system to support municipalities.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D2 The M&E system for utilisation by the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to support municipalities should be designed in a manner that takes into account the fact that municipalities have different capacities and varying social and economic contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate:


D3 I think that the managers in the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) have sufficient knowledge to utilise the M&E system as a mechanism to support municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please substantiate:
D4  The data that will be generated through the M&E system of the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should inform the type of support required by municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please justify:

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

D5  The utilisation of the M&E system by the Department of Cooperative Governance to support municipalities would be effective when it takes into account the monitoring and support responsibilities of other provincial and national departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please explain: 

D6 The M&E system should enable the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to detect early indicators of underperformance by municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate:

D7 The performance indicators incorporated in the M&E system of the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) should be agreed upon with municipalities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please explain:

_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________

D8 List what you consider to be the key challenges for the Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG) to utilise the M&E system to support municipalities:

_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________