

SECTION I

FRAMEWORK FOR THE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

1. Introduction

1.1 Strategic Objectives of a Performance Management System

South Africa, more specifically Buffalo City, continues to endure the legacy of under-development, poverty, infrastructure backlogs and inequitable access to basic services. In response to these, government is putting in place various mechanisms and measures to turn the situation around.

In the local government context, a comprehensive and elaborate system of monitoring performance of municipalities has been legislated. The system is intended to continuously monitor the performance of municipalities in fulfilling their developmental mandate. Central to the system is the development of key performance indicators as instruments to assess performance. The indicators help to translate complex socio-economic development challenges into quantifiable and measurable outputs. They are therefore crucial if a proper assessment is to be done of the impact of government in improving the quality of life of all.

As noted above, Buffalo City Municipality's process of institutionalising performance management has been a key informant to the IDP Review 2006.

In this regard, the Municipal Planning and Performance Management Regulations (2001) stipulate that a "Municipality's Performance Management System entails a framework that describes and represents how the municipality's cycle and processes of performance planning, monitoring, measurement, review and reporting and improvement will be conducted, organized and managed, including determining the roles of the different role players" (Chapter 3, Section 7, Municipal Planning and Performance Management Regulations, 2001).

1.2 Policies and Legislative Framework for Performance Management

The framework for Performance Management is informed by the following policy and legislation on performance management:

- The Constitution of the RSA, 1996 (Act 108 of 1996)
- The Batho Pele White Paper (1998)
- The White Paper on Local Government (1998)
- The Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000)
- Municipal Planning and Performance Management Regulations 2001(No 796, 24 August 2001)
- Regulations for Municipal Managers and Managers reporting directly to Municipal Managers, 1 August 2006
- The Local Government : Municipal Structures Act, 1998 (Act 117 of 1998)
- The Municipal Financial Management Act , 2003 (Act 66 of 2003)

The Municipal Systems Act, No. 32 of 2000, states that a Municipality must:

1. Develop a Performance Management System.
2. Set targets, monitor and review performance based on indicators linked to their Integrated Development Plan (IDP).
3. Publish an Annual Report on performance for the Councillors, staff, the public and other spheres of Government.
4. Conduct an internal audit of performance before tabling the report.
5. Have their annual performance report audited by the Auditor-General.
6. Involve the community in setting indicators and targets and reviewing municipal performance.

The Local Government: Municipal Planning and Performance Management Regulations, 2001, Section 7(2) require that the Municipality, in developing its Performance Management System, must ensure that the system:

1. Complies with all the requirements set out in the Municipal Systems Act;
2. Demonstrates how it is to operate and be managed from the planning stage up to the stages of performance review and reporting;
3. Clarifies the roles and responsibilities of each role player, including the local community, in the functioning of the system;
4. Clarifies the processes of implementing the system within the framework of the Integrated Development Planning process;
5. Determines the frequency of reporting and the lines of accountability for performance;
6. Relates to the Municipality's Employee Performance Management processes.

Furthermore, Section 43 of the Systems Act authorises the Minister to prescribe general KPIs that every municipality must report on. Regulation 5(1) mentions the following general KPIs:

1. The percentage of households with access to basic level of water, sanitation, electricity and solid waste removal.
2. The percentage of households earning less than R1100-00 per month with access to free basic services.
3. The percentage of the Municipality's capital budget actually spent on capital projects in terms of the IDP.
4. The number of local jobs created through the Municipality's local, economic development initiatives, including capital projects.
5. The number of people from employment equity target groups employed in the three highest levels of management in compliance with a Municipality's approved employment equity plan.
6. The percentage of a Municipality's budget actually spent on implementing its workplace skills plan.
7. Financial viability with respect to debt coverage; outstanding debtors in relation to revenue and cost coverage.

The objective of institutionalising a Performance Management System (PMS), beyond the fulfilling of legislative requirements, is to serve as a primary mechanism to monitor, review and improve the implementation of the Municipality's IDP. In doing so, it should fulfil the following functions:

- Promoting accountability
- Decision-making and resource allocation
- Guiding development of municipal capacity-building programmes
- Creating a culture of best practice, share learning among Municipalities
- Develop meaningful intervention mechanisms and early warning system
- Create pressure for change at various levels
- Contribute to the overall development of a Local Government system

The Municipal Financial Management Act

It is also important to note that the Municipal Finance Management Act (MFMA) contains various important provisions related to municipal performance management. It requires municipalities to annually adopt a Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan (SDBIP)

with service delivery targets and performance indicators. Whilst considering and approving the annual budget the Municipality must also set measurable performance targets for each revenue source and vote.

2. THE MUNICIPAL SCORECARD

A number of performance models are available and any of them could be applied by the Buffalo City Municipality. Some of the available models include the Municipal Scorecard, Balanced Scorecard and the Key Performance Area Model. However, the Municipality has chosen the Municipal Scorecard (MS) as its preferred performance management model. In terms of the MS model all indicators are grouped together into four perspectives as depicted in the figure below e.g. inputs, process, outputs and outcomes.



Figure I.1: Municipal Scorecard

It is important to note that the Municipal Scorecard model assumes the following cause-and-effect hypothesis based on an open-systems theory by which inputs are used through process to develop or deliver, in this case products and services which eventually would benefit the community as a whole. This cause and effect relationship is depicted schematically in Figure I.1 & I.2.




Figure I.2: A Systems Approach

2.1 THE CAUSAL EFFECT

The value-add of a framework is that it gives guidance to the integrating process of performance objectives and indicators at the different levels within an institution. A major issue of resistance to performance management within municipalities is usually the argument of individual control, by implication the individual is hesitant to commit to certain indicators as he or she has little control over the outcome or ultimate achievement of a relevant performance objective and indicator. The MS model is one of the few models which accommodate this area of contention as it allows for the clear demarcation of accountability. The Diagramme explains the causal relationship starting from the bottom to the level of outcomes at the top.




Figure I.3: Municipal Scorecard: Cause & Effect

It should be clear from the above that the senior employee is accountable for all three levels which feed into the outcomes to be achieved and which should be under the control of the municipality. The Municipal and/or Institutional Scorecard should therefore have a healthy balance of indicators clustered into the different categories of inputs, process, outputs and outcomes. The emphasis should be placed on outputs because these indicators directly reflect the results of the indicators achieved through input and process.

3. Scorecards

A Scorecard is a logical and visually powerful method of representing performance management information, at both the Organizational/Institutional (Municipal and Directorate) and Individual (Manager and Employee) levels.

Scorecards must be:

1. Tightly aligned to the strategic planning and IDP processes.
2. Directly relevant to the notion of developmental local government.
3. A balanced view of performance based on inputs, outputs, outcomes and process.
4. A simple portrayal of municipal performance, where inter-relations can be mapped.

There are two levels of scorecards for BCM, i.e. the Institutional and Individual Scorecards.

3.1 Institutional Scorecard

BCM has an Institutional Scorecard adopted by BCM council on 4 September 2006. r which reflects its 6 strategic priorities; namely:

KEY ISSUES	BCM KEY OBJECTIVES
<i>Buffalo City lacks a clearly defined long-term development strategy, which negatively impacts on the ability of BCM & Buffalo City stakeholders to work towards the achievement of Buffalo City's vision.</i>	BCM1 Local, Provincial & National stakeholders support and work together to achieve the vision for Buffalo City
<i>The sustainability of BCM is dependent on expanding its revenue in relation to costs and its financial viability, whilst implementing its mandate.</i>	BCM2 Effective, efficient, co-ordinated financial management and increased revenue - enabling BCM to deliver its mandate*.
<i>Inefficiencies exist within the institution, which compromise BCM's ability to deliver services.</i>	BCM3 BCM's institution is capacitated and structured to enable efficient, effective, and sustainable service delivery.
<i>Low economic growth, high unemployment, low skills levels, high levels of poverty and high inequality exist within BCM.</i>	BCM4 BCM creates an enabling environment for an economy that is growing, diversifying, generating increasing number of sustainable employment opportunities and contributing to increased incomes and equality.
<i>Whilst BCM delivers basic services (water, sanitation, waste removal & electricity) to about 70% of households, many households still lack adequate transport, social services, economic opportunities & an enriching environment.</i>	BCM5 Buffalo City is well structured, efficient and supports sustainable human settlements, thus enabling residents to meet their physical, social, developmental, environmental, cultural & psychological needs. (live, work & play)
<i>Lack of sustainable development and inappropriate use of resources has a harmful impact on the health and well-being of present and future generations of BCM.</i>	BCM6 BCM has a safe, healthy and sustainable environment protected for the benefit of present and future generations through securing ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources, whilst promoting justifiable social and economic development.

At institutional level the five-year IDP of a municipality forms the basis for performance management, whilst at operational level the annual SDBIP forms the basis. The IDP is a long-term plan and by its nature the performance measures associated with it will have a long-term focus, measuring whether a municipality is achieving its IDP objectives.

The measures set for the Municipality at institutional level is captured in an **institutional scorecard** structured in terms of the preferred performance management model of the Municipality (see next section). The measures at operational level are to be captured in the SDBIP of the Municipality and the SDBIPs of the various Departments in the Municipality.

3.2 Individual Scorecards

Individual Performance Management System (IPMS)

Individual or staff Performance Management deals with **performance on the level of the individual employee**. Individual performance targets are also formulated during this business planning process referred to in section 8.2. Measuring staff performance provides Council and management with appropriate information on the behaviour of staff and outcomes in the workplace. Reviewing staff performance at regular intervals will provide the Council and management with appropriate information on performance gaps or excellence.

By cascading performance measures from strategic to operational level, both the IDP and the SDBIP, forms the link to individual performance management. This ensures that performance management at the various levels relate to one another which is a requirement of the Municipal Planning and Performance Regulations and the MFMA. The MFMA specifically requires that the annual performance agreements of managers must be linked to the SDBIP of a municipality and the measurable performance objectives approved with the budget (circular 13 of the MFMA). The SDBIP in essence becomes the main operational tool to translate and manage the performance objectives as formulated in the IDP. This process is illustrated by the diagramme below and as described in circular 13.




Figure I.4: SDBIP as a Management Tool

4. South African Excellence Foundation

As a process of benchmarking the municipality against best practises to ensure excellence and service delivery the South African Excellence Foundation will be used. The South African Excellence Model provides a systems' perspective for understanding Performance Management. The model is a non-prescriptive framework based on eleven criteria reflecting validating, leading-edge management practices.




Figure I.5: The South African Excellence Model