

Performance Management

The Problem

With formulation of the Vision 20:2020 Economic Transformation Blueprint in 2009 and the development of the 1st National Implementation Plan (1st NIP) (2010 -2013) and the Transformation Agenda (TA) (2011-2015), the role of the public service and the machinery of government in the achievement of the vision's strategic objectives and pillars became glaring. Due to the time lag between this national development blueprint and its predecessor, the public service performance culture was weakened and it lacked a results-based framework or mechanism to measure or manage institutional and individual performance. The Annual Performance Evaluation Report (APER) - a performance appraisal tool used to measure individual performance in the MDAs - is deemed unreliable and inadequate as a performance management and service delivery improvement tool, due to the lack of integrity of its output. Specifically, APER is widely perceived to possess some negative characteristic as following:

1. Supervising officers seldom rate subordinates' work delivery objectively
2. The prevalence of an over-accommodating/comradeship culture in the civil service
3. The parameters measured in the appraisal tool are not on standards relevant to the achievement of the MDA's goals or tangible service delivery to the citizens.
4. Although promotion examinations were introduced to address the inadequacies of the APER tool, it also proved to be an ineffective and unreliable method of determining the suitability of officers for promotion. The need therefore to measure performance from the highest implementing level and distil this to the individual level is essential to ensure that performance is aligned to the country's plans and ultimately the national vision.

Reform Actions

In 2009, a performance management training workshop covering the following topics was organised by the Office of the Head of the Civil Service of the Federation (OHCSF):

1. Setting standards
2. Target setting
3. Monitoring and evaluation
4. Remedial action

The OHCSF subsequently rolled out a performance management system in 2012 with the following objectives:

1. Facilitate the measurement of MDAs performance in a fair, objective, and comprehensive manner
2. Create a results-oriented public service delivery mechanism
3. Promote transparency and accountability in governance through public display of performance results measured against performance contract commitments of the MDAs

4. Promote responsiveness of the MDAs through the design of its Service Delivery Charter and then hold the MDAs accountable for implementing its charter
5. Transforming administration with the development of a MDA-specific strategic plan to define the direction it wants to take within a defined timeframe
6. Increase efficiency and focus resources on the attainment of key national policy priorities
7. Institutionalise performance-oriented culture in the public service through introduction of an objective performance appraisal system for staff

The OHCSF inaugurated an integrated performance management system comprising an institutional and individual framework and established a new the Performance Management System (PMS) department to drive the introduction and institutionalisation of the PMS in the federal civil service.

In a related development, in 2010 the National Monitoring and Evaluation Department was established in National Planning Commission (NPC). This department in conjunction with MDAs developed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to track the performance of ministries and agencies. These KPIs formed the basis of the ministerial performance contracts. Again, in 2010, the Commission prepared the first annual performance monitoring and evaluation report and subsequently published the 2011 annual report.

The signing of the performance contracts by the President and all his ministers and other strategic public officials in August 2012 commenced the implementation of the Performance Management System. Subsequently ministers were required to sign cascaded versions of this contract with permanent secretaries and permanent secretaries with directors, chief executives of parastatals as well as all officers in the ministry. These performance contracts are monitoring and evaluation tools aimed at measuring the performance and level of service delivery of public officers and civil servants from the institutional to the individual level starting with ministers, permanent secretaries, heads of non-ministerial departments, agencies and parastatals and all civil servants. Ministerial performance contracts can be reviewed biannually to stimulate improvements in service delivery by public institutions and to assist the presidency with the tracking of government officials' performance against key performance indicators and timelines.

In 2013 the activities of the three key stakeholders in institutionalising and improving the PMS in the Federal Civil Service, Office of the Head of the Civil Service of the Federation (OHCSF), Federal Civil Service Commission (FCSC), and the National Population Commission (NPC) were harmonised through the establishment of the Presidential Tripartite Committee. This committee is responsible for the development and integration of PMS tools, templates, and the roll out of performance management system in the federal civil service.

Main Achievements

1. The development of a consolidated performance management system comprised of institutional and individual performance management components. The achievement of the performance management system objectives will improve transparency of governance, improve accountability of leadership and managers, enhance professionalism, reduce the cost of governance and increase efficiency in service delivery.
2. When the PMS is fully implemented performance contracts of each public and civil servant will be based on the current planning document (such as the Transformation Agenda and the 2nd National Implementation Plan (NIP)), making it easier to measure

progress towards the achievement of the vision and identify challenges in implementation.

3. The establishment of the Presidential Tripartite Committee ensures a concerted roll-out of the PMS by all stakeholders.
4. The development and review of KPIs with the MDAs will ensure tracking of MDAs' performance objectively.
5. The signing of performance contract agreements between the President, ministers, and strategic officers has impelled regular reporting of performance by ministers and strategic officers at the Federal Executive Council (FEC). This has exposed public officials to greater presidential scrutiny and fostered a higher degree of accountability to the President and the citizenry.
6. Already the performance management system has been validated and a draft memo is ready for submission to FEC for approval and implementation of the PMS. The implementation is to commence in October 2014 in phases.
7. To ensure that the gains of performance contracting at ministerial level is cascaded at all levels, in 2013 a tripartite committee made up of representatives of the three key stakeholders – Office of the Head of Civil Service of the Federation (OHCSF); Federal Civil Service Commission (FCSC); and National Planning Commission (NPC) was inaugurated to jointly develop and propose a roadmap for the implementation of an effective and harmonised Performance Management System (PMS) for the Federal Public Service. The Committee subsequently produced a single harmonised integrated Performance Management System with tools and templates as well as an implementation strategy for PMS to commence in October 2014.

Key Challenges

The slow pace of installing the PMS creates the perception that implementation has not progressed beyond the signing of performance contract agreement. Some of the challenges encountered in the implementation of the PMS include:

1. *Lack of a legal framework for the performance contracts:* The institutionalisation of the PMS is threatened by its current lack of legal backing though it has political backing from the President.
2. *The prevalent work ethics of civil servants and political leadership:* A system is only as good as the people running it and in this case the level of professionalism in the civil service can be a major obstacle to the implementation and entrenchment of the system.
3. *Inadequate target-setting capacity:* There is a dire need to build capacity across board within the MDAs so as to reduce subjectivity in appraisals
4. *Weak linkage between plans and budget:* The main anchor for any performance contract system is the availability of a viable plan to ensure it is targeted appropriately. However the weak linkage of plans particularly in MDAs needs to be addressed.
5. *Inadequate information and data systems:* Lack of sufficient data on key performance areas is probably the most significant technical issue for the performance contract. Performance contracts are data reliant and the availability of quality data is essential to quantify the level of achievement or achievement of contractually agreed terms.
6. *Limited monitoring and evaluation capacity in MDAs:* This is a major constraint in spite of the development of the monitoring and evaluation process the capacity to implement is inadequate. The sustainability of this system depends on a significant improvement of the present capacity.

7. *Resistance to change*: The need for change management at organisational and individual levels to facilitate the shift from the old paradigm to the new.
8. Managing performance fairly and objectively and overcoming the human constraints that limited the APER process.
9. The non-conclusion of the Professionalisation and pooling of DPRS Cadre under the National Planning Commission.
10. There has been inadequate funding for the M&E functions of the National Planning Commission to track the implementation of government projects, programmes and policies

Assessment of Reform Initiative

Judged against the 10 assessment criteria, the effective implementation of the PMS still faces a lot of challenges regardless of the signed performance contract so far.

S/No.	Assessment Criteria	Result of Assessment
1.	Has the performance management reform improved the quality and quantity of public services?	No. There is as yet no evidence of this.
2.	Do more people now have access to services, including disadvantaged groups such as women, young persons, and people with disabilities?	Not Applicable
3.	Has the reform reduced the cost of governance?	Not yet.
4.	Has the reform made the service more affordable for citizens?	Not yet.
5.	Has the reform reduced corruption?	Not yet.
6.	Has the reform reduced unnecessary bureaucracy and red tape?	Not yet
7.	Is the reform initiative likely to lead to improved development outcomes?	Yes, if properly implemented and institutionalised.
8.	Are things improving, staying the same, or getting worse?	Things are generally staying the same. There has been no appreciable change.
9.	Where things are improving, will those	Not Applicable

S/No.	Assessment Criteria	Result of Assessment
	improvements endure?	
10	Where things are not improving, what should be done?	A speedy and robust installation of the PMS is required to support result oriented service delivery

There are positive signs of improved on the areas being assessed. The capacity building on performance management and M&E extended to the MDAs for the last 2-3 years had actually created a positive change in attitude in the management of the MDAs. The MDAs now have a better understanding of what constitutes results in development and service delivery and that is significantly affects the way they do things. What is needed is to now embark on specific studies to ascertain the changes on those indicators as a result of the introduction of the PM system.

Proposed Next Steps

1. To present the PMS framework to FEC for consideration along with the proposed phased implementation and to put in place a framework and mechanism for securing funds to drive Performance Management in order to forestall the slow pace of implementation.
2. The weak linkage between plans and budget needs to be addressed for an effective implementation of the PMS. NPC is to work with the Federal Ministry of Finance and the Budget Office of the Federation to address this issue. There may be the need for a certain percentage of the cost of projects to be set aside for M&E to ensure that funds are made available for effective M&E and for value for money
3. Continuous training on target setting for all staff across board within the public service so as to reduce subjectivity since performance will then be measured against set targets. A major focus is needed on institutional strengthening and sanitation in preparation for the implementation of PMS
4. Officers should be trained on monitoring and evaluation to enhance their capacity that is presently weak. NPC is already working with the Nigeria Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER) to work out modalities for periodic training of officials of DPRS nationwide to enhance their capacities to effectively discharge their duties
5. The harmonized Performance Management System (PMS) agreed by the OHCSF, National Planning Commission (NPC) and FCSC should be adopted as the framework for the implementation of the proposed PMS for the Federal Public Service and OHCSF should serve as the lead implementing agency.
6. Appropriate steps should be taken to ensure that there is an alignment between PMS and other ongoing public service reforms and Public Service Rules (PMS) should be reviewed to support the implementation of the PMS.
7. The implementation of PMS in the Federal Public Service should commence on a pilot basis and the outcome should not be used for promotion exercise during the pilot year;
8. In order to ensure an effective implementation of PMS in the Federal Public Service, there is need for an alignment between sector plans, MDA plans, and there should be adequate funding and timeliness in funds releases.
9. NPC to work closely with the OHCSF to conclude the professionalization and pooling of the cadre.