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Different performance tools have been developed to meet different objectives and problems, and address different linkages and accountability arrangements among various actors within the public sector. Many of these are mutually reinforcing, creating a network of supporting arrangements.
SELECTED TECHNIQUES TO DRIVE DELIVERY

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT APPROACHES

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

RAPID RESULTS/CHANGE MANAGEMENT
Performance management includes activities which ensure that goals are consistently being met in an effective and efficient manner. Performance management can focus on the performance of an organization, a department, employee.

Here we focus on a sub-set of approaches to driving performance:

Delivery Unit/Performance Stat Approaches and the related techniques they utilize, such as:

- Establishing Key Performance Indicators
- Performance Monitoring
- Performance Agreements/Contracts

* A number of countries without delivery units also utilize these techniques to varying degrees across government (Thailand, Canada)
Delivery Units are semi-permanent structures that are placed at the apex of executive power to foster performance improvement for a limited set of output or outcome areas of high importance to senior leadership.

Such units exist in different forms at different levels of government, reflecting the peculiarities of administrative traditions and variations in the performance management approach taken by countries.
Why are countries introducing Delivery Units?

**SYMPTOM:** Current governmental performance system is not delivering results quickly enough or perhaps in the desired areas.

- no progress towards achieving key objectives (policies, deliverables, services)
- imperative to make more rapid progress on a few selected policies and objectives.
- not being adequately monitored

**CAUSE:** Existing public policy, planning, and administrative systems are not producing results or are not responding to new objectives.
Characteristics of Delivery Units

Comprised of a **small cadre of highly skilled staff**, often drawn from the public and private sectors that work in partnership with ministries/agencies.

Sufficient **formal or informal authority from the center of government**. Senior delivery unit staff generally have direct access to the chief executive and Ministers in order to initiate authoritative and binding problem-solving meetings.

A focus on a **limited number of government priorities** and the establishment of a **light, nimble data collection** and reporting system that ensures that responsible ministers maintain a continual focus on the objectives.
What are the functions of a DU?

Ex. UK PMDU Functions

- Drive delivery of the top priorities of the PM
- Assess and report on the performance of Government against a full range of cross-cutting PSAs and Cabinet Priorities
- Provide analytical support and recommendations to overcome key delivery challenges
- Provide support that accelerates delivery capacity in departments
- Debottleneck - helping remove or resolve obstacles to delivery
- Develop the performance management framework and policy on PSAs

- Signaling key government delivery priorities within and outside of the public sector

- Focusing political pressure for specific results through progress-chasing on behalf of the head of government

- Providing a simple and direct monitoring mechanism for key government priorities

- Providing a clear signal that government is holding ministers and senior staff to account for delivering the government's key priorities

- Supporting innovation, coordination by various ministries, and providing a forum for problem solving when needed.
### Delivery Units/Stat Approaches

Some of the tools used by delivery units include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery Planning</strong></td>
<td>Looking at the way the system has clarified roles and responsibilities; aligned programs: governance; performance and program management; and incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery System Mapping</strong></td>
<td>Developing an understanding of the roles, responsibilities and motivations of a delivery system – and how government can intervene to enhance delivery of its priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparing for Delivery</strong></td>
<td>In the early stages of a program finding ways to identify, through a collaborative approach, the underlying barriers to delivery and increase the prospects for secure outcomes of a Government priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Reviews</strong></td>
<td>A rapid analysis of the state of delivery of a high priority target or deliverable which identified the actions needed to strengthen delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stat Reviews</strong></td>
<td>A meeting where key stakeholders come together to tackle a specific challenge or to take stock of actions underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Journey</strong></td>
<td>Understand what public services are like from a citizen’s perspective and to analytically track the experience in order to improve efficiency and delivery of outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A **Performance Agreement** is a document which defines responsibility and expectations between parties to achieve mutually agreed results. Performance Agreements can be agreed between a range of actors in the public sector:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between a Head of State and a Minister</td>
<td>(for all government priorities or a sub-set)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually for agency heads</td>
<td>(Chile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between two independent agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between a minister and an agency head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between a public agency and a private or not-for-profit organization</td>
<td>for the supply of goods and services (Performance Contracts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between a central agency and a budget-funded agency (Minas Gerias, Brazil)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between the central government and a subnational government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of Central Delivery Units, ‘Delivery Agreements’ usually refer to agreements between the Head of State & Minister on key priorities.
Purpose of Delivery Arrangements

To focus the attention of institutions, central agencies, and politicians on improving performance.

More specifically:

- To elicit a fair and explicit understanding of public agency performance (which objectives, how they are defined)
- To achieve productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness targets (ex. case processing durations, waiting times, and levels of user and staff satisfaction)
- To improve the coordination of planning and implementation of programs
- To instill accountability and transparency in service delivery and the use of public money
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Intergovernmental coordination, if performed well, allows for collective expertise from across the public sector to be mobilized and brought to bear on the most pressing decisions confronting the country.

Ministries, agencies and departments with a stake in a particular issue are consulted, and their views and technical knowledge are fully integrated into the decision process.
Some Key Questions

- **Outcomes and Accountability:** Have short-term and long-term outcomes been clearly defined? Is there a way to track and monitor their progress?

- **Bridging Organizational Cultures:** What are the missions and organizational cultures of the participating agencies? Have agencies agreed on common terminology and definitions?

- **Leadership:** How will leadership be sustained over the long-term? If leadership is shared, have roles and responsibilities been clearly identified and agreed upon?

- **Clarity of Roles and Responsibilities:** Have participating agencies clarified roles and responsibilities?

- **Participants:** Have all relevant participants been included? Do they have the ability to commit resources for their agency?

- **Resources:** How will the collaborative mechanism be funded and staffed? Have online collaboration tools been developed?

- **Written Guidance and Agreements:** If appropriate, have participating agencies documented their agreement regarding how they will be collaborating? Have they developed ways to continually update and monitor these agreements?
KEY LESSON: Successful collaborations have a common purpose, strong insistence on a whole systems approach, shared power, and used the service user’s perspective to stimulate change.
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A results-focused learning process, the Rapid Results Approach (RRA) aims to jump start major change effort through a series of small-scale, results-producing and momentum-building initiatives.

RRA speeds up implementation by using a series of mini projects, with low initial investment, to produce visible results.

Ambitious goals are set for project/program priorities with 90, 100 or 120 day targets, resulting in detailed work plans and accountability mechanisms to track progress.

RRA does the following:

- Stimulates existing capacity and pushes teams to breakthrough organizational inertia
- Provides a structured process supporting implementation on the ground
- Rallies stakeholders around shared priorities and strategic goals
- Sets short term measurable targets for tracking progress toward achieving impact
RAPID RESULTS APPROACH

The Process

1. SCOPE AND PREPARE
   - Select overall goal
   - Select challenges
   - Organize event
   - Conduct preliminary work

2. THE EVENT
   - Discuss and analyze issues
   - Brainstorm solutions
   - Develop action recommendations
   - Take decisions at Town Meeting
   - Sharpen work plans

3. IMPLEMENTATION
   - Move into action
   - Track progress
   - Achieve results
   - Build on results
   - Validate progress in 50, 90-150 days
When RRA would work

- Is this a sector where it is possible to achieve tangible products and services?
- Is there a sense of urgency, or a political imperative for change?
- Does the borrower have a clear idea of what it wants to achieve?
- Does the borrower, as well as other major stakeholders, understand that investing in short term goals is but a first step in a larger longer-term process of experimentation to produce sustainable results?
- Does the leadership have enough clout to affect change; is the leadership willing to take risks? Will the leadership come out publicly in support of the rapid result goal? Will the leadership set ambitious goals and be willing to delegate some authority to manage for results?

When RRA would NOT work

- When relationships among key stakeholders have broken down (e.g. government sponsors and/or ministries are in conflict, etc.)
- When goals are intangible and hard to measure, or require long term investment, such as changes in culture, behavior or attitude?
- When there is little time, and few resources for supervision and implementation support.
- When leadership is not willing to make immediate decisions and launch immediate action
“The process of helping people understand the need for change and to motivate them to take actions which result in sustained changes in behavior”.

The top five mistakes top-level sponsors make during a major change:

1. Failed to remain visible and actively demonstrate support
2. Failed to communicate messages about the need for the change
3. Failed to build a coalition of support
4. Assumed all employees were on-board regarding the change
5. Delegated or abdicated the sponsorship role

**Diagnose** – assesses change risk and readiness to inform program design

**Plan & Design** – involves development of the change strategy and change communications plan

**Deploy** – Involves the execution of the change strategy through the consistent and frequent engagement of impacted stakeholders and dealing with instances of resistance

**Monitor & Evaluate** – involves tracking change impact in the form of desired behavior and identifies instances where change interventions may be required
CASES:

(1) Malaysia’s Delivery Unit – Techniques to Foster Delivery

(2) Using the Rapid Results Approach in Madagascar
Malaysia’s Performance Management & Delivery Unit
PEMANDU – Basic facts

- **Location**: Prime Minister’s Office & a Special Purpose Vehicle (PEMANDU Corp)
- **Priorities**: National Key Result Areas
- **Number of Staff**: 135
- **Performance Agreements**: Minister’s level
- **Performance Agreement Dialogues**:  
  - every week (with DMO’s staff)  
  - every month (with ministries staff)  
  - every 6 months (between ministers and PM)

**Functions**

- Conduct independent assessment of performance and progress, give recommendations and highlight areas of attention to PM and Cabinet Ministers
- Act as a catalyst for change
- Provide active support to PM and Cabinet Ministers on all NKRA and MKRA activities
- Work in partnership with ministries and civil service to achieve BIG FAST RESULTS
## Cases: Malaysia’s Delivery Unit

### History Of Performance Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reform</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Productivity Improvement</td>
<td>Treasury improved the identification of performance indicators in the Modified Budgeting System by measuring productivity in terms of time, cost, and manpower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Total Quality Management</td>
<td>Malaysian Administrative Modernization and Management Planning Unit identified public agencies’ clients, documented their needs, and integrated quality control into targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>New Remuneration Scheme</td>
<td>Public Service Department reduced 5x74 public sector salary schemes to 19 to facilitate planning, and introduction of merit-based system linking performance to salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Clients’ Charter</td>
<td>Malaysian Administrative Modernization and Management Planning Unit advocated a publicly documented charter, publicized by each public agency, targeting the quality and timeliness of services provided to citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)</td>
<td>Malaysian Administrative Modernization and Management Planning Unit had ministries set up process-based targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Strategic Results Areas and Strategic Key Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Treasury required public sector organizations to identify strategic results areas and indicators and measure the results of operations in these focal areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Star Rating System on Financial Management</td>
<td>Auditor-general rated and ranked financial management and performance of ministries using an annual star system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Performance indicators for jobholders in the senior echelons of the public service</td>
<td>Public Service Department annually evaluated senior executive civil service jobholders on targets evaluating national competitiveness, governance, accountability, leadership, and service delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cases: Malaysia’s Delivery Unit

Techniques PEMANDU Uses

1. Establish Ministers’ KPIs
2. Ministry Implementation Plan
3. Performance monitoring of KPIs
4. PM-Ministers Performance Reviews
5. Rewards, consequences and actions
In 2003, the new government recognized the urgency of addressing the peoples’ high expectations for **concrete economic and social improvements in the short term**.

In February 2005, when the government launched its first rapid results pilot.

- **The goal was to mitigate the effects of a significant shortfall in rice production, importation, and distribution.**
- **The crisis was solved by a combination of policy-based and technical interventions.**
- **Rice production increased significantly in two of the four targeted regions when the RRA was applied.**
An independent review of the results of the 2005 pilot phase concluded that teams:

- The RRA also contributed to tangible results in health (family planning, HIV/AIDS, and nutrition) and tourism (infrastructure, electrification, and water completed).
- It has also been used to increase textile production, litchi production, and exports.

**Impressive performance results were seen in Analamanga region.**

- Access to family planning sites / services reached **100 percent within 100 days**
- Contraceptive rates increased **from 18 percent to 24 percent in 2006**.
PARTICIPANT EXERCISE

BREAK INTO GROUPS OF FIVE AND DISCUSS THE FOLLOWING:

1) What are the top three implementation challenges you are currently facing?

2) Which approach or combination of combination of approaches might help facilitate progress on Caribbean Growth Forum commitments?