As has been often mentioned in the previous editions of this Newsletter, the ‘quality’ of systems is a major determinant of the performance of any organization. Indeed, it is equally true for governments. We believe that the people working in the government are as good as those in any other sector, and they can do amazing things. But they are often constrained by systems over which they have little control.

This is neither unique nor new. The quality of systems is a major challenge confronting all governments around the world and that is why most of them are trying to find solutions to re-engineer and re-invent their systems of management in governments. We had an opportunity to get a taste of the wide-ranging efforts being made by countries to reform their systems during the two international events supported by the Performance Management Division (PMD): (a) International Workshop on Government Performance Management in July 2013, and (b) Global Roundtable on Government Performance Management in December 2013. These events allowed us to benchmark our efforts in the field of Government Performance Management against the emerging best practices around the world.

Though difficult to summarize the rich insights from these international events, starting with this edition of the Newsletter, we plan to share major finding and insights through a series of articles written by national and international participants of these events. The purpose of these articles would be to initiate a debate on the lessons of these reform efforts for our work in India. We would like to hear from you about the relevance of reforms in other countries to our work.

Similarly, this Newsletter continues to provide a window on our on-going work in the area of Government Performance Management (GPM). Our work on GPM is clearly a work-in-progress. No doubt we have made some significant progress but we want to consolidate several initiatives and also learn from our own experience. Your partnership in providing ideas and feedback is critical for making a good system even better.
Performance Management System in Brazil
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Brazil and India are nations with some similarities. They are both continental countries marked by ethnic and cultural diversity. Both suffer from inequality and other challenging social problems. Both are federal states and major democracies that are progressing in quality. They are part of the block of emerging countries, pursuing greater wealth and competitiveness. They have implemented management improvement processes to meet these and other development requirements and opportunities.

Results-based management is not exactly a new subject in Brazil. But the current context can be characterized as a transition from the models proposed by the federal government, mostly focused on the so-called managerial reform of 1995, inspired by the principles of New Public Management; to experiments that have gained momentum in states and municipalities. Minas Gerais, the 3rd biggest Brazilian state in population and wealth, stands out as a paradigm in this process.

The federal government of India has its Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System (PMES), a performance management model that involves agreement, monitoring, evaluation and incentives, as part of a broader set of propositions by the Second Administrative Reform Commission. The model is based on the Results-Framework Document (RFD), a triennial document adjusted annually, approved by the High Power Committee on Government Performance, that currently covers 80/84 ministries/departments, extending to 800 responsibility centers. The RFD defines and agrees on a vision, mission, priorities, objectives, roles, actions and cross-cutting interdepartmental issues. Indicators and targets are agreed for outcomes, outputs and activities, all weighted against and comprising of a grading system. After 4 years of progressive implementation, the Indian model has proven to be robust, and is spreading to States, municipalities and other countries.

There are many similarities and affinities between the Indian PMES and the Results Agreements (RA) in Minas Gerais. In Minas Gerais, performance contracts are a central element of the managerial modernization process started in 2003, called Management Shock. Originally, the management shock employed harsh fiscal adjustment measures and setting of development targets. Today, the process of managerial modernization is known as Networked State, emphasizing collaborative and participatory management, but retaining the centrality of performance contracts.

Results Agreements (RA) are performance contracts, a management tool whose primary aim is to align the government strategy established in the Integrated Development Plan (PMDI) and the organizations responsible for their implementation. Currently, there are 68 agreements in force, covering 97% of the state’s agencies.

The RA is set annually at two levels. The first is an agreement between the Governor and 22 groups of secretariats denominated operating systems (e.g. the operating system of social defense involves the department of social defense, police and fire department). At this stage, targets and indicators are agreed upon for: a) Development results (outcomes), weighing 40%; b) Priorities Portfolio (program outputs), weighing 35%; c) Strategic Initiatives (regional, cross-cutting, institutional development), weighing 15%;
and d) Quality of expenditure (quality of budget planning, execution and control), weighing 10%.

Level Two, the agreement signed between the head of the secretariat and its operating units, is the tactical-operational and individual/group cascading of the set of targets agreed at the first level and 100% based on implementation targets and indicators (efforts). The Level Two Agreement is thus a tool for internal management of each agency, with a view to directing the efforts and resources of each work team, ensuring better quality of service.

The preparation process for agreeing on the first level starts with the Secretariat of Planning and Public Management (SEPLAG), which prepares a draft proposal based on the governor’s guidelines and the Development Plan, negotiating it with the Strategic Management Advisory Offices (AGEI) of each agency. For the second level agreement, SEPLAG prepares an Adhesion Matrix, a set of guidelines to be followed in the implementation of the second stage, in order to ensure its effective alignment with the first stage, and negotiates targets with the AGEl. Once the targets, conditions and obligations are agreed during a meeting, the RA document is signed.

As a means to ensure the achievement of the agreed targets, the model secure state budget funds and provides managerial flexibilities and autonomies to be granted by SEPLAG to the units under the RA. These are basically related to procurement (expanded limits on bidding modalities and exemption of SEPLAG approval on certain bids), HR (to redefine the number of managerial positions, allow leave of absence for graduate studies, pay for meal and transportation vouchers, set the value of internships and per diem etc.) and administrative sundries.

Another key aspect of this contractual experience is monitoring & evaluation. At the first level, monitoring can vary from 2 to 4 annual meetings. At the second level, the frequency of monitoring is highly variable and incorporated into the management process. In both cases, SEPLAG and the AGEl play a key role in the M&E process. The monitoring process is concluded with the development of an Implementation Report for each System (in the first stage) or agency (in the second stage), which

---

Minas Gerais, Brazil

- **587,000 km²**
  - (Larger than France and Spain)

- **20 million inhabitants**
  - (Comparable to Australia)

- **853 municipalities**
  - (More than any other state in Brazil)

- **Third largest economy in Brazil**
  - (GDP - US$ 200 billion (2010) - 9.3% of Brazil)
compares the performance achieved against the established targets, and clarifies the reasons for greater or lesser achievement of each target. SEPLAG is responsible for guiding agencies in the implementation and improvement of the monitoring of the RA, supporting the AGEI in the design and adequacy of the process, according to the specificities of each agency or entity. SEPLAG also guides the AGEI in preparing follow-up meetings.

Responsibility for evaluation belongs to the Monitoring and Evaluation Commission (CAA) of each RA, composed of duly appointed representatives of the various players involved in the process. The process involves measuring the degree of achievement of the Agreements’ targets by analyzing the report vis-à-vis what was agreed, and culminates in the suggestion of improvement actions aimed at course correction. SEPLAG coordinates the evaluation process, setting schedules for completion of the activities. The evaluation process, which includes publication on the internet of all evaluation cycles of the Results Agreements (first and second stages) as well as the implementation and evaluation reports, seeks to encourage the involvement of all stakeholders, contributing as a motivating factor for the pursuit of the targets.

Based on monitoring and evaluation information and strategic definitions for the following year, SEPLAG, along with the agencies and entities, reviews the Results Agreement to prepare for the following year’s agreement. If necessary, targets and indicators are reviewed and adjusted, keeping them appropriate to the State’s reality. Furthermore, the degree of alignment of the indicators with the government strategy is evaluated once more, thus ensuring the achievement of the objective proposed by the model.

Finally, incentives are offered in the form of monetary bonus and recognition to nearly 300,000 civil servants if they meet the agreed targets. This variable remuneration, which can amount to an extra salary each year, is paid if the first level RA has reached 100% of the targets for development results and more than 80% of other targets, in addition to satisfactory achievement, as defined in the RAs, of the team’s second level targets. For the purpose of the bonus, the first level corresponds to 70% and the second level to 30%.

Many critical factors were essential for the success of this experiment, including the following: political leadership from the Governor himself, as well as executive leadership from SEPLAG’s Secretary and the Vice Governor; qualified staff from SEPLAG and civil servants; technical support from international organizations and consultants; intensive monitoring (to get into the organizations), and link to budget.

One of the main attributes of the RA model throughout its 10 years is its alignment with other key elements of the managerial modernization model, namely: development plan (a cascading of the planned results); fiscal adjustment (containing targets for rationalizing and improving the quality of expenditure); budget (which ensures the necessary funds), and HR policy (establishing an evaluation and variable remuneration component based on results).

Even as part of a broader public management policy, the RAs have contributed largely to the indisputably exceptional performance of Minas Gerais in the last 10 years, both in terms of absolute economic and social indicators and in comparison with the rest of Brazil. In short, the experience of Minas Gerais confirms the need for a model capable of structuring the determinants of performance. It is also believed that another contribution of the model is greater transparency and accountability of public officials in relation to the results proposed and resources used.

Finally, the RA assists in implementing a results-oriented culture, stimulating, appreciating and drawing attention to civil servants committed to the delivery of service to society, and who, in turn, will be entitled to a Productivity Award, in proportion to their performance.
Sometimes it is refreshing to look at how other countries approach the challenge of measuring and managing performance in their governments—especially when our government is so, let’s say, non-functional right now. Last week, I had the opportunity to attend a World Bank seminar where the Secretary of Performance Management for the Government of India described how his country is doing it.

**Background:** In June 2009, the President of India, Pratibha Patil, announced to a joint session of Parliament her commitment to create a Performance Management and Evaluation System for its national government, comprised of more than 4 million civil servants working in 84 departments and ministries. Her announcement was tied to the creation of a secretary-level office, headed by Dr. Prajapati Trivedi, who was designated the first Secretary of Performance Management. This position seems roughly equivalent to that of President Obama’s designation of a Chief Performance Officer when he took office in 2009.

Dr. Trivedi, a former economist at the World Bank, designed a performance management system with interesting parallels and differences from the U.S. performance management system that has evolved under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

**Organizational Framework:** Dr. Trivedi helped create the Performance Management Division in the Indian Cabinet Secretariat, which launched the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System (PMES) in September 2009. The PMES was developed, in part to reduce institutional fragmentation and multiple reporting across the government. The Performance Management Division seems to be roughly equivalent in the U.S. system to the staff arm of the Performance Improvement Council, and the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) Office of Performance and Personnel Management.

To implement the PMES, the Performance Management Division developed a “Results Framework Management System” which is intended to provide a “unified and single view of performance” for contributors to the system (probably roughly equivalent to OMB’s MAX Federal Community). The major component of it is the “Results-Framework Document,” which is roughly equivalent to U.S. agencies’ annual plans required under GPRA.

Agency-level Results Framework Documents (RFDs) are prepared and signed by the respective ministers and sent to the Performance Management Division for review. But to minimize gaming (e.g., setting low targets in order to easily achieve them), they are also reviewed by a third-party quality-scoring team – the Ad Hoc Task Force – which is comprised of about 200 outside experts and former government officials. The outside experts often make recommendations which are then incorporated by the ministries before being finalized.
After the RFDs are finalized, they are then sent to a High Power Committee on Government Performance, comprised of cabinet-level officials, and chaired by the Secretary of the Cabinet. The closest parallel in the U.S. system might be the President’s Management Council, which is comprised of departmental deputy secretaries serving as their department’s chief operating officers.

All of the agency-level RFDs are posted on a centralized website, performance.gov.in, which seems to be inspired by the U.S. government’s Performance.Gov website (the link is currently unavailable due to the federal government shutdown).

**Strategic and Annual Plans:** The Indian government has historically created five-year plans for the government as a whole. It is currently operating under its 12th Five-Year Plan (2012 – 2017). The national Planning Commission also prepares Annual Plans for the economy, as well (here’s a link to the 2013-2014 plan).

But under PMES, each agency and ministry prepares its own strategic plan, as well, which are supposed to reflect priorities in the governmentwide Five-Year Plan. Here’s a link to all agency strategic plans.

The agencies are grouped into six “syndicates,” which seem to roughly parallel the U.S. budget functions framework. The agency-level strategic plans, though, do not seem to be linked directly to budgeting or personnel resources. Budget resources are reflected, however, in the governmentwide Planning Commission’s annual plan.

**The Results-Framework Document:** The key element of the Indian PMES is the Results-Framework Document (RFD). Each agency is responsible for creating one; they seem to be roughly parallel in the U.S. system to Agency Annual Plans. Each department or ministry’s RFD addresses three elements:

- What are the department’s main objectives for the year?
- What actions will be taken to achieve these objectives?
- How do you determine progress?

The “main objectives” are derived from agency strategic plans. The “actions to be taken” are based on criteria/success indicators developed by agency leaders. Interestingly, these indicators are then assigned numerical weights by agency leaders to signal their significance. Agency leaders are also responsible for defining target values for what constitutes “success.” Here is a link to all 73 ministries who have submitted an RFD this year.

As the year progresses, progress against the targets are measured, and at the end of the year, the level of achievement is calculated first as a raw score, which is then weighted and is used to create a composite raw score.

According to the Performance Management Division’s website: “A Results-Framework Document (RFD) is essentially a record of understanding between a Minister representing the people’s mandate, and the Secretary of a Department responsible for implementing this mandate. This document contains not only the agreed objectives, policies, programs and projects but also success indicators and targets to measure progress in implementing them.”
The RFDs have six sections:

- Section 1 - A Ministry’s Vision, Mission, Objectives and Functions.
- Section 2 - Inter se priorities among key objectives, success indicators and targets.
- Section 3 - Trend values of the success indicators.
- Section 4 - Description and definition of success indicators and proposed measurement methodology.
- Section 5 - Specific performance requirements from other departments that are critical for delivering agreed results.
- Section 6 - Outcome/Impact of the Department/Ministry.

As an example, here’s a link to the most recent RFD for one agency, the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation. They are short, and are largely in tabular form.

**Agency-Level End-of-Year Scores:** As noted earlier, the performance information collected for each RFD is scored as “successful” or not, and each performance element is weighted relative to its significance. They are then combined into a Composite Index for a single performance evaluation score for the department or agency. Here is a sample of what one of the scorecards looks like:

**Table 4:** Example of Performance Evaluation at the End of the Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Column 5</th>
<th>Column 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Criteria/Success Indicators</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>Target/Criteria Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Rural Health</td>
<td>Improve Access to Primary Health Care</td>
<td>% Increase in number of primary health care centers</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>Excellent 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>% Increase in number of people with access to a primary health center within 20 KMs</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>Very Good 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of hospitals with ISO 9000 certification by December 31, 2009</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Good 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite Score = 84.5%

The scores are taken seriously because they are linked to pay levels, which are set in relation to pay levels in the private sector. Progress is measured every six months, with a final report to the Prime Minister.

**The Government-wide Scorecard:** At the end of the year, the agency-level composite indexes are consolidated to create a government-wide ranking of how well agencies did against the targets in their RFDs. The composite scoring index allows a cross-agency ranking. There is no U.S. equivalent. This scorecard, as you might imagine, makes headline evening news in India when it is released.

Interestingly, of the 28 states and 7 territories in India, about 16-17 are undertaking a similar effort.
Implementation of Citizens’/Clients’ Charter of Central Departments: An Independent Audit
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Government of India’s ministries/department’s are mandated to develop Citizens’/Clients’ Charters (CCC). This exercise, in fact, marks the culmination of a process whose origin can be traced to the Conference of Chief Ministers of States and Union Territories held way back on May 24, 1997, in New Delhi and presided over by the then Prime Minister of India, Shri I.K. Gujral. In this Conference, an ‘Action Plan for Effective and Responsive Government’ at the Centre and State levels was adopted. One of the major decisions taken in the Conference was that Departments would formulate Citizens’ charters starting with those sectors that have large public interface. However, overall not much progress was made in this direction. Given the unsatisfactory track record of the implementation of CCC and the uneven quality of CCCs, which were neither useful for measuring the performance of departments with respect to this important aspect of departmental performance, nor was there any consequence for ignoring the commitments listed in CCCs, the High Power Committee on Government Performance, chaired by the then Cabinet Secretary, in its meeting of May 28, 2010 decided to include “Development of Citizens’/Clients’ Charters” in Results Framework Documents (RFDs) as a mandatory indicator for all ministries/ departments.(Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>SUCCESS INDICATORS</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>TARGET/Criteria Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Audit of implementation of Citizens’/ Clients ‘Charter (CCC)</td>
<td>% of implementation</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Excellent 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequently, departments have prepared CCCs and all CCCs that were found to be of acceptable quality have been published as a compendium and are also available on the website of Performance Management Division (PMD), Cabinet Secretariat (CS), GoI, which is the nodal agency for ensuring the approval of CCC by respective ministries and departments. CCC of respective ministries and departments are also available on their websites.
Independent Audit

An independent audit of implementation of CCC under the leadership of Dr. Prajapati Trivedi, Secretary, Performance Management Division, Cabinet Secretariat, was carried out by the Centre for Media Studies (CMS) in mid-2013. Fifty nine (59) ministries/departments of the Central Government, whose CCCs have been approved by PMD were included in this audit. The exercise was intensive which included physical visit to each ministry/department’s office, interacting with nodal officers of 2-3 services provided by the respective ministries/departments, observing the display of CCC, making the phone calls for checking the response rate and accurateness of contact details of the nodal person and analyzing the quality of self-assessment report of each ministry.

With the expectation that a shared understanding of the proposed methodology and the process would ensure transparency, objectivity and fairness of the proposed independent audit, all the ministries and departments were informed well in advance about the audit methodology and process. The Audit was participatory in nature as it included not only ranking of ministries/departments on the basis of visits by CMS audit team members (Success indicator A to E in Table 2); but equal weight was given to Self-assessment reports of respective ministries/departments (success indicator F in Table 2). Being the first year of audit, it was decided to restrict the audit process only to assess the preparedness and practice of ministries and departments as far as CCC is concerned. The indicators, weights assigned and target/criteria value used for audit of ministries/departments status on CCC is shown in the Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESS INDICATORS</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>TARGET/Criteria Value</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of visibility of CCC in relevant area</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of departmental officers/staff about CCC</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of accuracy of the numbers and names of the contact persons mentioned in CCC</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate for the phone calls made to contact persons</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the self-assessment report</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Score as calculated by the ministry/department</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Score/Performance-Ministries/Departmental Rating

The composite score of the Ministries/Departments on the six success indicators of Independent Audit present a not so satisfactory picture (Table 3).

Table 3: Performance Rating of Ministries/Departments vis-a-vis Implementation of CCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Rating</th>
<th>Composite Score Rating (in %)</th>
<th>Number of Ministries/Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>100-96</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>95-86</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>85-76</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>75-66</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Below 65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Insights

* Considering the fact that in case of most of the ministries/departments, the implementation of CCCs has completed about an year or so, the efforts made by departments/officials to make CCC visible is encouraging.

* At the same time it is observed that CCC is yet to sink in among different level of functionaries functionaries, including the reception desk. Orientation of staff is desirable to give the message that CCC is for bringing both transparency and accountability in service delivery. It is more for self-assessment and improving departments’ performance and less as an additional burden.

* The perception that ministries/departments do not interact directly with public but has more inter-departmental interaction at centre and as a partner with states, hence there is no need for CCC, has to be addressed for making CCC more effective.

* Regular, may be every six-month update of designated officials’ name and contact details in CCC uploaded on respective ministries/departments’ websites is desirable. As most of the clients are state departments and institutions, they will be a ‘virtual visitor’ to the ministries/departments through the websites for required information.

* Last but not the least, this round of audit, due to paucity of time, did not take the feedback of service seekers. Next round of audit should factor in the experience of service users (institution/individuals) as well as assess the implementation of the CCC, in spirit and in action.
RFD policy is based on the fundamental principle of management: What gets measured gets done. This principle is transcendental in its application and it also applies, in equal measure, to the ‘quality’ of RFD. Unless we have an agreed yardstick for measuring the ‘quality’ of RFD, we will not be able to determine whether successive drafts represent an improvement. Indeed, we will not be able to determine whether all our collective efforts are improving the ‘quality’ of RFDs over time.

Also, we need to remember that RFD is a means towards an end and not an end in itself. The purpose of RFD is to improve performance of an organization by giving the departmental managers clear, meaningful and unambiguous targets and evaluating their performance by comparing their achievements against these targets.

RFD Evaluation Methodology (REM) is a document that outlines the methodology for evaluating the quality of a Results-Framework Document (RFD). This methodology is based on the Guidelines for preparing RFD, developed by the Performance Management Division (PMD), Cabinet Secretariat, and approved by the High Power Committee on Government Performance. Hence, this methodology is a complement to the RFD Guidelines and should be read along with it.

The RFD evaluation methodology outlined in this document is intended to provide a benchmark against which the design of an RFD can be evaluated. It provides an agreed definition of “quality” in the context of designing RFD. In the absence of such a shared understanding, there is a danger that the “quality” of RFD, like beauty, could lie in the eyes of the beholder.

If the quality of targets is not very meaningful, then achieving these targets is not likely to be very meaningful. This then is the reason for ensuring that targets in RFD are meaningful. For example, the meaningfulness of targets depends, among other things, on their alignment with vision, mission and objectives. This is just another way of saying that quality of RFD matters.

The following heuristic equation captures the essence of the above arguments:

For example:

Figure 1: Heuristic Equation Explaining True Performance of an Organization
In simple words, if the quality of your RFD is 70%, then the maximum score that you can get is 70%. The quality of RFD provides the upper limit on the maximum score a department can get.

**Approach**

Any ‘evaluation’ essentially involves comparing achievement against a target. Therefore, to evaluate the quality of an RFD we must agree on the target against which we shall judge the quality of RFD. Since RFD is supposed to be designed as per the RFD Guidelines, it is only logical and fair to use the RFD Guidelines as the benchmark / target for judging the quality of an RFD. In other words, our approach is to ascertain how well the RFD Guidelines were followed to draft the RFD that is being evaluated.

The Results-Framework Document Evaluation Methodology (REM) is a useful analytical tool designed to assess all RFD sections across all Departments using the same methodology and minimizing the subjectivity of the assessments.

For each section of RFD we have provided a number of assessment criteria against which a score is assigned, using the same 5 points rating scale already in use for the RFDs (from 60% to 100%). These criteria are largely based on the RFD Guidelines document. They comprise quantitative and qualitative criteria. Quantitative criteria aim to capture risks and limitations in a numerical way (e.g. "percentage of data populated"); qualitative criteria are applied to assessment areas for which a numerical analysis is not feasible but can indeed be measured against the agreed Guidelines for preparing RFD.

**Target Audience**

This methodology is meant primarily for the organizations preparing RFDs. It provides a convenient checklist for a self-audit. To ensure that all stakeholders are on the same page, this methodology is also meant for providing a useful platform during the departmental discussions with members of the Ad-hoc Task Force.

**CALCULATING OVERALL QUALITY RATING OF RFD**

As we know, an RFD contains the following six sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1</th>
<th>Ministry’s/departament’s Vision, Mission, Objectives and Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>Inter se priorities among key objectives, success indicators and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>Trend values of the success indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>Description and definition of success indicators and proposed measurement methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>Specific performance requirements from other departments that are critical for delivering agreed results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td>Outcome / Impact of activities of department/ministry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Summary of the Six Sections of the RFD*
Hence, the overall quality of RFD would depend on the quality of each section and the relative priority of the section. Table 1 summarizes the relative weights for each of the six sections of the RFD and illustrative calculations used for arrive at the Overall Quality Rating for the RFD as well.

The distribution of relative weights among various sections was decided after extensive consultations with all stakeholders, including members of the Ad-Hoc Task Force (ATF).

**Table 1: Distribution of Relative Weights and Illustrative Calculation of Overall Quality Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of RFD</th>
<th>Section Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Raw Score for the Section</th>
<th>Weighted Raw Score for the Section</th>
<th>Source of Data*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (A)</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Table 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (B)</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>Table 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (C)</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>Table 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inter se priorities among key objectives, success indicators and targets</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>Table 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trend values of the success indicators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>Table 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Description and definition of success indicators and proposed measurement methodology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>Table 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Specific performance requirements from other departments that are critical for delivering agreed results</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Table 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Outcome / Impact of activities of department/ministry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>Table 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Weight = 100**

**Overall Quality Rating for RFD = 88.5**

* Please see REM Guidelines for details at: www.performance.gov.in

The general principle for writing an RFD critique would be to take individual elements and do a consensus rating. Where ATF / evaluators fail to reach a consensus they may take the average of the individual ratings given by members.

Where judgment is involved and the score given by the evaluators is less than 100%, then the onus is on them to explain in writing the reasons for their dissatisfaction with that particular aspect of RFD.

The robustness of this methodology, in the final analysis, will be judged by how close the final ratings are of different groups evaluating the same RFD. Till they become close enough, we will need to keep improving this methodology from the experience on the ground.
Performance Management Division (PMD) organized a two day workshop on REM for all the Ministries and Departments of Government of India on February 18-19, 2014. Two representatives from each ministry/department attended the workshop. The participants were given an extensive presentation on REM by Dr. Prajapati Trivedi, Secretary, Performance Management. A copy of the presentation is available on our website along with the REM guidelines. Following this, the participants were divided into 6 syndicate groups and given an RFD to critique using the REM. The aim of the exercise was to give the participants hand-on training and feel about the REM. Alongside, two esteemed and seasoned ATF members were asked to evaluate the same RFD using the REM. The afternoon session was utilized to discuss the deviations of REM score of the groups from the evaluation of the ATF members. This helped the departments develop an in-depth understanding of REM. This workshop was also used as an opportunity to distribute the RFD compendium for the year 2013-14 to the Ministries and Departments.

The workshop was received very well by the participants, which was clear from the level of participation and questioning that followed each session of the workshop. This workshop was highly critical, as from 2014-15 onwards, it has been decided that the quality of each RFDs has to be judged using the REM. Thus, the process of judging the RFDs through REM has started and following are the departmental RFD rankings according to REM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Ministry / Department</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D/o Sports</td>
<td>90.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>D/o Posts</td>
<td>90.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D/o Electronics &amp; Information Technology</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D/o AIDS Control</td>
<td>89.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D/o Space</td>
<td>89.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>D/o Health Research</td>
<td>88.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>D/o Telecommunications</td>
<td>88.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M/o Shipping</td>
<td>88.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M/o Statistics &amp; Programme Implementation</td>
<td>88.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M/o Railways</td>
<td>88.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The concept of “scaling up” has become increasingly popular as concerned governments, foundations and official donors note the relatively poor track record of innovative pilot projects extending their reach to larger populations. The MSI Scaling-Up Management (SUM) Framework, guidelines and toolkit seek to improve this track record by offering practical help for officials charged with designing, assessing, implementing and scaling up pilot projects.

The SUM Framework and Toolkit were developed over a 9-year period with support from the MacArthur and Packard Foundations. They were tested and refined in 22 cases in three countries – Mexico, Nigeria and India -- and more than 100 professional seminars and workshops.

Recently, the SUM Framework and Toolkit was the subject of a major national workshop in India sponsored by the Planning Commission and the Population Foundation of India where the SUM Framework was used to illuminate the story-behind-the-story of several notable cases of innovations that went successfully to scale.

The cases reviewed at the workshop were introduced by individuals who played active roles and had intimate knowledge of these successful efforts, including:

- The Green Revolution: Dr. M.S. Swaminathan, Member of Parliament
- Home-Based Newborn Care: Dr. Rajani R. Ved, Management Systems International
- Indira Kranthi Pratham: Mr. K Raju, Joint Secretary of National Advisory Committee
- Right to Information: Dr. Shekhar Singh, National Campaign for Right to Information
- Performance Management: Dr. Prajapati Trivedi, Secretary to the Government of India, Performance Management
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The SUM Framework features a three-step, ten-task process for effective scaling up and includes concrete suggestions on how to manage each of these steps and tasks. The steps and tasks included in the Framework are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Task 1: Create a Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2: Assess Scalability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 3: Fill Information Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 4: Prepare a Scaling Up Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Task 5: Legitimize Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 6: Build a Constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 7: Realign and Mobilize Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Task 8: Modify Organizational Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 9: Coordinate Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 10: Track Performance and Maintain Momentum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theory and practice underlying the Framework come from the discipline of “strategic management”. More specifically, Step 1 brings to bear best practices related to strategic planning in complex settings; Step 2 focuses on the change management functions associated with consensus building, policy change and resource allocation; and Step 3 emphasizes the operational functions of coordination, accountability and multi-actor program implementation.

Each element of the Framework is conceived and presented as a task to be managed, not simply a category to be analyzed. To that end, the framework outlines for each task the actions that need to be taken and, where appropriate, includes options and alternatives. Annexes to the document present a sequenced list of questions to guide the scaling up process and a list of tools that support each task. A companion document, the scaling up Toolkit, provides details on each of fifteen tools along with examples and links to outside resources that can be of help in carrying out each of the ten tasks included in the Framework.

Fieldwork in India funded by the MacArthur and Packard Foundations focused on 16 interventions in maternal and child health, rural health, and family planning. Subsequently, the framework and toolkit were adapted and applied to other sectors including early childhood education, community policing, human rights, welfare reform, and livelihoods. While initial efforts focused on using government to scale up efforts developed by the NGOs and the private sector, more recent work also considered
situations in which experimentation and scaling up are undertaken by governments as part of a deliberate strategy of reform. The framework and toolkit are designed to address both of these pathways.

The framework distinguishes a total of ten pathways to successful scale (see Table 1). There are, increasingly, documented cases of successful scaling up using each of these methods; and the framework draws on, and references, many of these cases.

Table 1: Scaling Up Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>a. Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Franchising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Spin-offs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>a. Policy Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Diffusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Grafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Mass/Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Commercialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>a. Formal Partnerships, Joint Ventures and Strategic Alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Networks and Coalitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fieldwork also clearly distinguishes between three important institutional roles – the originating organization that develops and tests the new approach; the adopting organization that applies the approach or model at scale; and the intermediary organization that helps to plan, support and manage the scaling up process. The tasks performed by intermediary organizations include those shown in Table 2 below. These tasks often spell the difference between innovations that are successfully and sustainably scaled and those that never proceed beyond the pilot phase.

Table 2: Skills Needed for Intermediary Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Strategic Planning</th>
<th>• Convening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Impact Evaluations</td>
<td>• Change Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operations Research</td>
<td>• Technology Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documentation</td>
<td>• Systems Strengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocacy and Marketing</td>
<td>• Process Consulting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A series of lessons have already emerged from the application of the SUM Framework and Toolkit in India. Among them, the most important lessons are the following:

**Simplify:** The more one can simplify a model without losing its essential features, the more feasible it is to scale it up.

**Governance Matters:** Transferring responsibility to and from government, between levels of government, or between NGOs and government is very dependent on the details of governance in particular localities and states.

**Prioritize Intermediation:** “Innovation” is currently being over-funded relative to the investment in helping to scale up successful innovations.

**Avoid Common Pitfalls:** Going to scale is particularly difficult when models lack credible documentation of impact, do not include a technological innovation, depend on coordinated action by multiple organizations, are value-laden or process-intensive, cannot be easily grafted onto existing services, or do not have a dedicated revenue source.

**Plan Backwards:** Begin with an eye on scale and a strategy for achieving it.

**Tailor Evidence to the Audience:** Data from pilot projects is rarely tailored to the decision-criteria or decision-making styles of policy makers.

**Begin Advocacy and Ownership Early:** The chances of taking an innovation to scale are substantially increased by creating a multi-stakeholder team; establishing an advisory board or some other mechanism to develop buy-in from key decision-makers and adopters; and setting up partnerships or collaborative mechanisms with potential alternative, competing models.

**Focus on Systems and Incentives:** For sustainable change to occur, it’s essential to understand and replicate the incentives from the original model or to make sure that an alternative incentive system reinforces the needed actions.

**Educate Policy Makers on Scaling Up Realities:** Going to scale takes time, money and capacity that are often great than those needed for the pilot. Securing and maintaining the necessary commitment and resources calls for tangible milestones, strategic communications, and an explicit strategy for maintaining momentum.

**Provide for Multi-Stage Monitoring:** It is essential to monitor and report on both the scaling up process and implementation at scale. The monitoring and reporting process can and should be used as part of an ongoing strategy to maintain political and popular support and funding.
Background

In 2003-04, Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG) developed a more systematic framework for a citizen-centric Government called ‘Sevottam’—it was coined by synthesizing two Hindi words: Seva (Service) and Uttam (Excellent). It means ‘Service Excellence’ and has three components: (i) Citizens’ / Clients’ Charter; (ii) Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM); and (iii) Quality Management System (IS 15700 / ISO 9001). The Second Administrative Reforms Commission endorsed the Sevottam framework and recommended its full implementation in Central and State Governments. This recommendation was accepted by GoM. The current article focuses on GRM.

Concept

Grievances are expressions of resentment against specific acts of omission or commission that are wrong or perceived as wrong, and requiring corrective action to be taken. Grievance Redress Mechanisms (GRMs) are process systems set up by organizations to receive, record, investigate, redress, analyze, prevent, or take any other appropriate action in respect of grievances lodged against them. GRMs in Central Ministries / Departments include grievances received by them from the public and clients / service recipients as well as from their own employees. As such, these include issues related both to service delivery as well as to employment related matters (e.g. transfers, promotions, pensions, pay fixation). The compilation of the guidelines for Redress of Public Grievances, 2010 contains all the major guidelines issued since 1985 for the creation of grievance redress mechanism in all Ministries/Departments/Organizations of Government of India. More information about the GRM and its design & implementation can be found on our website.

The current article will try to focus on an important aspect of the GRM – Scoring of the Independent Audit of GRM. The article will begin with a brief outline of the relationship between GRM and RFD. After which it will explain the steps involved in scoring the independent audit done to assess the GRM.

GRM and RFD

Every year the RFD cycle starts with the High Power Committee (HPC) on Government Performance, chaired by the Cabinet Secretary, deciding on the Mandatory Success Indicators (SI) for all the Ministries and Department. In the year 2010-11, the HPC, based on the recommendations of the 2nd ARC and its numerous advantages, decided to include the following mandatory SI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESS INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESS INDICATOR</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In the year 2011-12, the HPC felt that there needed to be an independent evaluation of the grievance redress mechanism. The concept of the independent audit of all the 73 departments began at the Conference of Chief Ministers of various States and Union Territories held on May 24, 1997 in New Delhi, and presided over by the Prime Minister India, Shri I.K. Gujral. In this Conference, an 'Action Plan for Effective and Responsive Government' at the Centre and State levels was adopted. One of the major decisions taken at that Conference was that the Central and State Governments would formulate Citizens' Charters and Grievance Redress Mechanism. Thus, the HPC decided to include the following mandatory indicator:

### Scoring of the Independent Audit

Even though the above Mandatory indicator was included in the RFD in the year 2011-12, not many departments and Ministries are yet aware of the procedure followed to evaluate the independent audits conducted. The present article aims to de-mystify this process. The score for this mandatory success indicator was calculated on the basis of the following seven metric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Indicator</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Audit of Implementation of Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring of the Independent Audit

The data for each criterion was obtained from the database maintained by Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG) for CPGRAMS (Centralized Public Grievance Redress and Monitoring System). It may be recalled, the adoption of CPGRAMS as a common platform for grievance redress was a mandatory indicator for all RFDs for the year 2010-2011. Consequently all 73 departments covered by the RFD policy for the year 2011-2012 have the CPGRAMS link on their home page.

Based on the information given by DARPG with respect to compliance with CPGRAMS, PMD calculated the achievement (in terms of %) for all the Departments. It may be also noted that information with respect to criterion 2 (% of RCs covered) and criterion 3 (Are non- electronic grievances uploaded) is not available with DARPG / CPGRAMS. Hence, the departments were given the benefit of doubt with a request to let us know in case the information with them was different.
Criterion 2 requires that all Responsibility Centres (RCs) under the Department to also (a) have CPGRAMS link on their website and (b) they must be registered under their respective Departments. This was done to allow the Departments to forward grievances relating to the RCs electronically through CPGRAMS.

Criterion 3 required the Departments to have a system to scan and upload all grievances received outside the CPGRAMS’ electronic format and record them in the CPGRAMS system to have a uniform system across various Central Government departments.

By implementing an objective and accountable system of redressing grievances, we have finally redeemed, to large extent, the pledge made in 1997.

**The Results**

The Ministry of Development of North Eastern Region scored the highest (score = 91.85), where the average score of the Ministries / Departments was calculated to be 58.83. Even though there is scope for substantial improvement in this field, at least it is a step in the right direction for all.

The detailed department wise results of evaluation for RFD 2011-12 against the GRM criteria can be found on our website. Below are the top 10 performers in the field:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>MINISTRY / DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>M/o Development of North Eastern Region</td>
<td>91.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>D/o Public Enterprises</td>
<td>90.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>D/o Disinvestment</td>
<td>88.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>M/o Panchayati Raj</td>
<td>88.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>M/o Women and Child Development</td>
<td>81.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>M/o Power</td>
<td>80.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>D/o Legislative</td>
<td>80.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>M/o Steel</td>
<td>80.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>D/o Rural Development</td>
<td>78.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Citizens'/ Clients' Charter (CCC) is a written declaration by a Government department that highlights the standards of service delivery that it subscribes to, availability of choice for consumers, avenues for grievance redress and other related information. In other words, it is a set of commitments made by a department regarding the standards of service which it delivers.

The High Power Committee (HPC) on Government Performance chaired by the Cabinet Secretary decided that all RFDs for 2010-11 will include the following mandatory success indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Success Indicators</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Target/ Criteria Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a Sevottam compliant system to implement, monitor and review Citizen's Charter</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Dec. 30 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Audit of Implementation of Citizen's Charter</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this, the Ministries and Departments of the Government of India prepared their CCCs. Performance Management Division (PMD) published a compendium of the CCC of all the Government Ministries and Departments in the year 2012-13. They also published ‘CCC at a glance’ which is a shorter version of the compendium. Both these documents are available on the PMD website (www.performance.gov.in)

The foreword written by the Cabinet Secretary for the CCC compendium is reproduced on the next page:
Foreword

This compendium contains Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters prepared by 50 Government ministries and departments for the year 2011-2012. It marks the culmination of a process whose origins can be traced to the Conference of Chief Ministers of various States and Union Territories held on May 24, 1997, in New Delhi, and presided over by the Prime Minister of India. In this Conference an ‘Action Plan for Effective and Responsive Government’ at the Centre and State levels was adopted.

The Citizens’ / Clients’ Charter is a written declaration by a Government department that highlights the standards of service delivery that it subscribes to, availability of choice for consumers, avenues for grievance redress and other related information. In other words, it is a set of commitments made by a department regarding the standards of service which it delivers.

Though not enforceable in a court of law, the Citizens’ / Clients' Charter is intended to empower citizens and clients so that they can demand committed standards of service and avail remedies in case of non-compliance by service provider organizations. The basic thrust of the Citizens’ / Clients’ Charter is to render public services citizen centric by making them demand driven rather than supply driven.

Though Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters have been prepared by departments since 1997, their design and implementation was largely left to the individual departments. Thus, a wide variety of approaches and formats were developed and implemented with varying degrees of success.

In 2009, the High Power Committee on Government Performance decided to include Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters as a mandatory requirement under the Results-Framework Documents for 2010-2011. Since then a more systematic approach has been adopted towards the design and implementation of Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters.

This compendium contains Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters that are a product of several rounds of training and review. It is a result of collaboration between Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG) and Performance Management Division, Cabinet Secretariat. Today, all departments are required to prepare Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters using a specialized software called Results-Framework Management System (RFMS) developed by National Informatics Centre (NIC). This compendium includes only those Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters that have been declared acceptable by an independent group of experts. I hope that remaining departments will strive to develop more meaningful Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters in the coming years.

While all Citizens’ / Clients’ Charters are available on the websites of respective departments, this volume is being brought out for greater convenience and ready reference. We hope that this will be a useful document for the citizens and clients of the Government and help us make our Government even more responsive and citizen-centric.

(AJIT SETH)
Cabinet Secretary
Yet another year has passed and along with it the 5th cycle of the RFD has almost come to an end. One of the major milestones of a RFD cycle is the publication of the RFD Compendium. Every year, the RFD compendium is published containing the final RFDs prepared by all the Ministries and Departments of the Government of India as approved by the High Power Committee (HPC). The RFD compendium for the year 2013-14 contains RFDs of 73 Departments and Ministries. The department of Disability Affairs is the most recent addition to the RFD family this year (2013-14).

The 2013-14 RFD compendium contains a total of 2333 pages which is divided into two volumes to make the document more manageable. Volume one has the forward by the Cabinet Secretary which is also given at the end of the article, the updated Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System (PMES) and RFDs of Ministries and Departments. The volume 2 has the remaining RFDs of the Ministries and Departments, the Prime Minister’s order on PMES, the RFD guidelines for 2013-14, about the Members of the Ad-Hoc Task Force (ATF) and about the Secretaries who attended the ATF meetings.

One significance of the 2013-14 compendium is that after a long time, the PMES has been updated. The RFD guidelines are revised and updated every year. However, this time the PMES has also been updated. Another interesting point about the RFD Compendium is that it is available both in hard as well as soft copy. The RFD compendium for any of the 5 years can be downloaded from our website (www.performance.gov.in) by anyone. It is also available in CDs which is sometimes easier for people to carry around. Every year the design of the cover page of the compendium remains the same to maintain continuity and build familiarity. However, the colour is changed to make the versions stand out.

This year the 2013-14 RFD compendium was distributed to all the Ministries and Departments during the RFD Evaluation Methodology (RFD) Workshop on February 18-19, 2014. The compendium was very well received by all the Departments and Ministries as always.

The foreword by the Cabinet Secretary, Mr. Ajit Seth in the 2013-14 RFD compendium is reproduced on the next page:
FOREWORD

This fifth edition of the Compendium contains a compilation of Results-Framework Documents (RFDs) prepared by 73 ministries and departments for the year 2013-2014. This year one new department (Department of Disability Affairs) has been added to the RFD system.

The coverage of RFD system is in the process of stabilizing in the Government of India and we would like this process to gather speed. Our efforts are increasingly focused on consolidating and improving the quality of RFD documents. Towards that end, we have now developed an RFD Evaluation Methodology (REM) to assess the quality of the RFD documents as scientifically and objectively as possible. We are also trying to ensure a better alignment of RFDs with the 12th Plan priorities and strengthening the interface of RFDs with stakeholders. The latter is being done through more effective implementation of Citizens'/ Clients’ Charters (CCC) and Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM).

As part of the RFD-led changes, we are also taking steps to ensure sustainability of the improvements that are being put in place. Departments are developing action plans for creating a robust eco-system for continuous innovations in Government.

I am particularly happy to note the interest of States in adopting the RFD policy at the State level. As of now, seventeen States are at various stages of implementing RFD policy in their respective States. We would like other states to also examine this experience and consider adapting this policy to suit their needs.

The change that we seek requires cooperation and collaboration from all stakeholders. We intend to make the Performance Management System an even more collaborative process. It should not be an annual event but a continuous process of dialogue, learning and knowledge sharing. However, a more collaborative approach is not very useful unless it is done in a purposeful manner that actually improves the performance of the work being done.

According to experts, while management tools and frameworks may facilitate collaboration, strong leadership is necessary to motivate information sharing and coordination across organizational and sectoral boundaries. Effective leadership enables the successful utilization of management tools for improving the quality of goal alignment, performance information, and decision making. That is to say, tools and techniques are not a substitute for leadership but a complement to it.

Finally, I commend all Secretaries for their leadership in making the RFD system more robust and participatory and the RFD coordinators in various departments for their enthusiasm, dedication and commitment to make a good system even better.

(AJIT SETH)
Departmental Secretaries are personally accountable for results in Australia

Sanjeev Sabhlok (IAS RR 1982, resigned in 2001) is senior economist in the Department of Treasury and Finance in Victoria. He taught at LBSNAA in 1994 and held many senior roles in Assam and Meghalaya. He writes extensively on political, economic and governance reforms in India (including a book in 2008, many articles, and a popular blog). He can be reached at sabhlok@gmail.com.

It is a proven fact that a well designed system is conducive to efficient performance and a system not well designed may cause the best people to underperform. The fact that India’s policy development and program management, led by IAS officers, is often considered lackluster is best explained by the not so performance driven system in which they operate. For this I know: that the caliber of IAS officers is second to none.

The bureaucracy is one of three key governance sub-systems that closely interact with each other. The other two are the electoral system and economic policy frameworks. In the past, India’s economic policy, divorced from market signals, explained its systemic governance failures. But India’s economic policies are better now. Residual inefficiency in governance can now be attributed largely to continuing weaknesses in the design of India’s bureaucracy.

In this paper I outline how the bureaucratic system of Victoria delivers world-class governance, and discuss the implications for India.

India’s “steel frame”

By 1880, British India’s civil service was the world's best. Incentive structures introduced by Lord Cornwallis were not foreign to India’s existing models of governance. India’s great economist and systems thinker: Chanakya, wrote in Arthashastra that senior advisers should be paid 800 times more than lowest functionaries. (Of course, he also had many other brilliant insights into what we today call incentive compatible contracts and public choice analysis.)

The UK gladly copied Indian public service innovations. But after independence, India’s bureaucracy went backwards. The West, however, kept improving by adopting the findings of the theories of public choice, rent seeking and regulatory capture. Western politicians introduced a regulatory impact assessment process to test public policies for net benefit, and a senior executive service as part of which departmental heads employ the staff. By mid-1990s, Australia had established a sophisticated policy development process managed by contractual senior executives who also delivered government programmes.

By the time (in March 2001) I began working in the office of its largest regulator, Victoria had a truly modern bureaucracy with market competitiveness of remuneration, open market recruitment by application for each position, flexible arrangements for retirement savings and many other improvements over its earlier tenured civil service system.

Victoria has continued to improve through its 2004 Public Administration Act and amendments. In my 2008 book I have compared nine key features of the Victorian and Indian bureaucracies. It is clear that Victoria’s system of civil service accountability, along with its electoral system (which includes state funding) and world-class economic policies, explains the outstanding governance experienced by its citizens.
The Cabinet is Victoria’s Board of Directors

The best way to think about Victoria is to imagine its Government (Cabinet) as Victoria’s Board of Directors, with the Premier as its Chair. Reporting to this Board are eleven departmental Secretaries who can be imagined as its non-voting Managing Directors.

The Victorian Premier is given four years by its citizens to deliver election promises. To get re-elected, he needs to deliver his promises effectively without charging citizens too much for this privilege. He begins by deciding his “machinery” (number and type of departments) and selects and appoints departmental Secretaries on individually negotiated contracts of up to five years. These contracts can be terminated:

- at any time without showing cause (subject to four months’ notice or pay in lieu); or
- at any time if the Premier believes that the Secretary has significantly failed to fulfil contractual obligations (subject to four weeks’ notice or pay in lieu); or
- immediately, without notice, for reasons of serious misconduct (summary dismissal).

Termination provisions focus the minds of Secretaries. Also (compared with Indian State Governments where Secretaries are frequently transferred) having a clear contractual duration ensures stability and continuity in departments, provided the Secretary performs to expectations.

The Premier selects Secretaries through a head-hunting process from amongst outstanding managers in the private and public sector, and academic leaders. While all public servants are paid private-sector-comparable salaries, Victoria’s head of the civil service earns a robust $600,000 per year (with a
component at risk subject to performance). This reward, coupled with the stringent termination conditions, guarantees total integrity. The slightest question regarding a Secretary’s integrity will lead to instant termination. (Lok Pal type solutions are not needed since incentive compatible contracts preclude the possibility of corruption.)

**Performance goals and resources**

The Premier then writes priority (“charter”) letters to his Ministers outlining his expectations. These priorities flow into specific quantified output targets for Secretaries. But Secretaries can’t possibly deliver targets without appropriate resourcing. So the Premier ‘purchases’ outputs through detailed departmental output statements published in budget papers. These statements include measures with clear link between purpose of funding and the measure, controllability, timeliness, and so on.

With this, the Secretaries are fully equipped. With the right incentives, necessary authority and necessary resources, they are charged with delivering results. There is no excuse for failure.

**Departments operate like private companies**

Secretaries operate like business chief executives. They hire the best senior executives they can find through open advertisement and build a team that works for them. It is not uncommon for many existing senior executives to be terminated when a new Secretary joins a department. There is no political interference in such decisions. The Secretary is given a free hand so he can’t later make excuses for his non-performance. His other senior officers then employ the best people to report to them, all the way down the line. Competitive salaries are paid to everyone within a broad framework established by the Government. It is well understood by everyone that if you pay peanuts you will get monkeys.

Ministers are the Secretaries’ key customers. To guide their daily activity, Secretaries create strategic plans in consultation with Ministers. They also actively seek feedback from Ministers to fine-tune departmental priorities, strategies and resources. Secretaries are expected to provide fearless, professional, apolitical advice to Ministers, who can either accept it or ask their own (Ministerial) advisers.

Secretaries also often establish a departmental Board that include non-departmental Board members with capability for strategic focus and oversight. Boards use a committee structure (e.g. risk governance, knowledge management, audit, finance). Separately, Secretaries commission departmental capability assessments to guide optimal resource use. In brief, every management benchmark and standard is used to motivate a culture of innovative (“blue-sky”) performance.

**The crunch time: Performance review**

Annual reviews against contractual performance targets are the main vehicle for assessing Secretaries’ performance. Secretaries begin the process by providing self-assessments to the Chair of the Victorian State Services Authority and to Secretaries of the Premier’s department and Treasury. These claims are carefully validated by expert teams and the results (and recommendations) reported to the Premier.

As their employer, the Premier may choose to pay a performance bonus to Secretaries who meet his expectations. He may also agree to any average performance bonus for other departmental executives. The Secretary can then pay a bonus to his executives on the basis of their individual performance, within the average established by the Premier.
How are Secretaries prevented from overcharging?

It is a basic implication of public choice theory that bureaucrats will over-charge for their services, particularly since they operate monopolies. Corruption can be stopped, but excess ‘fat’ and inefficiency is harder to remove.

To ensure that Victoria is not overcharged, a number of processes are used to monitor the costs that Secretaries bill the Government. Detailed price reviews by the Treasury determine the appropriateness of prices quoted by Secretaries. All output targets and prices are also reviewed during the budgetary process. Variances can flag cost control issues, prompting detailed investigation. Secretaries are also required to deliver ongoing efficiencies and a productivity dividend. The cost of each widget produced by Secretaries should fall over time through innovation and better technology.

Finally, Victoria’s Auditor General provides the Parliament with detailed performance audits of departmental effectiveness and efficiency, and his recommendations often prompt systemic improvements. These measures, taken together, ensure that Victorian citizens receive world-class governance at the lowest possible cost.

Possible improvements

No human system is perfect. Contrary to what is expected of them, Secretaries sometimes tailor their advice to suit the expectations of Ministers. After all, they are their pay masters. The pendulum has perhaps swung too far in the direction of political masters. The Victorian system can be improved through:

a) an even more merit-based environment: inclusion of independent voices in recruitment decisions to reduce managers’ (sometimes significant) biases;

b) even greater openness to new ideas: consciously engaging oppositional voices at the decision making table to reduce group think;

c) even greater transparency: departments should be authorised (in moderation) to potentially contest political masters’ policy positions by publishing independent working papers; and

d) even bolder policy analysis: Victoria definitely requires more innovative policies if it is to prosper in the increasingly competitive global environment.

Implications for India

What does all this mean for India? Can India adopt these systemic features and improvements?

Well, it goes without saying that the imperative for doing so is self-evident. The prize (benefits to a billion Indians) is huge. But introducing such reforms will be challenging. The detailed reform pathway outlined in my 2008 book can offer some clues on overcoming these challenges. But in the end this will require a vision, a dream. Every starry eyed young recruit to the IAS has the dream of making India the world’s best place. There are perhaps no greater well-wishers of India than members of the IAS. In any case, few work harder. Maybe it is time to work smarter.

If the shared goal of India’s leaders of the political system and bureaucracy is to improve India’s governance and unleash India’s massive potential, then a way forward can be found. It must be found.
# PMD: What we have been up to

Select activities of **PMD** since the last issue of *Performance Matters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 2014</td>
<td>IIFT, New Delhi</td>
<td>Training Workshop on RFD Evaluation Methodology (REM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13, 2014</td>
<td>Thimphu, Bhutan</td>
<td>Workshop on Government Performance Management for officers of the Royal Bhutan Civil Service at Thimpu, Bhutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11-12, 2013</td>
<td>The Taj Palace Hotel, New Delhi</td>
<td>Global Roundtable on Government Performance Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 04, 2013</td>
<td>IIFT, New Delhi</td>
<td>Symposium on New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11, 2013</td>
<td>Bhuwneshwar</td>
<td>Workshop on RFD for Government of Odisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13, 2013</td>
<td>Mussoorie</td>
<td>Lecture on “Performance Management in Government” in the IAS Phase IV training programme at the Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration (LBSNAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 01-12, 2013</td>
<td>The Taj Mahal Hotel, New Delhi</td>
<td>International Workshop on Government Performance Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 04, 2013</td>
<td>IIFT, New Delhi</td>
<td>Workshop on Innovation Action Plan - Review and Next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2013</td>
<td>Shillong</td>
<td>Workshop on RFD for Government of Meghalaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 05, 2013</td>
<td>IIFT, New Delhi</td>
<td>Workshop on Preparing an Action Plan on Innovations in Government Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 22, 2013</td>
<td>Aizwal, Mizoram</td>
<td>Workshop on RFD for Government of Mizoram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 04, 2012</td>
<td>IIFT, New Delhi</td>
<td>Workshop on ISO 9001 Implementation for Government Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 07, 2012</td>
<td>Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh</td>
<td>Workshop on RFD for Government of Andhra Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2012</td>
<td>Jaipur</td>
<td>Workshop on RFD for Government of Rajasthan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2012</td>
<td>Agartala</td>
<td>Workshop on RFD for Government of Tripura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 2012</td>
<td>Raipur</td>
<td>Workshop on RFD for Government of Chhattisgarh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Contracting as an Instrument for Improving Performance in Government: The Experience of RFD in Government of India

Dr. Devesh Chaturvedi is a 1989 batch IAS officer from UP cadre. He has held many positions in the Centre and State Government such as land revenue, environment and forest and tourism. He is currently the Principal Secretary, Minority Welfare and Muslim Waqf, Government of Uttar Pradesh. He has completed his PhD from Department of Management Studies, Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), Delhi. This article is based on the author’s PhD dissertation. He can be contacted on: d.chaturvedi@nic.in

Introduction

Developing and implementing an effective Performance Management System (PMS) for Good Governance has been one of the foremost challenges of the policy makers in India. The Performance Contract Systems (or RFD) is one such novel initiative implemented since 2009-10 with an objective to improve Governance and performance of ministries in Government of India.

A research study was undertaken with the objective to provide an integrated perspective on Results Framework Document (RFD) in the emerging technological and socio-economic context. The study analysed the structure and processes of the ministries and their impact on the effectiveness of the RFD process. The objective was to identify the gaps and duplication that exist while implementing the initiative under the Central Government dispensation.

The study based its analyses on the perceptions of members of the All India Services /Central Services /Central secretariat services with a seniority of Under Secretary and above. The data was obtained through a structured questionnaire based survey. A sample size of 117 officers was taken. The findings were corroborated and refined based on semi-structured interviews of senior civil servants. The next section of the article highlights some of the major findings of the study.

Key Research Findings

The research revealed that the RFD process has been perceived to contribute significantly in following areas of Governance:

i. Objective assessment of schemes and programs being implemented by the Ministries in Government of India
ii. Development of a template to assess the performance of Ministries objectively
iii. Facilitating objective performance appraisal of civil servants
iv. Inculcating performance orientation in the civil servants by channelizing their efforts towards meeting organizational objectives
v. Facilitating a critical review of the schemes, programs and internal organisational processes for bringing in required reforms.
vi. Facilitating the policy makers to re-evaluate and redefine the Ministry’s ‘Vision, Mission and Objectives.

From the above, it can be seen that RFD process has made a huge impact on the Government Performance Management System in India. However, the study also indicated that this process has some shortcoming.
The next section of the article summarizers the drawbacks of the RFD process, which once overcome can improve the process many folds.

**Perceived Areas of Improvement**

Presently, it is perceived that in practice, the RFD process is primarily driven by the civil servants with comparatively less involvement of the political executive (i.e. the Ministers). The involvement of external stakeholders has also been perceived to be limited only to finalisation of the Ministry’s vision and strategy. Also, there is a need for a stronger integration of the RFD process with the capacity building of civil servants in the Government. The research has revealed that civil servants do not prefer financial incentives over non-financial incentives. Therefore, there is a need for putting in place a system of rewards and incentives based on the performance of the ministries evaluated by the RFD.

Further, it has been observed that the Performance Measurement System in Government needs to be geared up to provide timely and reliable information on the performance parameters/success indicators for effective monitoring and evaluation.

In addition, the study showed that civil servants perceive that excessive time is spent in attending official meetings leaving little time to work on the issues which often hinder their performance.

Thus it can be seen that even though RFD has brought about some much needed changes to the Government machinery, there is still work to do done in this area.

**Recommendations for the Future**

The following steps can possibly contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the RFD process:

i. Involving political executives in a more proactive way at various stages of the RFD.

ii. Introducing an exercise to encourage internal and external stakeholder consultations with a view to incorporate all relevant perspectives while deciding the action points and the success indicators in a Ministry’s RFD.

iii. Popularizing the use of latest Information and Communication Technology to improve the Quality of MIS supporting the RFD review. This may also be included as a mandatory indicator for all the ministries.

iv. Negotiating challenging success indicators that contribute towards fulfilment of the ministry’s vision and objectives.

v. Introducing reward and incentive scheme based on RFD for civil servants to increase their motivation leading to enhanced performance.

vi. Utilizing the performance score of Ministries in the RFD as the guiding force for capacity development /training of civil servants. This could also be a part of the mandatory indicators in the RFD.

vii. Optimizing meetings held by Ministries by (a) having focussed agenda, (b) adhering to a time schedules and (c) participation by relevant officers only who have done proper homework before the meeting.

The present article thus highlights the numerous benefits that the RFD process has had on evaluating and monitoring Government Performance in India. However, the article also recognises some of the minor shortfalls of the system and gives recommendations to overcome these as well. The author believes that the above mentioned recommendations can have highly positive impact on the RFD process and further improve the way Governance is done in India.
Institute of Public Enterprise (IPE) in collaboration with Performance Management Division (PMD), Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India organized the International Workshop on Government Performance Management (IWGPM) in New Delhi, India from July 1 to 12, 2013. During this Workshop, it was decided that a Community of Practice (COP) on Government Performance Management should be established, following which the Government Performance Management Peer Assisted Learning (GO-PEM-PAL) was formed in July 2013.

Initially, only the participants and faculty of the International Workshop were given membership of the GO-PEM-PAL. To capitalize on the potential of GO-PEM-PAL, the membership was increased by spreading awareness through various events and activities, such as RFD workshops (which included RFMS hands-on training) organized for the directorates of the Assam Government in Guwahati, Assam on the request of the Government of Assam on September 25-27, 2013; technical assistance to Government of Karnataka in reviewing their 2013-14 RFD using RFD Evaluation Methodology (REM); and helping the Sakala Mission, Government of Karnataka get ISO 9001 certified.

Currently, there are around 15 COP on various topics such as ISO implementation, Results Framework Management System (RFMS) users, Global Roundtable on Government Performance Management, etc. Over 700 government and non-government employees, related to the field of Government Performance Management (GPM), are members of COP along with 70 international members. The COPs not only provide a common platform for discussion on various aspects of GPM but also help maintain a repository of International best practices in this field. These valuable documents are available to the members of the COPs.

With the membership of the GO-PEM-PAL reaching a sizable number and its popularity increasing steadily, its soft-launch was organized on October 4, 2013 and the GO-PEM-PAL logo was publically launched for the first time. The event was chaired by Dr. Prajapati Trivedi, Secretary, Performance Management Division, Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India. He introduced the concept of COP to the audience by highlighting its potential benefits for the Government. The event was also considered as an opportunity to spread awareness about the activities and events organized under the auspices of the GO-PEM-PAL and sensitizing the Government officials towards its future goals.
This initiative is being supported by the World Bank and the UNDP. Mr. Roland Lomme, Senior Governance Specialist, World Bank and Ms. Sumeeta Banerji, Assistant Country Director and Head Democratic Governance, attended the event as the World Bank and UNDP representatives. Mr. Lomme also shared the international experience on COP and outlined the scope of the GO-PEM-PAL.

Keeping in view the objectives and vision of GO-PEM-PAL, a ‘Symposium on New Public Management’ was organized. Two internationally recognized speakers Prof. Pradip N Khandwalla, Former Director, IIM Ahmedabad and Dr. Kathleen A. Peroff, Former Member of the Senior Executive Service, US Government were invited to grace the event and make the experience more interesting and enriching. Prof. Khandwalla shared the principles of ‘New Public Management’ with the audience. His session was based on his book titled ‘Transforming Government through New Public Management’, a copy of which was distributed to everyone who attended the launch along with the copy of a book by Mr. Ken Miller titled ‘Extreme Government Makeovers’.

Dr. Peroff shared her valuable experience on ‘how the US government manages the State and Federal relationship’ especially in cases where schemes are funded by the Federal Government and implemented by the State Government.

This event was also seen as an opportunity to recognize the great work that has been done by the States in the field of Government Performance Management. Currently there are around 17 States that are at various stages of implementing the PMES and RFD policy. While reviewing how the various States are implementing the policy, it was discovered that no one State had a monopoly over excellence in RFD implementation. Different states have achieved excellence in different aspects of the RFD implementation. Thus, to recognize their achievements, “Award for
excellence in implementing RFD Policy” was given out to seven States as mentioned below (the awards are mentioned in no particular order):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Award for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>First Compendium of the RFDs of the State Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assam</td>
<td>Most Extensive Implementation of RFD at State Level extending to Responsibility Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Haryana</td>
<td>Best Compendium of RFDs of State Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Karnataka</td>
<td>Most Sustainable and Self-reliance Implementation of RFDs at State Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kerala</td>
<td>Maximum Number of Most Complete RFD Implementation Cycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Punjab</td>
<td>First and Only State to have Introduced District Level RFDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The launch was a highly successful event. It was attended by over 100 Government Officials from the States and Central Government of India. It sensitized the participants about the COPs and more specifically about the GO-PEM-PAL. Since the launch, its membership has increased further and many events have been like the ‘Global Roundtable on Government Performance Management’ was organized on December 11-12, 2013. More details about the event (agenda, speakers, country experiences, etc.) can be found on our website (www.performance.gov.in). The basic aim of GO-PEM-PAL still remains (a) reaching out to a much wider audience and (b) popularizing the concept of Government Performance Management in India.
Civil Service Reform (CSR) is a term used for policies affecting any aspect of civil service. As such, the term encompasses a great variety of efforts. While many governments have attempted CSR, only a few are recognised as successful models. Ironically, the governments that have been most successful are those that launched these efforts on their own and not at the behest of foreign development experts. The list of successful efforts includes the “big bang” public sector reforms in New Zealand, modernisation of the government initiative in the UK, and reinventing the government programme in the US. Hardcore enthusiasts name other success stories, including efforts of The Netherlands and Ireland, but even they cannot point to a single case of successful CSR in the developing world - where the Malaysian experience appears to be the most successful effort.

Part of the success can be attributed to its “homegrown” origins. More often than not, CSR specialists tend to point out isolated examples of success in some aspect of civil service, even though the success may have lasted for only a limited time. For example, some point to a case in which total employment in the civil service decreased for a brief time as a result of a so-called “golden handshake” policy, only to return to its original level after donor money was exhausted and the passion for CSR had faded. Others point to attempts in developing countries to create “Next Steps” agencies and “Citizens’ Charter” programmes modelled on the UK experience. The latest fad is to point out the efforts to introduce e-government initiatives as examples of CSR success. Unfortunately, all these examples are akin to rearranging the chairs on the Titanic.

Several strategic issues need to be addressed before diving headlong into a CSR programme. The following list of four key questions represents the minimum set of issues that need to be considered. Having a clear understanding of and answer for these questions is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the success of any CSR effort.

1) What is the core purpose, or goal, of the CSR exercise?
2) What are the strategic options for achieving the goals of the particular reforms?
3) How do we know we are achieving the goals of civil service reforms?
4) What should be the sequencing of civil service reforms?

Let us address them one by one -

1) Reformers have to establish the primary goal of the CSR exercise before deciding anything else. Essentially, they have to choose between “increasing the quality of government” and “decreasing the quantity of government”. More often than not, governments have undertaken a CSR exercise under budgetary pressure. Many governments, pushed to reform their macroeconomic environment, have found that a promise to cut the size of bureaucracy is music to the ears of most international agencies that have the state of their economies under scrutiny. Unfortunately, as experience has shown, these efforts have not been successful even in achieving their limited objective of cutting the size of government. In many cases, they have resulted in demoralisation and further deterioration in the quality of essential government services.
There is a classic asymmetry in the two options. If we start the CSR exercise by reducing the quantity of government, it often leads to a decrease in the quality of government services (economists call this a negative supply shock phenomenon). Yet, attempts to increase the quality of government service usually lead to a concomitant decrease in the quantity of government. The most obvious example of this phenomenon is the introduction of e-government to improve public services. In most cases, if done properly, they also lead to a quantitative reduction in the government apparatus required to deliver these services.

Treating problems with the quantity of government (either too much or too little) as a symptom of poor-quality government rather than a cause, is another way of looking at this trade-off. Governments with weak accountability and governance structures tend to have bloated and inefficient bureaucracies. Economists would say that the direction of causality is from quality to quantity, and not the other way around. Holding government employees accountable for efficient operations (an aspect of quality) ensures reduction in the size of government operations. However, mandating a reduction in the size of government does not ensure better service delivery or increased accountability. In many cases, cutting down the size of government has succeeded only in providing yet another excuse to non-performers: they are now able to say with some modicum of credibility that their poor performance was caused (or aggravated) by policymakers who care more about saving money than improving service quality.

2) In management literature, there are basically two ways of managing any enterprise—“management by objectives” or “management by processes”. If the objectives are clear, then it is easy to manage by objectives. This is generally the case for private enterprises, whose goal is to make profits. If objectives cannot be specified (allegedly the case in civil service), then it is necessary to specify detailed procedures, and hope that by following these, bureaucrats will attain the desired results. This explains the emphasis on procedures in bureaucracies throughout the world.

These two options also apply to managing CSR programmes. Unfortunately, most governments in the developing world have opted for a focus on processes (input-oriented CSR) rather than performance (results-oriented CSR) for several reasons. First, it is easy to justify and measure input-oriented reform efforts such as reduction in the number of civil servants and changes in wage structures and recruitment procedures. Reformers, and those funding them, find it easier to count the civil servants offered a golden handshake than the efficiency of government machinery. Second, expenditure-reducing reforms help cut down budgetary deficits, and these reforms are often part of the conditions for getting additional resources into government coffers. Finally, most governments do not want to attract attention to their performance (or lack of it) and thus are happy to keep experts busy on other bean-counting activities.

However, if reform managers want to follow good managerial practices, they ought to focus on the results of CSR and give corresponding freedom to implementers to devise the most appropriate means to achieve them.

3) While measuring the success of CSR may be easier said than done, it is certainly possible to devise a monitoring and evaluation system for measuring the effectiveness of a CSR programme. In fact, policymakers have little choice in the matter if they want to implement results-oriented CSR. The good news is that the technology of measuring government performance has improved dramatically. The term “government performance” refers to the performance of individual departments. The government is not one monolithic entity. It is made up of several layers, and it is meaningful only to look at the performance of these clearly delineated departments or agencies. With proper coordination, the performance of government as a whole ought to be greater than the sum of the performance of individual departments.
The “performance” of an individual government department or agency means its ability to achieve its stated objectives, established on an ex-ante basis. There is no doubt that having proper objectives is important. However, once these objectives are agreed upon, the task is to achieve them.

4) In sequencing CSR, developing a measurement and evaluation system should be the starting point. If policymakers are serious, they should not spend a lot of energy on CSR until they have a mechanism to monitor the progress they make in implementing it. This means they must start by reforming the government’s Performance Management System. A decent system acts as a touchstone for the design of other CSR policies. It provides the bottom line that is otherwise absent from government operations. With such measurables in place, managing by objectives becomes a natural option. Any CSR policy or programme that can be shown to enhance performance should be adopted with enthusiasm.

In short, the existence of an effective performance management system in the government is a necessary requirement for launching a full-fledged CSR effort. Only then is it possible to know whether the resources expended on CSR are taking the country in the desired direction. Also, such a system dramatically increases the probability that the reforms will be sustainable.

That’s not all. Beyond that, the beneficial spillover effects on public sector reforms in general as result of creating an effective performance management system are analogous to creating an enabling environment for private sector development.

An effective performance management system creates mechanisms and incentives to implement all other reforms. Thus, a strategic view of CSR suggests that policymakers have to make a strong commitment to improving the performance management system within the government before initiating any other element of CSR.
On May 27, 2013, Cabinet Secretary, Mr. Ajit Seth inaugurated the Performance Management Division (PMD), Cabinet Secretariat website. It was a unique event because it was a completely electronic inauguration. The Cabinet Secretary pressed an electronic button on the computer and an electronic curtain was lifted from the website and launched for the first time. The inauguration took place from the Cabinet Secretariat, Rashtrapati Bhawan. After the electronic curtain raiser, Secretary, Performance Management Division, Dr. Prajapati Trivedi presented a brief overview of the key features of the website. These key features and some more interesting facts about the Performance website are given in the next section of the article. Following Dr. Trivedi’s presentation, Secretary, DEITY, Mr. Satyanarayan spoke about the technological options and lessons for other departments. Another unique feature of the inauguration ceremony was that it was webcast live and viewed by many people. The webcast was also recorded and is available for viewing on the following link: www.webcast.gov.in/cabsec/index.html

Key Features of the Performance Management Division Website

1. The website uses an open-source Content Management System (CMS) called Drupal. It is an absolutely free and user friendly CMS. The structure and framework of the website is very clean and simple. It requires minimum configuration and thus can be used by anyone to develop their own website as well.

2. Knowledge Management through creation of Communities of Practice (COPs). We have introduced the concept of Communities of Practice (COPs) on the website which allows us to manage and share knowledge electronically. Further, Institute of Public Enterprise (IPE) in collaboration with Performance Management Division (PMD), Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India organized the International Workshop on Government Performance Management (IWGPM) in New Delhi, India from July 1 to 12, 2013. During this Workshop, it was decided that a Community of Practice (COP) on Government Performance Management should be established. Following which the Government Performance Management Peer Assisted Learning (GO-PEM-PAL) was formed in July, 2013. More information about COP and GO-PEM-PAL can be found on the website.
3. The website uses Web 2.0 standards. This allows us to engage the users in a two way interaction. This is an unique feature that helps us to use features such as blogs, discussion forums, etc. and allows the user to contribute significantly to the content.

4. It supports email notifications. This feature is rather interesting and highly advanced. This allows users to subscribe to various website updates like the newsletter, events, press releases and/or vacancies & tenders. The advantage of this is that once a user subscribes to one or all of these updates, any new information on these subjects would send an email notification to the subscriber. A key feature is that it allows you to choose which update(s) you want to subscribe to, thus reducing the chances of junk emails. Based on your areas of interest you can subscribe to these 4 website updates.

5. The website is disabled-friendly. In lay man terms, the webpages can be read by using the “screen reading software”. This software reads out aloud the content on the page, thus allowing a visually impaired person to benefit from the vast pool of knowledge that is available on the website.

6. The website also follows the Department of Electronics and Information Technology (DEITY) Guidelines. These guidelines have been developed by the National Informatics Centre (NIC) and adopted by Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances (DARPG).

7. Introduction of departmental pages. Often while looking for information on various government departments, we find it difficult to locate information. Thus, we have tried to reduce this effort by creating a page for each ministry/department of the Government of India. Currently, there are 73 ministries and departments under the RFD policy. Each departmental page has information regarding its current Secretary including their brief profile and a picture and important departmental documents like the RFDs, Strategy Papers, Outcome Budget, Annual Plan documents, etc. Also, we maintain a repository of the past three year for each of these documents. These pages are updated regularly by the PMD team. All this rich pool of information can be accessed by anyone. Our vision is to make the Performance website a one-stop-shop for all important information related to Performance Management of the Government of India.
8. We also have pages on each of the States that have adopted the RFD system of Performance Management. Currently, there are 17 states at various levels of implementing the RFD policy. Out of which 15 States are at an advance level of implementation and all RFD related information of these States can be found of these State webpages.

9. The ‘Ask the Expert’ feature. This is an interesting feature that allows users to register their question related to performance management in the government and we respond to them within a day.

10. Another unique feature of the website is that we have an active ‘Website feedback form’. We believe in proactively seeking feedback from our users because we want to continuously improve ourselves.

11. We actively update information regarding all future, on-going and past events, workshop, training programs, etc. We have also recently started the accepting only e-registrations for most of the PMD events, workshops and training programs. This allows fair, transparent and easy registration for all.

12. Help Desk and Service Standards for all services. PMD has a one point contact for each topic related to Performance Management Division (PMD) which is clearly displayed on our website. It contains the name and contact details of each person responsible for the task along with their service standards.
Global Roundtable on
Government Performance Management
December 11-12, 2013, New Delhi

Introduction

The Performance Management Division, Cabinet Secretariat organised a Global Roundtable on Government Performance Management on December 11-12, 2013 in collaboration with the Institute of Public Enterprise (IPE), UNDP and World Bank under the auspices of Community of Practice GO-PEM-PAL (Government Performance Management Peer Assisted Learning).

No civilized society can function effectively without an effective government. All countries use government as a mechanism to provide services that benefit all citizens: police, judicial services, national defense, and municipal services. Government also serves as a means of making some of the most important collective decisions: nature of the health system, education system, water and sewage system, roads and highways system. Given this pervasive nature of government, its performance has a direct bearing on the welfare of citizens.

Enhanced government effectiveness not only affects the welfare of citizens in the short run, but also in the long-run. In the increasingly globalized world, government effectiveness is the key determinant of a country’s competitive advantage. Experts agree that in the long run, race among nations will be won or lost not on the basis of comparative advantage arising from resource endowment, but by the competitive advantage created by effective governments.

This Roundtable on Government Performance Management was inspired by our belief that returns from improving effectiveness of the government are immense. Further, we believe that the majority of these benefits accrue to the socially and economically weaker sections of our society. Hence, we do not believe that there is a trade-off between efficiency and equity. Extra effort spent on improving government efficiency is likely to do more good on the margin, than spending it on a program that does not work effectively.

Both federal and state governments around the globe are under increasing pressure to provide results
that matter to the public, often within severe resource constraints. At the same time, government officials and managers are challenged to overcome the public’s lack of trust in government at all levels. Thus, this is the time for governmental leaders to ensure that the organizations they lead are taking responsibility for achieving results that matter to the public – by implementing effective government performance management systems.

**Purpose**

The main purpose for organizing this Global Roundtable was to take stock of the global best practices in Government Performance Management, identify the potential areas which could be replicated by India and thus improve the Indian GPM system. The intention is to add to the existing literature on performance management through documentation. This initiative also enriches India’s effort to strengthen the community of practice on government performance management by bringing in new partners for learning and thus fine-tune the Indian PMES/RFD system; along with increasing international membership of the Global Community of Practice on Government Performance Management Peer Assisted Learning (GO-PEM-PAL)

**Activity**

The main focus at the Global Roundtable was to collate global practices on GPM and make a comparative analysis of these examples with the Indian GPM system. 13 Practitioners from 11 different countries were invited as speakers, with the view of gathering knowledge from their country experiences on GPM and benchmarking them with the Indian system.

One of the key features of this roundtable was the grouping of the Indian ATF members as discussants, with an international counterpart/Speaker to ensure in-depth learning and sharing on key issues of design and implementation.

The discussions at the roundtable started with Dr Prajapati Trivedi, Secretary, Performance Management welcoming over 200 central & state government officials, other participants from academia, and media to the Global Roundtable on Performance Management. He highlighted the relevance and need for an in-depth discussion on the topic, which is of high relevance to all the countries. The Secretary introduced the speakers who had assembled from all over the globe to share their experiences on performance management in government in their countries. The Cabinet Secretary, Shri Ajit Seth graced the occasion with his presence. He welcomed the participants and the speakers to the global roundtable and conveyed his best wishes to them for a fruitful two-day discussion. Prof R K Mishra, Director, IPE thanked the Cabinet Secretary and the Secretary, PMD for their support, and the participants for taking out time to attend the roundtable.

The Roundtable was designed to derive maximum learning for all those who participated. Each session was allotted 90 minutes, out of which presentation was made for 20 minutes.
by the speakers of the two countries. This was followed by 10 minutes each for the discussants who raised critical issues on the country presentation which can provide further learning for improving the Indian GPM system. This was followed by a 30 minute question and answer session.

Outcome

The main outcome of the Global Roundtable on Government Performance Management has been to understand the global GPM practices and benchmark them with the Indian System. The participants of the global roundtable, who were senior officials from the Central and State Governments, have been exposed to some very interesting models of ‘Enhancing Government Efficiency’ taken up around the world.

The Country papers prepared by the ATF discussants based on their in-depth discussions with the international experts and understanding of various global systems will be compiled and published as a book by the UNDP. This book will give an insight to the readers about the international best practices in Government Performance Management.

Conclusion

The objective with which the global roundtable was organized has been achieved to a great extent, in the sense that globally there are many important initiatives on GPM that are already being implemented, which have lessons for India to selectively learn and adopt the practices for enriching the Indian system of GPM. For instance, there is an important learning from USA as to how a robust legal framework has been established by the Government to bring in the necessary focus on performance in public sector organizations. From countries like Vietnam, South Africa there are lessons of how to bring in the key stakeholder which is the citizen for making the performance management system meaningful and real. The South Korean and Canadian systems demonstrate process rigor and have some very fine elements of planning a good system of GPM. Indonesia, for instance, shows a novel method of UKP4 for fixing accountability in public sector. Therefore, there are many good practices that are being followed by countries which can be studied further by India for enriching the Indian system.
An International workshop on Government Performance Management was organised for two weeks starting from 1st of July 2013 to 12th of July 2013 at Hotel Taj Mansingh, New Delhi.

The key objective of the International Workshop was to discuss the theory and practice of performance management, both at the national and international level. A platform was created to discuss the cutting-edge tools and techniques available with various countries for improving performance of government departments as well as public sector enterprises. The workshop was attended by Political Representatives of the Rank of Deputy Ministers, Heads of Administrative Services, Senior Government officials from Prime Minister's offices, Presidents offices, Central government and state Government, Cabinet offices, Senior Public Enterprise officials, Professional Economists, Management Consultants, Journalists and Academicians. Total sixty four participants attended the workshop out of which thirty nine were International participants from more than 25 countries including Afghanistan, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Fiji, Jordan, Kenya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Palestine, Peru, South Sudan, Tanzania, Turkey, Tuvalu, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Many of the International participants were sponsored for this program by the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India; and the state government participants by the Department of Personnel and Training, Government of India.

The speakers included practitioners, governance experts, academicians and scholars working in governance and reforms globally.

The key themes that were covered in the workshop included government performance theory and practice, strategic planning, measuring government performance, international best practices and innovations in public administration, designing and implementing public grievance redress system and Citizens’/Clients’ Charters, use of information technology in enhancing efficiency of government, monitoring and evaluation to name a few. The workshop delivery was designed in a highly participatory manner. Each session concluded with a quiz/work session involving the participants. There were awards constituted for working in teams and individually during the workshop.
Dr Trivedi welcomed the participants of the workshop and gave them an overview of the two week program. The discussion was based on the theme- ‘Why government performance is important’ and the need to focus on improving efficiency of government service delivery for benefiting the vulnerable groups of our society. With the advent of technology, service delivery has been made faster and easier and can be delivered to a large number of people with ease at various locations, including remote areas. This was re-emphasized by the guest of honour Mr. Sam Pitroda, Policy maker, development thinker, telecom inventor and entrepreneur. Professor R.K. Mishra, Director IPE delivered a vote of thanks and concluded the inaugural session.

Dr Trivedi welcomed the participants of the workshop and gave them an overview of the two week program. The discussion was based on the theme- ‘Why government performance is important’ and the need to focus on improving efficiency of government service delivery for benefiting the vulnerable groups of our society. With the advent of technology, service delivery has been made faster and easier and can be delivered to a large number of people with ease at various locations, including remote areas. This was re-emphasized by the guest of honour Mr. Sam Pitroda, Policy maker, development thinker, telecom inventor and entrepreneur. Professor R.K. Mishra, Director IPE delivered a vote of thanks and concluded the inaugural session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Omar Abdullah</th>
<th>Mr. Sam Pitroda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Minister, Jammu and Kashmir</td>
<td>Policy maker, development thinker, telecom inventor and entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nandan Nilekani</td>
<td>Mr. Arun Maira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman, Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI)</td>
<td>Member, Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J Satyanarayana, IAS</td>
<td>Mrs Vineeta Rai, IAS Retd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary, Department of Electronic and Information Technology (DEITY), GOI</td>
<td>Member Secretary, Second Administrative Reforms Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Richard Ndubai</td>
<td>Ms. Christine Heflin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Secretary, Prime Minister’s Office, Government of Kenya</td>
<td>Director, Performance Excellence US Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Arunselam Rasappan</td>
<td>Mr. Akash Deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Advisor Center for Development &amp; Research in Evaluation (CeDRE) International, Malaysia</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, Public Policy Harvard Kennedy School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rohini Pande</td>
<td>Dr. Vinay Dabolkar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Kamal Professor of Public Policy Harvard Kennedy School</td>
<td>Founder, Catalign Innovation Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Rishikesha T. Krishnan</td>
<td>Prof Ram Kumar Mishra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Fellow, ISB, and Professor, Corporate Strategy &amp; Policy, IIM Bangalore (IIMB)</td>
<td>Director, Institute of Public Enterprise(IPE), Hyderabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Anil Gupta</td>
<td>Mr. William Dorotinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, National Innovation Council</td>
<td>Public Sector Performance Global Expert Team, World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Achim von Heynitz</td>
<td>Mr. Howard White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor, University of Geneva</td>
<td>Executive Director, International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Vikram K. Chand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Public Sector Management Specialist, World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table listing the distinguished faculty members at the International Workshop on Government Performance Management
Indian Government’s commitment to performance management was evident with the presence of one its most dynamic and young heads of a State- the Hon’ble Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Sri Omar Abdullah. He spoke in very clear terms what RFD meant for his government, how the system was rolled out in J&K and the benefits of implementation of RFD in his State.

The international workshop participants visited Agra during the weekend. All the participants, especially, the international participants enjoyed the experience immensely. Some of the images of the tour have been presented below.

The concluding program was planned on 12th July 2013. The Cabinet Secretary of India, Sri Ajit Seth, IAS graced the occasion. Sri Ajit Seth addressed the participants and shared with them as to how the Indian Government was totally committed to the process of bringing performance at the centre stage and to make all the government departments accountable for their performance and ultimately delivery of service to the common man.

A wonderful cultural evening was planned by the PMD, which included classical dance performances by youngsters, both in Kuchupudi style and Mohiniattam style, which are south Indian classical dance forms.

The workshop facilitated a lot of experience sharing and knowledge transfer among the participants in terms how performance management as a strategy is being used by various countries to make the
governments more accountable, transparent and citizen centric. At the end of the workshop there was a unanimous and fervent view of all the participants that this engagement among the group must go on and a mechanism to be evolved to continue discussion on issues of performance management and beyond. It was suggested that a Community of Practice to be put in place at the earliest to ensure that the discussion is taken forward in a much more planned and systematic manner.
RFD Implementation in States:
RFMS Training in Assam

Background / Overview

The Performance Management Division (PMD), Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India, organized 3 one day workshops on Results Framework Management System (RFMS) under the auspices of the Government Performance Management Peer Assisted Learning (GO-PEM-PAL), on the request made by the Government of Assam. The workshops were organized in Assam Administrative Staff College, Guwahati, Assam from September 25-27, 2013 and was attended by around 200 State Government Officials.

Significance of the Workshop

This workshop was an important advancement towards the PMD initiative of penetration of performance oriented culture at all levels of government in India. A special request was received for the first time from a State to conduct RFMS training for its Directorates (equivalent to Responsibility Centres in the Central Government).

Details about the Workshop

The workshops were facilitated by PMD team led by Mr. Sandeep Chugh, Resource Person (RP) and consisted of Mr. Sandeep Yadav, RP, Mr. Rakesh Choudhary, RP, Ms. Shivani Mehra, Junior Consultant & Mr. Dewesh Kumar, Programmer, from PMD; and Mr. Ritvik Mishra & Ms. Shreya Dutt, Knowledge Network Administrators, GO-PEM-PAL.

It was held over a course of three days; where hands-on training on RFMS was imparted to around 200 government officials from various Directorates and Departments.

The workshop was structured around the conceptual aspects of Performance Management and the demonstration of the RFMS software. Each day was divided into 2 parts, the first half of the workshop was focused on sessions on conceptual knowledge about the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System (PMES), the Results Framework Document (RFD), the Results Framework Document Evaluation Methodology (REM) and the RFMS. This was followed by an interactive question-answer session. The second half of the day included RFMS demonstration session, wherein the participants were divided into two groups and were given hands-on training on the RFMS software. They were asked to feed in a sample RFD (prepared for training purposes) into the RFMS. Participant’s doubts, queries and difficulties regarding the preparation of the RFD through RFMS were clarified simultaneously. This session assisted the participants to get an essence of the RFMS Software and structure, to increase their confidence in using RFMS; and to understand the RFD and its preparation process.

The hands-on training was organized and managed by the Knowledge Network Administrators (KNAs) Ritvik Mishra & Shreya Dutt, whereas the conceptual part was led by the PMD team of Mr Sandeep Chugh, Sandeep Yadav and Mr. Rakesh Choudhary. The KNAs ensured that each participant was introduced to and familiarized with the GO-PEM-PAL Network. All the participants of the workshop were registered as members of the ‘RFMS Training’ COP (Community of Practice). This has helped us in creating an interactive platform and a vast database of officials from all the Directorates of the Assam Government. These members can now be easily contacted through the COP, and their queries pertaining to Performance Management in Government, and more specifically those related to RFDs and RFMS.
can be resolved immediately by the KNAs.

The KNAs also gave an elaborate description about the Performance Management Division’s website, displaying special features of the website and focusing on ‘how the department is working for effective and efficient governance’ by bringing transparency, increasing accountability and developing more advanced ways of monitoring and evaluating the performances of the Government Ministries and Departments. Furthermore, other performance enhancing initiatives such as ISO, Sevottam, Innovation, and Corruption Mitigation were also touched upon in brief during the training session.

**Conclusion**

The training by the PMD Resource Team along with the Knowledge Network Administrators was very well received. The team was able to impart information about the PMES & RFD system, along with hands-on training of the RFMS. All the trainees are now members of ‘RFMS Training’ COP (Community of Practice) which would help us in future communication and collaboration with them. Their queries, doubts, and problems can be duly addressed by the KNAs and the PMD Team on the COP, and their suggestions and requirements can also be embraced from time to time. It is heartening to mention that the Principal Secretary, Personnel, AR & Training Department, Assam, Mr RK Bora (IAS AM: 85) along with Deputy Secretary in charge, Mr JVN Subramanyam (IAS AM: 09) are esteemed and active members of the COP.
Accountability: Angst, Awareness, Action

Jay P. Desai is the Founder & CEO of Universal Consulting India Pvt. Ltd. MBA from Willamette University, MS in Molecular Biology from Purdue University and a graduate of AMP, Harvard Business School. He has more than 22 years of management consulting experience in India. His research interests are in the application of lessons from evolutionary biology and complexity science to business strategy. He can be contacted on: jay@universalconsulting.com

My objective in writing this book was to increase the public understanding of the concept of accountability among the citizens of India. Accountability is the heartbeat of good governance. Accountability fixes responsibility for outcomes on specific individuals, positions, departments, ministries or organizations. The culture of accountability appears not to have percolated into the Indian psyche, be it for citizens or for public officials.

How does the societal fabric of India, influence the current state of accountability, our cultural predisposition to the idea of being accountable, and our ability to extract accountability from those in power? India’s socio-characterized by low literacy, inequality, and tremendous influence the quality of correlation analysis between we thought may have some relationship corresponding governance scores for a Factors such as adult literacy, social which we intuitively thought would weak-to-moderate correlation with hand, factors like income per capita, the society and social hierarchy have a governance. Sadly, India’s relative position on those socio-economic factors that have a strong correlation with governance is weak. Our current standing on these socio-economic factors is therefore unlikely to be the springboard from which we launch into an era of good governance.

Our research suggests that there are four foundations of accountability: Appropriate Representation (representation of citizens by capable and reliable public officials), Participative Conduct (participation of citizens, CSOs and media to assist the Government in effective functioning), Legitimate Conduct (transparent, fair and equitable functioning of the Government) and Liability Enforcement (evaluation of conduct and performance and application of sanctions). Only if these four foundations are truly stable, can you expect an environment where accountability will be strong.

We created a three-dimensional construct to optically examine and dissect the quality of accountability in the institutions that are responsible for good governance. This 3D model comprises the three mechanisms of accountability; internal mechanisms (imposed by a government department on itself), horizontal mechanisms (imposed by one government department on another) and external mechanisms
imposed by citizens, civil society organizations, and the media, on the government), the three institutions of government; the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary which are held accountable by these mechanisms, and finally; the four foundations of accountability.

We concluded that these four foundations are unstable due to several weaknesses in implementing the accountability mechanisms in the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary. These inadequacies point us to a broad roadmap for the improvement of accountability, in the form of Six Initiatives that we need to focus on:

1. **Information** – easily available and accessible information
2. **Impartiality** – objective and transparent processes of appointment, transfer and evaluation of public officials
3. **Implementation** – effective implementation of policies
4. **Infrastructure** – adequate personnel, systems and infrastructure support for accountability agencies
5. **Independence** – adequate authority of accountability agencies and adequate empowerment given to them
6. **Involvement** – proactive use of accountability mechanisms by citizens to monitor policy formulation and provide feedback.

Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), citizens and the media play a critical role in externally strengthening accountability. Building institutional capacity in these CSOs is critical, and is the easiest way for a citizen to play a role in the process of improving accountability. There are five avenues that citizens and businesses can pursue to support these CSOs: volunteering time, providing media access, providing intellectual capacity, providing technology and infrastructure, and providing monetary support.

It is my hope that those who read this book will transit from a state of angst about accountability, to a state of awareness, and ultimately, to a resting state of action. India will then truly make its ‘tryst with destiny.’