What is the Cost? The Effect of the Post-Independence Government on Public Sector Performance in Namibia

Christopher Pomwene Shafuda[1,*] and Utpal Kumar De[2]

[1]*University of Namibia, Namibia*

[2]*Department of Economics, North-Eastern Hill University, India*

Abstract: The end of colonisation in Sub-Saharan Africa did not bring the expected welfare to many. Several governments stumbled with public resource mismanagement, which created room for corruption and other malpractices (Good, 1994: Maipose, 2000: Ncholo, 2000: Tsatsu, 2015). This article examines the performance and efficiency of the Namibian government interventions between 1990 and 2020. The findings reveal that some indicators showed significant improvement, while some did not record any substantial improvement. Decent performance was recorded in government policies to reduce inequality and poverty. Good performance is also seen in policies improving education attainment, while policies to reduce unemployment performed poorly. Other indicators have shown mixed results. The results also revealed the worst performance during the first five years after independence. The period between 2016-2020 recorded poor government performance in most of the indicators. The findings suggest a need to improve performance and efficiency in the public sector.

Keywords: Public sector performance, Government interventions, Public policy, Namibia.

INTRODUCTION

Namibia's colonial past deeply entrenched racial inequalities, denying black Namibians political, economic, and social rights while white settlers thrived (Bauer, 2001; Shafuda & De, 2020). The whites reproduced functioning democracies within their microcosmic reservations regarding elections, leadership turnover, independent courts, and some press freedom. The independence in 1990 brought anticipation for a fairer system (De & Shafuda, 2023). However, the sovereign government inherited an economy of highly skewed income distribution towards resourceful minority whites. In contrast, blacks and other inhabitants were in absolute poverty. Income inequality in Namibia was extreme, as was inequity in access to other primary economic resources such as education and healthcare.

Upon independence, the post-colonial government introduced several reforms and interventions to ensure equitable access to Namibian resources and upgrade the livelihood of previously disadvantaged Namibians while maintaining the status of the previously advantaged Namibians. Although interventions/reforms were made to address the mistakes of past (colonial) governments, their effectiveness and efficiency are still under-studied. Furthermore, the empirical literature on the efficiency and performance of government interventions is limited. Therefore, most of the few studies in this field express the need for further analysis (Afonso *et al.*, 2005; Angelopoulos *et al.*, 2008). However, the available literature pointed out that governments of less developing countries are likely to perform poorly and less efficiently (Sun *et al.*, 2002; Putu *et al.*, 2007; Angelopoulos *et al.*, 2008; Hauner & Kyobe, 2008; Lovre *et al.* 2017; De & Shafuda, 2023).

Data and Methods of Analysis

Data from various Namibian government ministries and offices, the World Bank and the World Economic Forum, are used from 1991 to 2020.

Analysis in this study is made focusing towards an input-led output analysis rather than focusing only on output with the use of the public sector performance (PSP) and public sector efficiency (PSE) introduced by Afonso *et al.* (2003, 2005), which is an output-to-input composite index methodology. The main advantage of this approach is its simplicity and logical coherence, which allows a meaningful comparison of the public sector across periods. However, several assumptions are made first to calculate such a composite index (Afonso *et al.*, 2005 and 2006).

For the purpose of analysis, the whole study period (1991-2020) is divided into five-year sub-periods for which the performances have been computed. Using the set of indicators constructed by Afonso *et al.* (2003, 2005, and 2006) to measure both Public Sector Performance (PSP) and Efficiency (PSE) across five time periods. These indicators distinguish performance as a societal benefit from public actions and efficiency

*Address correspondence to this author at the University of Namibia, Namibia, E-mail: poshafuda@gmail.com

JEL No: H00, H11, H89, L38

as the ratio of benefit to spending. Constructed for the entire government and its key functions, the indicators include "opportunity" and "Musgravian" components, ultimately allowing for a comprehensive assessment of public sector efficiency.

"Opportunity indicators" assess government performance in administration, education, health, and infrastructure. Administration covers corruption, regulation burden, judiciary independence, and the shadow economy. Education tracks secondary school enrollment, achievement in math and science, and tertiary enrollment. However, it excluded primary education, since it is enforced by the law in Namibia. Health indicators include infant mortality, life expectancy, and adult mortality. Infrastructure considers road and communication quality, excluding water and electricity data limitations. Five-year averages smooth out structural changes for accurate assessment.

The "Musgravian" indicators provide a snapshot of how Namibia's economic policy successfully achieves the economic policy's stabilisation goal. It includes the traditional tasks of the government, i.e. distribution, stabilisation and economic performance. Distribution focuses on inequality, measured by the Gini coefficient and poverty rate. Stabilisation considers both GDP growth variability and inflation control. Lastly, economic performance is assessed through averages of GDP per capita, growth, unemployment, and public debt ratio to GDP.

The overall Public Sector Performance (PSP) is obtained based on the same weights given to "opportunity" and "Musgravian" indicators. The performance values are computed based on the average values. The public sector's efficiency is weighed with the corresponding public expenditure to get the overall efficiency of the public sector's performances (see De and Shafuda, 2023). The model defining public sector performance (PSP) of j^{th} government activities as the results of public policies that depend on the values of certain economic and social indicators *(Ik)* is given by Afonso *et al.* (2003) as follows:

$$PSP = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j PSP_j \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

Where $PSP_j = (I_K)$ and ω_j are the weights corresponding to each category.

Improvement in socio-economic indicators is an indication of the improvement in public sector performance. The average change in performance indicators is therefore given as:

$$\Delta PSP = \sum_{i=k}^{n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial I_j} \Delta I_j \dots\dots\dots (2)$$

This approach helps to find the value governments get from the interventions by directly comparing their performance in selected economic areas, heavily influenced by the interventions with the associated spending allocated to achieve that performance. Essentially, it aims to assess the cost-effectiveness of government interventions in these specific sectors, revealing whether the expenditure translates into desired outcomes or if adjustments are needed for optimal resource allocation. PSP and Public Sector Expenditure (PEX) are expressed as a percentage of the respective average (normalised to be 1). Thus, to construct a PSE index, there is a need to measure the Public Sector Performance (PSP) and the associated Public Sector Expenditure (PEX) for each policy area and each same period. Then, public sector efficiency (PSE) is measured as the ratio between public sector performance (PSP) and public expenditure (PEX) (Alfonso, Schuknetcht, Tanzi, 2003). Therefore

$$PSE = \frac{PSP_j}{PEX_j} \dots\dots\dots (3)$$

The change in PSE is computed as the average of changes in PSE indicators, linking performance indicators with the appropriate public expenditure used to achieve a given performance level. It is computed by using the following formula:

$$\Delta PSE = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{PSP_j}{PEX_j} \dots\dots\dots (4)$$

The PSE index measures the efficiency of a country's government with respect to each period in a particular policy area. The larger value indicates that the country's government is more efficient.

OBSERVATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

The post-independence government implemented inclusive growth and poverty reduction reforms. Adopted forms were to reduce interracial differences in the country. These reforms aimed to achieve high and

Table 1: Proportion of Various Government Expenditures and Revenues to GDP during Different Sub-Periods

	T Gvt Exp.	Health Exp.	Edu.Exp.	Social[1] Exp.	Grs CapF	Tax Revenue	Total Revenue[2]	Budget Balance
1990-1995	9.3	1.0	2.3	0.5s	12.9	25.5	29.0	0.0
1996-2000	15.5	2.2	3.7	0.4	16.6	26.6	29.3	-1.8
2001-2005	21.7	2.6	4.6	0.7	18.5	25.1	27.8	-2.5
2006-2010	29.1	3.9	7.1	1.4	23.5	28.5	31.0	-4.8
2011-2015	42.5	5.0	11.3	5.6	33.7	32.4	34.8	-7.1
2016-2020	26.0	7.5	9.6	5.1	31.9	30.5	31.8	-6.1

Note: Total Government Expenditure as a percentage of GDP (T Gvt Exp), Public Expenditure on Health as a percentage of GDP (Health Exp.), Public Expenditure on Education as a percentage of GDP (Edu. Exp.), Social Transfer as a percentage of GDP (Social Exp.) Gross Capital Formation as a percentage of GDP (Grs CapF), Tax Revenue as a percentage of GDP (Tax Revenue), Total Government Revenue as a percentage of GDP (Total Revenue) and Budget balance in percentage.
Source: **5** years average of Data from the World Bank.
[1]Social transfer exlude expenditure in education and healthcare.
[2]Total Revenue exclude grants.

Table 2: Changes in Percentage Share of Various Industries and Sectors of GDP by in Different Sub-Periods

Industry	1991-95	1996-00	2001-05	2006-10	2011-15	2016-20
Agriculture, fishing and forestry[3]	8.8	9.2	9.8	8.4	7.8	7.7
Mining and quarrying[4]	9.8	8.9	10.5	12.5	10.3	9.0
Primary industries	18.6	18.1	20.3	21.0	17.7	16.6
Manufacturing	10.2	8.9	10.3	12.5	11.5	11.9
Meat processing	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.7
Other manufacturing[5]	9.2	8.3	9.9	12.0	11.0	9.1
Electricity and water	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0	3.5
Construction	2.3	2.3	2.6	3.4	4.2	2.3
Secondary industries	14.3	13.2	15.0	17.9	17.7	17.7
Wholesale and retail trade, repairs	7.0	8.3	10.7	10.9	11.4	10.2
Accommodations and Food services	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.9
Transport and Storage	4.5	3.6	2.7	2.7	2.8	3.1
Information and communications	1.4	1.9	3.1	2.4	1.9	1.5
Financial and insurance services	2.3	3.1	3.9	4.8	5.9	7.2
Real estate and business services	8.6	8.6	9.0	8.2	8.5	0.0
Arts, entertainment and recreation	0.7	1.4	3.6	2.9	2.0	1.7
Producers of Government Services	30.5	24.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Public administration and defence	0.0	2.0	9.3	9.4	10.9	11.4
Education	0.0	1.6	7.5	7.0	8.7	9.9
Health	0.0	1.0	4.3	3.0	3.3	3.5
Private household with employed persons	1.9	1.5	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.7
Tertiary industries	58.2	59.2	56.7	53.6	57.3	58.3

Source: 5 years average of Data from Namibia Statistic Agency.
[3]**Agriculture, fishing and forestry** includes Livestock farming, Crop farming and forestry, Fishing and fish processing on board.
[4]**Mining and quarrying** includes all the miniral produces and products. The major contributors are Diamond mining, Uranium and Metal Ores.
[5]**Other manufacturing** includes Grain Mill products, Other food products, Beverages, Textile and wearing apparel, Leather and related products, Wood and wood products, Publishing and Printing, Chemical and related products, Rubber and Plastics products, Non-metallic minerals products, Basic non-ferrous metals.

Table 3: Opportunity Indicators of the Public Sector Performance in Namibia during 1991-2020

Category	Indicators		1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	Growth Rate				
		1991-95	1996-00	2001-05	2006-10	2011-15	2016-20	0-1st period	1st -2nd period	2nd -3rd period	3rd-4th period	4th-5th period
Administrative	Corruption Perception Index, (100 = no corruption & 0 indicates max. corruption)	47.00	51.33	43.40	45.20	50.60	51.8	9.22	-15.45	4.15	11.95	2.37
	Quality of Judiciary Index [1 weak; 5 strong]	2.78	2.79	2.60	2.70	2.76	2.81	0.36	-6.81	3.77	2.33	1.81
	Red Tape (Burden of Regulation) [1 weak; 5 strong]	2.77	2.84	2.61	2.58	2.40	2.39	-2.83	8.35	0.84	7.28	-0.42
	Shadow Economy, Percent of GDP	31.97	31.64	29.23	24.88	22.63	22.11	1.05	7.60	14.89	9.03	-2.30
	Mean Growth							1.95	-1.58	5.91	7.64	0.37
Education	Secondary School Enrolment Rate	51.00	56.84	63.82	65.00	66.81	69.87	11.46	12.28	1.85	2.79	4.58
	Tertiary School Enrolment Rate	4.56	6.28	6.39	9.87	19.18	24.59	37.85	1.64	54.53	94.31	28.21
	Quality of Math & Science Education Index [1=extremely poor; 7=excellent]	1.39	2.14	2.69	3.59	3.88	3.91	54.08	25.60	33.61	8.12	0.77
	Mean Growth							34.47	13.17	29.99	35.07	11.19
Heath	Adult Mortality	20.02	25.28	28.53	22.11	19.18	19.23	-26.28	-12.85	22.50	13.26	0.26
	Infant Mortality	4.78	4.88	4.77	4.10	3.44	3.33	-2.14	2.26	14.09	16.02	-3.20
	Life Expectancy at Birth	60.83	57.25	54.74	60.04	64.27	64.89	-5.89	-4.39	9.69	7.04	0.96
	Mean Growth							-11.43	-4.99	15.43	12.11	-0.66
Infrastructure	Quality of Road Infrastructure [1=low; 7=high]		4.67	4.82	5.28	5.43	5.56		3.07	9.55	2.84	2.39
	Quality of Network Infrastructure, [1=low; 7=high]		4.75	4.92	5.09	5.12	5.31		3.65	3.46	0.71	3.71
	Mean Growth								3.36	6.50	1.78	3.05

Note: Since PSE is an aggregate analysis, for homogeneity purposes, the variables that are beneficial to the economy (e.g., reduction in shadow economy) is negative are converted to a positive outcome.
Source: Compiled by the author.

Table 4: Musgravian Indicators of Public Sector Performance in Namibia during 1991-2020

Indicators	1991-95	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	Growth Rate				
		1996-00	2001-05	2006-10	2011-15	2016-20	0-1st period	1st-2nd period	2nd-3rd period	3rd-4th period	4th-5th period
Poverty Ratio, Percent Living on Less than 1.90 USD a Day	41.90	34.90	30.55	20.15	13.68	14.6	16.71	12.46	34.04	32.13	6.73
Inequality (Gini Index) [0 -perfect equality, 100-perfect inequality]	67.35	63.40	61.10	59.85	57.60	57.2	5.86	3.63	2.05	3.76	-0.69
Mean Growth							11.29	8.05	18.04	17.95	3.02
Five-Year Coefficient of Variation of GDP Growth	0.48	0.23	0.30	0.43	0.16	0.28	52.89	-31.95	-44.30	63.59	75.00
Rate of Inflation	2.15	1.71	2.34	2.20	1.71	3.62	20.23	-36.86	6.06	22.12	-111.70

Indicators	1991-95	1st 1996-00	2nd 2001-05	3rd 2006-10	4th 2011-15	5th 2016-20	Growth Rate 0-1st period	1st-2nd period	2nd-3rd period	3rd-4th period	4th-5th period
Mean Growth							21.02	-41.95	-17.85	29.42	-18.35
Economic Growth: Rate of Change of Real GDP	4.02	3.51	4.77	3.32	5.64	-1.1	-12.66	35.79	-30.49	70.13	-119.50
GDP per Capita (Constant 2010 NAD)	3718	3888	4352	51501	5926	5027	4.56	11.94	18.35	15.05	-15.17
Unemployment Rate	19.20	19.26	21.84	30.16	28.98	32.42	-0.31	-13.40	-38.10	3.91	11.87
Debt to GDP Ratio	8.54	15.45	28.51	27.34	39.50	49.62	-80.91	-84.53	4.10	-44.48	25.62
Mean Growth							-22.33	-12.55	-11.53	11.15	-24.30

Note: Since PSE is an aggregate analysis, for homogeneity purposes, the variables that are beneficial to the economy (e. g., reduction in poverty, etc.) is negative are and converted to a positive outcome.
Source: Compiled by the author.

sustained economic growth, create employment opportunities for all Namibians and reduce poverty and income inequality among Namibians (NDP-1, 1995). As a result, these reforms were accompanied by aggressive government expenditure on social services and excessive government investment in social and other infrastructures (see Table **1**). Nevertheless, in order to finance these extensive social services, the government had to establish avenues for revenue generation while also generating necessary employment opportunities for Namibians. As a result, the government aimed to ensure sustainable economic growth. Economic growth was sluggish during the 1990s, the transitional phase following independence, with an average GDP growth rate of over 3 per cent. Nonetheless, there are indications of a faster pace of growth in the period post-2000 before experiencing a downturn between 2016 and 2020.

The mining sector has been one of the largest and most consistent contributors to growth over the years, with diamonds and uranium being major contributors to the country's GDP. The mining industry contributes significantly to the country's GDP and provides employment to several Namibians. Agriculture is another important sector in the Namibian economy, with livestock farming being a major contributor. Cattle, sheep, and goats are the main livestock raised in Namibia, with beef and mutton being the important export items. Crop farming is also important, with corn, millet, and wheat being the main crops grown. The agricultural sector employs over 20 per cent of the Namibian labour force. Other important contributors are the fishing, wholesale, and retail trading sectors (Table **2**).

PSP and PSE for Namibia

Data are grouped into five-year clusters as 1991-95, 1996-00, 2001-2005, 2006-10, 2011-2015 and 2016-2020 to compute and examine changes in public sector performance in the opportunity and Musgravian indicators. Tables **1**, **2** and **3** show the relative changes in the values of these indicators during the study period. Despite overall improvement in opportunity indicators, Namibia struggles with recent declines, particularly in administration. This is largely due to a perceived rise in corruption and concerns about judicial independence. Transparency International and the Ibrahim Index highlight both issues, attributing them to the dominance of one political party and potential collusion between government branches.

Namibia initially grappled with excessive bureaucracy after independence but saw gradual improvement. However, progress stalled in the mid-2000s. Data reveals a decline in ease of doing business, ranking 66th in 2009 and falling to 108th by 2016 (World Bank, 2018). Interestingly, the "shadow economy" sub-indicator, reflecting informal economic activity, remained positive throughout this period.

Education performed the best among opportunity indicators, driven by significant government

investments in education. Tertiary enrollment surged from 2% in 1990 to over 24% in 2020, while math and science education thrived, thanks to mandatory math classes and promotion requirements. Secondary school enrollment rates also saw steady growth throughout the period. This highlights the positive impact of targeted investments in education.

Table 5: Aggregate PSP Indicator

	1st period	2nd period	3rd period	4th period	5th period
Opportunity Indicators	24.98	9.96	57.84	56.60	13.95
Musgravian Indicators	9.97	-46.45	-11.34	58.52	72.07
Aggregate PSP	34.95	-36.49	46.50	115.11	-39,63

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Table 6: Public Sector Efficiency in Namibia during 1991-2020

sCategory		1st sub-period	2nd sub-period	3rd sub-period	4th sub- period	5th sub- period
Administrative	PSP	1.95	-1.58	5.91	7.64	0.37
	PSX	66.37	40.08	34.20	83.68	-23.45
	PSE	0.03	-0.04	0.17	0.09	-0.016
Education	PSP	34.47	13.17	29.99	35.07	11.19
	PSX	62.68	23.16	54.26	87.44	20.12
	PSE	0.55	0.57	0.55	0.40	0.56
Heath	PSP	-11.43	-4.99	15.43	12.11	-0.66
	PSX	107.40	18.09	54.28	77.32	2.29
	PSE	-0.11	-0.28	0.28	0.16	-0.29
Infrastructure	PSP		3.36	6.50	1.78	3.05
	PSX	80.81	71.10	6.93	142.79	3.67
	PSE	0.00	0.05	0.94	0.01	0.83
Distribution	PSP	11.29	8.05	18.04	17.95	3.02
	PSX	-18.58	71.54	104.70	310.69	57.34
	PSE	-0.61	0.11	0.17	0.06	0.05
Stability	PSP	-11.76	-8.08	-10.95	17.60	-18.35
	PSX	66.37	40.08	34.20	83.68	-23.45
	PSE	0.32	-1.05	-0.52	0.35	0.78
Economic Performance	PSP	-22.33	-12.55	-11.53	11.15	(-)-24.3
	PSX	66.37	40.08	34.20	83.68	-23.45
	PSE	-0.34	-0.31	-0.34	0.13	-1.04
Aggregate PSE		-0.15	-0.95	1.26	1.20	0.88

Source: Compiled by the author. Note: These are sub-periods: 1st sub-period (1995-2000), 2nd sub-period (2001-2005), 3rd sub-period (2006-2010), 4th sub-period (2011-15), 5th sub-period (2016-2020).

Unlike education's success story, healthcare indicators in Namibia initially struggled (Table **1**). Both life expectancy and adult mortality rates declined in the first decade after independence, mirroring a rise in infant mortality. This bleak picture can be attributed to two main factors: HIV/AIDS emergence and Medical expertise shortage. The newly independent Namibia faced a lack of qualified medical professionals, further hindering healthcare delivery and performance. The later periods saw some positive changes, and addressing these challenges remains crucial for sustained improvements in Namibia's healthcare system.

Despite lacking data for the early post-independence years, Namibia's recent infrastructure performance stands out. The country boasts the best road infrastructure in Africa, earning the top spot in the World Economic Forum's rankings (World Economic Forum, 2017). However, rankings for electricity and telephonic infrastructure lag behind, reflecting limited electricity coverage until 2016 (around 50%), but the

mobile network coverage exceeds 90%. Addressing these disparities remains crucial for balanced infrastructure development in Namibia.

Musgravian indicators' analysis revealed a significant improvement in the distribution pattern of Namibian economy, though with high variations in the stability and economic performance (Table **4**). While Namibia saw positive steps in reducing inequality (measured by Gini index and poverty ratio), progress wasn't equal across all areas (Table **4**). Improvement in inequality still lagged behind poverty reduction, leaving Namibia a society with significant wealth disparities. However, stability and economic performance indicators painted a less rosy picture. Both experienced significant fluctuations, with particularly worrisome trends in public debt, unemployment, and GDP growth variability. These factors contributed to negative overall Musgravian indicator performance in the second and third sub-periods, highlighting areas needing substantial improvement for sustainable economic development in Namibia.

The computed result of variation in public sector aggregate performance has been presented in Table **5**. It reveals that interventions in education, infrastructure and distribution had a greater performance. On the other hand, poor performance was recorded in the interventions for stability, health care and administrative indicators.

The change in the public sector efficiency score is computed by dividing the percentage changes of performance indicators by the percentage changes in relevant public expenditure (PEX) for achieving that performance (Equations 2 and 3). Thus, the variables used are 1. Total Government expenditure as a percentage of *GDP for Administration Performance, Stability and Economic Performance, 2. Government expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP for Educational Performance, 3. Government expenditure on healthcare as a percentage of GDP* for Health Performance, 4. Government expenditure on capital projects as a percentage of GDP for Infrastructure performance, 5. Government expenditure on social services and a safety net (excluding health and education) as a percentage of GDP for Distribution performance.

The aggregate public sector efficiency showed a negative score during the first two time periods. However, the aggregate efficiency score improved in the fourth and fifth periods before declining during the period between 2016 and 2020 (Table **4**). Between 2005 and 2015, the Namibian efficiency score was above the international average (Afonso *et al.*, 2005; Angelopoulos *et al.*, 2008). Public efficiency improved due to capacity development through training and experience of the public sector employees. The results also revealed that the Namibian public sector has improved since 1990, except between 2011 and 2020 (fourth and fith sub-period), which showed decreased aggregate efficiency.

The country's declining efficiency partly stems from **Rushed Response:** Launching projects without research on financing, implementation, or sustainability. An example is the Targeted Intervention Programme for Employment and Economic Growth (TIPEEG). TIPEEG aimed to address unemployment quickly but ultimately failed. **Borrowing Blunder:** Unnecessary loans burdened the government due to a lack of spending plans, leaving funds idle and incurring storage costs. **Public Pressure Trap:** Hasty spending under public pressure led to short-term, unsustainable jobs lasting only short-term. Hence, well-researched and sustainable public policy is vital to achieve desired outcomes and avoid wasting valuable resources. **Lack of Economic Diversification**: Too dependent on the mining sector, the Namibian economy was strangled during the global commodity price shocks.

Conclusion and Policy Implication

This study examined the efficiency of government policy interventions in post-independent Namibia. The study found some encouraging signs of improving public sector efficiency in post-independence Namibia. Inequality and poverty reduction policies showed positive results, while unemployment interventions proved less effective. Though there were some progress in the earlier sub-periods, an overall decline in efficiency has been recorded between 2016-2020.

The findings of this study highlight some key areas for improvement:

- **Thorough Research:** Comprehensive planning and research are crucial to avoid costly failures.
- **Sustainability Focus:** Programs should target long-term economic impact and job creation, not short-term fixes.
- **Responsible Spending:** Careful allocation and transparent project selection are essential for efficient public fund usage.

- **Political will:** Leaders must demonstrably prioritise accountability and transparency in public resource management.

- **Policy alignment:** Aligning the National Development Plan with the presidential term may improve performance assessment. Furthermore, NDPs must be aligned to other regional and International planning.

These measures can help Namibia to be on the path of progress and achieve greater public sector efficiency, ultimately leading to improved development outcomes.

REFERENCES

Afonso, A., Romero-Barrutieta, A., & Monsalve, E. (2013). Public sector efficiency: evidence for Latin America. Inter-American Development Bank Discussion Paper No. IDB-DP-279. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2365007

Afonso, A., Schuknecht, L., & Tanzi, V. (2006) *Public sector efficiency: evidence for new EU member states and emerging markets*. ECB Working Paper, (No. 581). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.876945

Afonso, A., Schuknecht, L., & Tanzi, V. (2005). Public sector efficiency: an international comparison. *Public Choice, 123*(3), 321-347. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-005-7165-2

Afonso, A., Schuknecht, L., & Tanzi, V. (2003). *Public sector efficiency: An international comparison*. Working Paper Series (No. 242). European Central Bank. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.434002

Bauer, G. (2001). Namibia in the first decade of independence: how democratic?. *Journal of Southern African Studies 27,*1: 33-55. www.jstor.org/stable/823289. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070120029491

De, U. K., & Shafuda, C. P. (2023). Performance and Efficiency of Public Sector in Independent Namibia. *South Asian Journal of Macroeconomics and Public Finance*, *12*(2), 160-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/22779787231204698

Good, K. (1994). Corruption and mismanagement in Botswana: a best-case example?. *The Journal of Modern African Studies 32*, 3: 499-521. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022278X00015202

Hauner, D., & Kyobe, A. (2008). *Determinants of government efficiesncy". International Monetary Fund*. IMF Working Paper Fiscal Affairs Department. https://doi.org/10.5089/9781451870862.001

Lovre, I., Munitlak Ivanović, O., & Mitić, P. (2017). Analysis of public sector efficiency in developed countries. *Economic analysis 50*, 1/2: 38-49.

Maipose, G. S. (2000). Aid abuse and mismanagement in Africa: Problems of accountability, transparency and ethical leadership. In *corruption and development in Africa* (pp. 87-103). Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780333982440_5

Ncholo, P. (2000). Reforming the public service in South Africa: A policy framework. *Public administration and development 20*, 2: 87-102. https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-162X(200005)20:2<87::AID-PAD117>3.0.CO;2-H

Putu S, N., Jan van Helden, G., & Tillema, S. (2007). Public sector performance measurement in developing countries: A literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, *3*(3), 192-208. https://doi.org/10.1108/18325910710820265

Shafuda, C. P., & De, U. K. (2020). Fiscal Policy Changes in Namibia: Are Namibians Better Off After Independence?. *The Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, *42*(1). https://doi.org/10.35293/srsa.v42i1.197

Sun, Q., Tong, W. H., & Tong, J. (2002). How does government ownership affect firm performance? Evidence from China's privatisation experience. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, *29*(1-2), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5957.00422

Tsatsu, T. F. (2016). *Energy resource (oil) mismanagement in West-Africa*. Webster University.

World Bank. (2018). Doing Business 2019: Training for Reform - Namibia (English). Doing Business 2019. Washington, DC: World Bank Group. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/514681541154817278/Doing-Business-2019-Training-for-Reform-Namibia

World Economic Forum. (2017). Global Competitiveness Index: Quality of roads. http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-index-2016-2017/competitiveness-rankings/#series=EOSQ057

Received on 24-07-2023 Accepted on 02-09-2023 Published on 27-09-2024

https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-7092.2024.13.02