

# National Evaluation Plan 2012-13

13 June 2012



THE PRESIDENCY  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION



THE PRESIDENCY  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

# Foreword

It gives me great pleasure to see that our first National Evaluation Plan for 2012/13 is now published. We agreed on our National Evaluation Policy Framework only in November 2011.

Evaluation provides us with an opportunity to learn about what is working and what is not working and what we need to do to improve our performance. We must take this opportunity, all of us who are in the public service, to see how we can improve the impacts of the money we spend on our citizens.

Our first evaluation on Early Childhood Development has already been completed and the results are being implemented. In this National Evaluation Plan Cabinet has agreed to the top eight priorities for evaluation during 2012/13. These are all significant topics, which can make a significant difference in the lives of our people.

I look forward to seeing some high quality evaluations, and to hearing how these are being implemented.

Minister Ohm Collins Chabane,  
Minister of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation and Administration  
June 2012



# Contents

|                   |  |    |    |
|-------------------|--|----|----|
| Glossary          | iii  |    |    |
| Executive summary | iv   |    |    |
| 1                 | Introduction   | 1  |    |
| 1.1               | The Framework  | 1  |    |
| 1.2               | Purpose of the National Evaluation Plan (NEP)  | 2  |    |
| 1.3               | Criteria and process used for selection  | 2  |    |
| 1.4               | Audit of evaluations   | 2  |    |
| 2                 | Evaluations undertaken in 2011/12  | 2  |    |
| 3                 | Summary of evaluations for 2012/13   | 3  |    |
| 4                 | Concepts for evaluations for 2012/13   | 5  |    |
| 4.1               | Impact Evaluation of the School Nutrition Programme  | 5  |    |
| 4.2               | Impact Evaluation of Grade R   | 6  |    |
| 4.3               | Diagnostic/Implementation evaluation of nutritional interventions for children under five in the identified Primary Health Care facilities and their catchment areas | 7  |    |
| 4.4               | Implementation Evaluation of the Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme  | 9  |    |
| 4.5               | Evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme  | 10 |    |
| 4.6               | Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme  | 11 |    |
| 4.7               | Implementation Evaluation of the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)   | 12 |    |
| 4.8               | Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)  | 13 |    |
| 5                 | Outline of evaluations for 2013/14 and 2014/15   |    | 15 |
| 6                 | Key implementation issues  |    | 15 |
| 6.1               | Reporting on the plan, and review the plan   |    | 15 |
| 6.2               | Funding of the evaluations in the Plan   |    | 15 |
| 6.3               | Next steps once the plan is approved   |    | 15 |

# Glossary

|       |   |        |   |
|-------|---|--------|---|
| 3ie   | International Institute for Impact Evaluation                 | NSNP   | National School Nutrition Programme   |
| BPO&O | Business Process Outsourcing & Off-shoring (BPO&O)            | PEDs   | Provincial Education Departments  |
| BPS   | Business Process Services                                     | PHC    | Primary Health Care   |
| CRDP  | Comprehensive Rural Development Programme                     | PSC    | Public Service Commission   |
| DBE   | Department of Basic Education                                 | PSPPD  | Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy Development<br>(a partnership between the Presidency and the European Union) |
| DFID  | Department for International Development                      | UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund  |
| DPME  | Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation           | USDG   | Urban Settlements Development Grant   |
| DHS   | Department of Human Settlements                               | WHO    | World Health Organisation   |
| DRDLR | Department of Rural Development and Land Reform               |        |   |
| DSD   | Department of Social Development                              |        |   |
| dti   | Department of Trade and Industry                              |        |   |
| DWCPD | Department of Women, Children and People with<br>Disabilities |        |   |
| ECCE  | Early Child Care and Education                                |        |   |
| ECD   | Early Childhood Development                                   |        |   |
| ERU   | Evaluation and Research Unit, DPME                            |        |   |
| INP   | Integrated Nutrition Programme                                |        |   |
| IRDP  | Integrated Residential Development Programme                  |        |   |
| MDGs  | Millennium Development Goals                                  |        |   |
| NDOH  | National Department of Health                                 |        |   |
| NEP   | National Evaluation Plan                                      |        |   |
| NEPF  | National Evaluation Policy Framework                          |        |   |
| NIP   | National Integrated Plan for ECD                              |        |   |



# National Evaluation Plan for 2012/13

## Executive summary

### 1 Introduction

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) was approved on 23 November 2011. This set out the approach in establishing a National Evaluation System for South Africa. It sought to address the problem that “evaluation is applied sporadically and not informing planning, policy-making and budgeting sufficiently, so we are missing the opportunity to improve government’s effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability”. The purpose underlying is:

- Improving policy or programme **performance** (evaluation for continuous improvement) – providing feedback to managers;
- Improving **accountability** for where public spending is going and the difference it is making;
- Improving **decision-making** on what is working or not-working;
- Increasing **knowledge** about what works and what does not with regards to a public policy, plan, programme, or project.

The NEPF focuses on different government interventions including policies, plans, programmes and projects. It envisages evaluation as a process carried out throughout the intervention lifecycle, including prior to development of an intervention (a diagnostic evaluation), to confirm the design (design evaluation), to assess progress and how implementation can be improved (implementation evaluation), to assess impact (impact evaluation), and to see the relationship between costs and benefits (economic evaluation). The NEPF envisages a rolling National Evaluation Plan (NEP) including the key evaluations across government seen as a national priority.

The initial focus is on eight evaluations agreed as national priorities to be implemented as part of a National Evaluation Plan, which sets the benchmark for evaluations in the country. Minimum standards and guidelines are being developed, and these will be tested out in 2012/13. Selection in the plan means support from Cabinet that the topic is important, that the Guidelines and minimum standards being developed for the National Evaluation System must be used (for an example that an Improvement Plan must be produced), that the evaluation will be made public, and that DPME will support the department concerned to ensure that the findings are implemented.

Selection of the evaluations for 2012/13 was undertaken by a cross-government Evaluation Technical Working Group.

DPME has undertaken an audit of evaluations commissioned since 2006 in the social and economic sectors. Unless confidential, the actual evaluation reports will also be made available on the DPME website. Over 140 evaluations have been identified in this process.

### 2 Evaluations undertaken in 2011/12

The first evaluation undertaken supported by DPME has been a Diagnostic Review of the Early Childhood Development (ECD) Sector, undertaken prior to a Review of the National Integrated Plan for ECD. The partners have been the Department of Basic Education (DBE), Department of Social Development (DSD), Department of Health, Department of Women, Children and People with Disability (DWCPD). The findings have been tabled at a national ECD conference in March 2012, and are being used to rethink the future development of the sector.

### 3/4 Summary of evaluations for 2012/13

The evaluations that will be conducted during the 2012/13 financial year include:

- Impact Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme;
- Impact Evaluation of Grade R;
- Implementation Evaluation of the Integrated Nutrition Programme;
- Implementation Evaluation of the Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme;
- Implementation Evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme;
- Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme;
- Implementation Evaluation of the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP);
- Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG).

## 5 Outline of evaluations for 2013/14 and 2014/15

For the 2012/13 plan, there has not been time to develop the outlines for evaluations beyond the initial year. The call for evaluations for the 2013/14-2015/16 plan will be issued with the tabling of this Plan, and the plan for 2013/14-2015/16 will include the one page concepts for the first year and outlines for evaluations in the subsequent two years. The three year plan will be produced by September 2012.

## 6 Key implementation issues

DPME will work with the respective departments to implement these evaluations and ensure they are good quality and likely to be implemented. The reports of the evaluations will be made public, and for each an improvement plan will be developed.

This Plan has had to be developed after the budget process for 2012/13 was already complete. Some departments do have budgets they can allocate, while in several cases the majority of the funding will come from DPME. However for the two more expensive impact evaluations donor funding is being sought, from DFID and from 3ie.

Quarterly reports will be provided to Cabinet on progress with implementation of the Plan, highlighting key lessons, as well as emerging findings, and progress with implementation of improvement plans around each evaluation.



# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The Framework

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) was approved on 23 November 2011. This set out the approach in establishing a National Evaluation System for South Africa. It sought to address the problem that "evaluation is applied sporadically and not informing planning, policy-making and budgeting sufficiently, so we are missing the opportunity to improve government's effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability".

The Policy Framework and the National Evaluation System seek to:

- Foreground the importance of evaluation;
- Provide for an institutionalised system across government linking to planning and budget;
- Provide a common language and conceptual base for evaluation in government;
- Indicate clear roles and responsibilities related to evaluation;
- Improve the quality of evaluations;
- Ensure the utilisation of evaluation findings to improve performance.

The purpose underlying is:

- Improving policy or programme **performance** (evaluation for continuous improvement) - providing feedback to managers;
- Improving **accountability** for where public spending is going and the difference it is making;
- Improving **decision-making** eg on what is working or not working;
- Increasing **knowledge** about what works and what does not with regards to a public policy, plan, programme, or project.

Recognising that an evaluation system will take some time to establish, and longer to become part of management culture, the initial focus is on evaluations agreed as national priorities to be implemented as part of a National Evaluation Plan, which sets the benchmark for evaluations in the country. Minimum standards and guidelines are being developed, and these will be tested out in 2012/13 as part of the process of implementing this plan, the first ever National Evaluation Plan in South Africa.

The benefits for departments submitting evaluations for the NEP are that:

- DPME will be a full partner in these evaluations, helping to assure technical quality;
- DPME will have up to R500 000 on average to part-fund these (and in some cases is assisting in finding donor funding);
- The approval by Cabinet will give political focus on these issues, as well as impetus in ensuring the findings are followed up and have political support;
- Particularly in 2012/13, the evaluations will be used to test and develop the system, and so the departments have the opportunity to participate in development of the evaluation system.

Selection in the Plan means that the Guidelines and minimum standards being developed for the National Evaluation System must be used (for an example that an Improvement Plan must be produced), that the evaluation will be made public, and that DPME will support the department concerned to ensure that the findings are implemented.

## 1.2 Purpose of the National Evaluation Plan (NEP)

The purpose of the NEP is to provide details of evaluations approved by Cabinet as priority evaluations to undertake in 2012/13, and summarise the situation with ongoing evaluations.

## 1.3 Criteria and process used for selection

The Policy Framework puts the priority for evaluation of existing interventions, and on those that:

1. Are a national priority:
  - Linked to the 12 outcomes, and the top five priority ones have precedence;
  - Large (with a programme budget of over R500m or with a wide footprint, covering over 10% of the population);
  - Strategic, where it is important to learn.

Additional features to be considered include those interventions that:

2. Are **innovative** and where learning is important;
3. Are from an area where there is a lot of **public interest**;
4. Have a **theory of change**/logical framework. At this stage there are no minimum standards for implementation programmes so evaluations are not excluded if this is not the case;

5. Have not been evaluated recently;
6. Are at a **critical stage** where decisions are to be taken for which an evaluation is needed, and so it is important that it is evaluated now;
7. Ideally have **monitoring data** that can be used including background and previous documented performance, current programme situation;
8. Have a **potential budget** for evaluation from the department, DPME or donors. This is particularly important for 2012/13 where the Evaluation Plan has been developed late for the budget cycle. In future it will be developed at the same time.

The call for proposals was issued on 30 January 2012 with letters sent to all national Directors-General. 12 proposals were received in total and selection of the successful eight was undertaken by a cross-government Evaluation Technical Working Group on 13 March 2012, and eventually approved by Cabinet on 13 June 2012.

#### 1.4 Audit of evaluations

DPME has undertaken an audit of evaluations undertaken since 2006 in the social and economic sectors<sup>1</sup>. This list will be made available on the DPME website with contact people, and unless the evaluations are confidential, the actual evaluation reports will also be made available on the DPME website. This will greatly help in ensuring that existing work is used, and the results of evaluations are available for future planning, budgeting and evaluative processes. Over 140 evaluations have been identified in this process.

## 2 Evaluations undertaken in 2011/12

### Early Childhood Development (ECD) diagnostic review

The first evaluation undertaken supported by DPME has been a Diagnostic Review of the ECD Sector, undertaken prior to a Review of the National Integrated Plan (NIP) for ECD. The partners have been the departments of Basic Education (DBE), Social Development (DSD), Health (NDOH), and Women, Children and People with Disability (DWCPD). The final report prior to a combined report with the NIP Review was presented in March 2012, and the key findings were presented at an ECD Conference at the end of March 2012. The evaluation has been a diagnostic, assessing the issues overall in the sector. There is much existing work done, and so this has not been primary research, but based on 110

<sup>1</sup> This was supported by the Programme for Support to Pro-Poor Policy Development (PSPPD), a partnership between the Presidency and the EU.

existing studies. Key questions were around the overall paradigm being used, the types of services offered, cost-effectiveness, and institutional issues.

Key findings are:

- The definition of ECD in the Children's Act is too limited and should be widened beyond care outside of the home to include care in the home. This will expand the health aspects of ECD and strengthen the focus on the first 1000 days from conception.
- Many elements of comprehensive support and services for children are already in place and some are performing well. These include aspects of household infrastructure provision, citizenship through birth registration, social security, health care for women and children, early child care and education (ECCE), and preparation for formal schooling. Improvements in access and quality are being, and must continue to be, sought in all areas.
- However, important gaps remain. These include support for parenting, prevention of stunting among young children, safe and affordable child care for very young children and other families needing assistance, and planned rapid expansion and provision of ECCE services to the most at-need families, including children with disabilities.
- ECD services require strong and coordinated inter-sectoral vision, commitment and action. High-level authorization and legitimacy of a well-resourced central agency or mechanism is needed to drive forward key strategies for ECD. These strategies should include:
  - to deliver comprehensive services to young children in as integrated way as possible, using all opportunities of contact with families;
  - to extend ECCE through home- and community-based programmes, beginning with the poorest communities not reached by current services;
  - to ensure food security and adequate daily nutrition for the youngest children to avert the life-long damaging effects of stunting;
  - to launch well-designed high-profile parent support programmes through media campaigns, community activities and services that acknowledge and reinforce the importance of positive parenting for young children.
- Achieving these goals also depends on new funding and resourcing strategies, especially for ECCE.

### 3 Summary of evaluations for 2012/13

Table 1 summarises the evaluations that will be conducted during the 2012/13 financial year. The three year plan will be produced by September 2012.

**Table 1: The three year plan for 2013/14 to 2015/16**

| Name of Department            | Name of intervention                | Title of evaluation   | Methodology   | Years of implementation |         |         | Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------|---------|---------|---|
|                               |                                     |   |   | 2012/13                 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 |   |
| Department of Basic Education | National School Nutrition Programme | Impact Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme    | An ex post study, using existing data sources. A scoping exercise will be undertaken to determine the feasibility of conducting the impact evaluation using existing data sources. In addition some qualitative work will be needed to understand how the impact can be strengthened. | X                       |         |         | The NSNP aims to enhance the educational experience of the neediest primary school learners through promoting punctual school attendance, alleviating short-term hunger, improving concentration and contributing to their healthy development. About 8.8 million learners are beneficiaries of the NSNP. The aim of government is that by 2014, 75% of learners in quintiles 1-3 public primary and secondary schools should be receiving free school lunches. Outcome 1 includes improving teacher-pupil contact time, of which part is linked to learner absenteeism. High levels of absenteeism are often an early signal of dropping out of school. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the NSNP and to see how the impacts could be increased. |
| Department of Basic Education | Grade R                             | Impact Evaluation of Grade R                                    | An ex post study, using existing data sources. A scoping exercise will be undertaken to determine the feasibility of conducting the impact evaluation using existing data sources. In addition some qualitative work will be needed to understand how the impact can be strengthened. | X                       |         |         | The Grade R programme provides an opportunity for learners to develop their cognitive, social, emotional and psychological skills so that they can cope well when they enter primary school. Output 3.1 in Outcome 1 is about implementing Grade R. The intervention is just over 10 years old. In 2011, 50 026 learners were enrolled in pre-Grade R and 83% of learners (734 654) were enrolled in Grade R in ordinary schools. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the Grade R programme and how the impact of the programme could be strengthened.   |
| Department of Health          | Integrated Nutrition Programme      | Implementation Evaluation of the Integrated Nutrition Programme | The evaluation will be conducted at selected PHC facilities and their catchment areas in sample provinces with urban and rural mix. It will involve desk research of existing studies, complemented by some field work.   | X                       |         |         | The Integrated Nutrition Programme (INP) was introduced in 1994 to improve the nutritional status of all South Africans, particularly pregnant women and children under the age of five. Nutrition is key in three of the outputs of the Health Outcome. The economic costs of under-nutrition are substantial: productivity losses to individuals are estimated at more than 10% of lifetime earnings, and losses to gross domestic product may be as high as 2-3%. The estimated budget allocation for nutrition-related interventions in provinces under the health budget vote is R320 million.   |

| Name of Department                              | Name of intervention                                   | Title of evaluation  | Methodology  | Years of implementation |         |         | Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)   |
|---|--|--|--|-------------------------|---------|---------|---|
|   |  |  |  | 2012/13                 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 |   |
| Department of Rural Development and Land Reform | Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme | Implementation Evaluation of the Recapitalisation and Development Programme  | Mixed methods will be used to respond to the evaluation questions consisting of document reviews, interviews with programme managers and case studies of selected projects involving site visits, interviews with project implementers and beneficiaries and an analysis of project records. | X                       |         |         | The Recapitalisation and Development Programme started in 2010 for farmers and communities that have received land from the state and did not have the necessary support to sustain production. It also covers revitalization of irrigation schemes, state farms and private farmers who are indebted from financial institutions. The ultimate objective of the Recapitalization and Development Programme is directly linked to outcomes 7, 4 and 10. 25% of DRDLR's entire budget is allocated to the Land Reform Recapitalization and Development programme. The total Land Reform budget for 2012/13 financial year is R3.2 billion. |
| Department of Rural Development and Land Reform | Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)       | Implementation Evaluation of the CRDP  | A mixed method approach will be used including document reviews, basic financial analysis, site visits and interviews with programme and project managers and beneficiaries.   | X                       |         |         | The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) was introduced in 2009 targeting rural people and communities and covers agrarian transformation, rural development and land reform as well as investment in economic and social infrastructure. CRDP is directly linked to outcome 7 and 4.   |
| Department of Trade and Industry                | Business Process Services Programme                    | Implementation/ design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme | A mixed method will be used consisting of literature review, review of the theory of change and logical framework, cost-effectiveness analysis, interview with internal and external stakeholders and site visits.   | X                       |         |         | The South African Government introduced a Business Process Outsourcing & Off-shoring (BPO&O) incentive programme in July 2007. The revised BPS Incentive Scheme Programme aims to attract investment and create employment in South Africa as a whole through off-shoring activities, and became effective in January 2011. It is envisaged that the Programme will result in the creation of a total number of 15 149 jobs over 3 years and support 22 firms in the 2011/12 financial year. The intervention is linked to outcomes 4 and 5. The three year budget is R754 million from 2012/13 to 2014/15                                |
| Department of Human Settlements                 | Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)    | Implementation Evaluation of the IRDP  | Case studies of the pilot projects will be undertaken, using mixed method approach, including document reviews, site visits and interviews.  | X                       |         |         | The Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP), provided for a settlement-wide, comprehensive development approach striving to address the exclusion of the poor and the inability of the housing programme to bring about integration of different races, economic classes and mixed land uses. Building sustainable human settlements is the focus of outcome 8.   |
| Department of Human Settlements                 | Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)             | Implementation Evaluation of the USDG  | A mixed method approach will be used including review of existing research, the submissions of the required grant documentation, the Built Environment Performance Plan Assessments (BEPPs) and other relevant reports, as well as interviews with relevant stakeholders.                    |                         |         |         | The USDG is a direct grant from national government to metros and major cities, aiming to supplement their capital investments to enhance the overall performance of the urban built environment with particular reference to where the poor live. The USDG was initiated in the 2011/12 municipal financial year and implemented by eight metros with a budget of R6.2 billion. Building sustainable human settlements is the focus of outcome 8.  |

## 4 Concepts for evaluations for 2012/13

### 4.1 Impact Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme

**Implementing department** Department of Basic Education

#### Background to the evaluation

The National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) was conceptualised primarily as an educational intervention aimed at enhancing the educational experience of the neediest primary school learners through promoting punctual school attendance, alleviating short term hunger, improving concentration and contributing to their healthy development. At its inception, the NSNP catered only for learners in public primary schools. However, following the 2006 survey by the Finance and Fiscal Commission, it was confirmed that there was a need to expand the programme to secondary schools. School nutrition in secondary schools was first implemented in quintile 1 (the poorest) secondary schools in April 2009, and was phased into quintile 2 and 3 public secondary schools in April 2010 and 2011 respectively<sup>1</sup>. An in-depth implementation evaluation of the NSNP was undertaken several years ago in all nine provinces. Evaluation reports of NSNP implementation in each province are available.

#### Importance of the evaluation

In addressing Outcome 1 (Improved Quality of Basic Education) the Department of Basic Education has to ensure that the contact time of learners with their teachers is maximised, of which one way is by reducing learner absenteeism. High levels of absenteeism are often an early signal of dropping out of school. Measures such as school lunches for learners in poorer are one means of improving daily attendance.

Through the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) around a quarter of all learners receive food directly delivered to the school by the Provincial Education Department, whilst another quarter receive school lunches paid for by money that is transferred from the national Department to the school. There are approximately 11.8 million learners in public ordinary schools. About 8.8 million learners are beneficiaries of the NSNP. The aim of government is that by 2014, 75% of learners in quintiles 1-3 public primary and secondary schools should be receiving free school lunches.

<sup>1</sup> Source: National School Nutrition Programme Annual Report 2009/10

There has been much public interest on whether the huge investment in this programme is having beneficial effects. There is concern about corrupt tendering practices as well as the poor quality of food supplied in some schools. It is also important to assess whether the menu offered by schools is making a difference to the child's health status.

#### Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the NSNP and to see how the impacts could be increased.

#### Key questions to be addressed

- How does the NSNP impact on learner achievement?
- What is the impact of the NSNP on daily attendance?
- What is the impact of the NSNP on learner retention and drop out?
- What is the impact of the NSNP on repetition?
- What is the impact on changes to the nutritional status of learners (weight for age and height for age)?
- Who benefits most from the programme? Which poverty quintile, which age group, which gender and how does this differ by province?
- How can the impact of the NSNP be strengthened?

**Principal audience** Policy makers, government officials, Provincial Education Departments (PEDs), civil society

**Type of evaluation** Impact

#### Methodology

The impact evaluation is to be an ex post study, using existing data sources. A scoping exercise will be undertaken to determine the feasibility of conducting the impact evaluation using existing data sources. The scoping study is to answer two key questions: (1) is it possible to identify a credible comparison group of children who did not benefit from the programme, and (2) do the required data exist to implement the proposed design? In addition some qualitative work will be needed to understand how the impact can be strengthened.

## Management strategy

The project is a partnership between the Department of Basic Education (DBE), the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3IE) and the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME). Two management structures will be established: (1) a technical group from the three organisations to provide technical oversight; (2) a broader Steering Group which will include programme managers and will have overall responsibility for overseeing the evaluation.

## Cost estimate

At this stage the cost implications are not clear. A scoping exercise is being supported by 3ie and following the findings of this exercise, the approach to the actual impact evaluation will be determined. The budget will depend on the methodology to be used, which in turn is dependent on the recommendations of the scoping exercise.

## Timing and Duration

The scoping exercise will be completed by June 2012. The actual impact evaluation may be completed in the 2012/13 financial year, should the scoping exercise reveal that it is possible to use existing data sources.

## 4.2 Impact Evaluation of Grade R

**Implementing department**      Department of Basic Education

### Background to the evaluation

Grade R (the reception year) represents a “formal” education programme attended by children the year before they attend primary school. It falls in the category of a “pre-primary” programme. The Grade R programme is intended to provide an opportunity for learners to develop their cognitive, social, emotional and psychological skills so that they can cope well when they enter Grade 1. The programme is underpinned by a curriculum which is reflected in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement of the Department of Basic Education.

Grade R is taught by “ECD practitioners” who do not all have the same level and/or type of qualifications. Grade R is offered in 89% of schools that have Grade 1. The participation rate of children in Grade R (gross enrolment rate) currently stands at 91% (General House-

hold Survey data). 83% of all five year old children in the country currently attend ECD in a formal education institution with the rest enrolled in “ECD sites” that are not registered as schools. In 2011, 50 026 learners were enrolled in pre-Grade R and 734 654 learners were enrolled in Grade R in ordinary schools.<sup>2</sup>

The intervention is just over 10 years old and responds to an important need, as evidenced in poorer provinces where Grade R participation rates are much higher than in less poor provinces.

UNICEF recently undertook an expenditure tracking survey of ECD (which included Grade R). This study offers useful insights into both the financial as well as quality dimensions of Grade R.

### Importance of the evaluation

Investing in early childhood is increasingly being viewed internationally as an important social and economic investment in a country’s future productivity. In the long term, failure to attend to these formative years results in negative prospects in school performance, high dropout and high levels of repetition. Grade R has also been called the great equalizer and, if effectively operationalised and expanded, could be the driver for renewed educational improvement. The proposed evaluation should therefore take into account that Pre-Grade R programmes are likely to influence the effects of Grade R.

The Grade R intervention is one strategy (among several) intended to improve poor learning outcomes in higher school grades. In addition, the initiative provides an institutional base for the roll out of the National School Nutrition Programme which is an innovative way of dealing with problems relating to the nutritional status of younger children. The impact evaluation tests the theory that improved pre-school access will improve learning outcomes. It will therefore inform the public and broader government whether the massive investments that have been made in Grade R are providing good returns and contribute to the national and international knowledge base on this issue.

Some key questions which need to be answered are about minimum qualifications for Grade R practitioners, the funding for Grade R (especially in relation to salaries), and whether Grade R should become compulsory as opposed to just ensuring “universal access”.

<sup>2</sup> Source: Department of Basic Education, School Realities, 2011.



## Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the Grade R programme and how the impact of the programme could be strengthened.

## Key questions to be addressed

- What are the benefits of Grade R?
  - On improving learning outcomes in primary and higher grades of the schooling system?
  - On the nutritional status of learners?
  - On the participation of parents, especially women, in the labour market?
- Who benefits and how? Do poorer children benefit more than those who are more economically and socially advantaged? For how long does it persist?
- Under what contexts do Grade R interventions have the biggest impact and under what contexts do they not?
- How can the impacts of Grade R be strengthened?

**Principal audience** Policy makers, government officials, Provincial Education Departments (PEDs), civil society

**Type of evaluation** Impact

## Methodology

The impact evaluation is to be an ex-post study, using existing data sources. A scoping exercise will be undertaken to determine the feasibility of conducting the impact evaluation using existing data sources. The scoping study is to answer two key questions: (1) is it possible to identify a credible comparison group of children who did not benefit from the programme, and (2) do the required data exist to implement the proposed design? In addition some qualitative work will be needed to understand how the impact can be strengthened.

## Management strategy

The project is a partnership between the Department of Basic Education (DBE), the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3IE) and the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME). Two management structures will be established: (1) a technical group from the three organisations to provide technical oversight;

(2) a broader Steering Group which will include programme managers and will have overall responsibility for overseeing the evaluation.

## Cost estimate

At this stage the cost implications are not clear. A scoping exercise is being commissioned by 3ie and the approach to the actual impact evaluation will be determined following the findings of this exercise. The budget will depend on the methodology to be used, which in turn is dependent on the recommendations of the scoping exercise.

## Timing and Duration

The scoping exercise will be completed by June 2012. The actual impact evaluation may be completed in the 2012/13 financial year, should the scoping exercise reveal that it is possible to use existing data sources.

## 4.3 Diagnostic/Implementation evaluation of nutritional interventions for children under five in the identified Primary Health Care facilities and their catchment areas

**Implementing Department:** Department of Health

## Background to the evaluation

The Integrated Nutrition Programme (INP) was introduced in 1994 to improve the nutritional status of all South Africans, with specific reference to the most vulnerable groups, namely pregnant women and children under the age of five. Since the development of the INP and related interventions, given the pressure for speedy service delivery, seldom has there been allocation of sufficient time to enable extensive review of these strategies in relation to implementation and impact of proposed interventions. Malnutrition undermines progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) directly to those goals related to poverty, maternal health, child mortality and education, and indirectly to the remaining MDGs. Nutrition is critical for, inter alia, the improvement of maternal and child health, as underscored in the negotiated service delivery agreement. Priority interventions for the Integrated Nutrition Programme are as follows:

- Infant and young child feeding, which include promotion of safe infant feeding practices;

- Micronutrient malnutrition control-supplements, fortification and food diversification;
- Facility-based nutrition interventions;
- Growth monitoring and promotion;
- Disease-specific interventions such as nutrition interventions for people living with TB, HIV&AIDS and other chronic debilitating conditions;
- Prevention of chronic diseases of lifestyle through dietary and other lifestyle modifications;
- Maternal nutrition.

However, implementation of these evidence-based nutrition interventions has been disappointing. This evaluation will assist in identifying bottlenecks at the primary care level that hinder implementation of these interventions targeted at under five children.

### Importance of the evaluation

Nutrition is key in three of the outputs of the Health Outcome (Outcome 2) including Increasing Life Expectancy, Decreasing Maternal and Child Mortality, Combating HIV and AIDS and Decreasing the Burden of Disease from Tuberculosis. The economic costs of under-nutrition are substantial: productivity losses to individuals are estimated at more than 10 percent of lifetime earnings, and losses to gross domestic product may be as high as 2–3 percent. The estimated budget allocation for nutrition-related interventions in provinces under the health budget vote is R320 million. Therefore the evaluation is important because of the investment that government is making on nutrition-related interventions for under-five children. Identifying bottlenecks in scaling up nutrition-related interventions targeting children under five will contribute better programme planning and resource allocation.

### Purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation will focus on identifying the critical system and implementation constraints at primary health care level in scaling up nutrition-related interventions targeting under-five children. The evaluation will provide the opportunity to re-focus interventions targeting children under five.

### Key questions to be addressed

To what extent are identified Primary Health Care (PHC) facilities and their catchment areas implementing nutrition interventions addressing malnutrition in under five children?

- a) Do PHC facilities have the necessary equipment, guidelines, protocols and supplies to deal with malnutrition in under-five children?
- b) Are workers in government departments capacitated to address malnutrition?
- c) What monitoring systems are in place to monitor nutrition-related interventions?
- d) What contributions have other government departments made in addressing malnutrition?
- e) What corrective measures should be put in place to strengthen evidence-based nutrition interventions at PHC level?

**Principal audience** Politicians, policy makers, government officials, researchers and academia

**Type of evaluation** Diagnostic/Implementation

### Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted at selected urban and rural PHC facilities and their catchment areas in sample provinces. It will involve desk research of existing studies, complemented by some field work.

### Management strategy

A steering committee will be established and will comprise representatives from the national Department of Health (NDOH), Department of Social Development (DSD), Department of Basic Education (DBE), DPME and representatives from other development partners such as the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the World Health Organisation (WHO). The NDOH will be the lead agent for this evaluation process.

### Cost estimate

A budget of R1 million is suggested for this evaluation, including the contribution from DPME.

### Timing and Duration

The evaluation is expected to start in 2012/13 and finish during the 2012/13 financial year.



## 4.4 Implementation Evaluation of the Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme

**Implementing Department:** Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR)

### Background to the Evaluation

The Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme started in the year 2010 for farmers and communities that have received land from the state and did not have the necessary support to sustain production. The Programme also covers revitalization of irrigation schemes, state farms and private farmers who are indebted from financial institutions. The model is designed in such a way that a farm will be funded under close supervision of the Department in order to ensure sustainability. The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRLR) has committed itself to recapitalise more than one thousand deserted and unproductive farms. This initiative is meant to increase production, guarantee food security, graduate small farmers into commercial farmers, and create employment opportunities within the agricultural sector.

### Importance of the evaluation

The Department has allocated 25% of its entire budget to the Land Reform Recapitalization and Development Programme. The total Land Reform budget for 2012/13 financial year is R3.2 billion. The ultimate objective of the Recapitalization and Development Programme is directly linked to outcome 7, namely: "Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security". The Programme is also linked to outcome 4, namely: "Decent employment through economic growth" and outcome 10: "Sustainable natural resources management". The evaluation of the Recapitalization and Development Programme will determine the extent to which the Department is able to achieve the above outcomes.

### Purpose of the evaluation

This evaluation will provide strategic information on the Land Reform Recapitalization and Development Programme and whether it is achieving its intended objectives. Lessons from the evaluation will be used to improve programme performance.

### Key questions to be addressed

- Are the intended outcomes of recapitalization and development being achieved?
- Is the Programme reaching its targeted beneficiaries?
- Are the recapitalization and development projects designed according to good project standards?
- Are the resources used efficiently? Is value for money being obtained?
- How can the Programme be strengthened?
- Does it need to be up-scaled and if so, how?

**Principal audience** Politicians, policy makers, government officials

**Type of evaluation** Implementation

### Methodology

Mixed methods will be used to respond to the above questions consisting of document reviews, interviews with programme managers and case studies of selected projects involving site visits, interviews with project implementers and beneficiaries and an analysis of project records.

### Management strategy

The evaluation will be managed by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in collaboration with the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.

### Cost estimate

The evaluation is estimated to cost R1.5 million, which will be covered by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

### Timing and Duration

The evaluation will be start in June 2012 and will be completed by 2013.

## 4.5 Evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme

**Implementing department** Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR)

### Background to the evaluation

The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) was introduced in 2009 as a poverty relief intervention targeting rural people and communities. CRDP employs a three-pronged strategy, namely: agrarian transformation, rural development and land reform. The Programme arises from the fact that people in rural areas have a right to basic necessities such as electricity, water, flush toilets, roads, entertainment, sport centres, shopping centres, schools, and the possibility of effective agricultural production to be able to contribute to food security. The CRDP aims to enable rural people to take control of their destiny, with support from government, and thereby address rural poverty effectively through the optimal use and management of natural resources. It is hoped that the goals of the Programme will be achieved through coordinated and integrated broad based agrarian transformation, as well as the strategic investment in economic and social infrastructure that will benefit all members of rural communities.

### Importance of the evaluation

CRDP is a major programme that is intended to create social cohesion and development in rural areas. The Programme is meant to assist the estimated 21 million rural people in rural areas, as per StatsSA data for 2001. CRDP is directly linked to outcome 7, namely: "Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security". The Programme is also linked to outcome 4, namely: "Decent employment through economic growth" and outcome 10: "Sustainable natural resources management". The findings of the evaluation will be used to improve programme performance by learning from what has been done so far.

### Purpose of the evaluation

This evaluation will assess whether the CRDP is achieving its policy goals, and how the Programme can be strengthened and upscaled.

### Key questions to be addressed

- Are the objectives set for the CRDP being achieved?
- Is the Programme reaching its targeted beneficiaries?
- Are the CRDP projects designed according to good project standards?
- Are CRDP projects implemented according to CRDP principles? e.g. whether they are implemented in a coherent/co-ordinated manner?
- Is value for money being achieved?
- How can the Programme be strengthened and up-scaled?

**Principal audience** Politicians, policy makers, government officials

**Type of evaluation** Implementation (which will include design evaluation and basic economic evaluation)

### Methodology

A multi-method approach will be used. This will include document reviews, basic financial analysis, site visits and interviews with programme and project managers and beneficiaries.

### Management strategy

The evaluation will be managed by a Steering Committee (SC) consisting of officials from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) and the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME). The SC will oversee the whole evaluation process.

### Cost estimate

The evaluation will cost R1 million, shared 50% by DPME and DRDLR.

### Timing and Duration

The duration of the evaluation will be 9 months. The evaluation will start in June 2012 and should be completed by March 2013.



## 4.6 Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme

**Implementing Department** The Department of Trade and Industry (dti)

### Background to the evaluation

The South African Government introduced a Business Process Outsourcing & Off-shoring (BPO&O) incentive programme in July 2007. During the period July 2007 to March 2010, the incentive resulted in the creation of at least 6,000 new jobs and attracted R303 million in direct investment. A systematic review of the BPO&O incentive programme was undertaken with the private sector and has resulted in a revised Business Process Services (BPS) Incentive Scheme, which became effective in January 2011. While there was a programme review in 2010, there is still a need to evaluate the implementation mechanisms of the revised BPS Incentive Scheme as a way of improving on the take-up of the Scheme, which will in turn lead to faster job creation by the benefiting firms.

### Importance of the evaluation

The BPS Incentive Scheme Programme aims to attract investment and create employment in South Africa as a whole through off-shoring activities. It is envisaged that the Programme will result in the creation of a total number of 15 149 jobs over 3 years and support 22 firms in the 2011/12 financial year.

The evaluation is linked to outcome 5: "A skilled and capable workforce to support an inclusive growth path" and output 5.3: "Increase access to occupationally-directed programmes in needed areas and thereby expand the availability of intermediate level skills". The Monyetla Work Readiness Programme is utilised by the BPS to provide work-readiness training and placement for entry level agents within South Africa's growing BPS industry. The Programme is also directly linked to Outcome 4: "Decent employment through inclusive growth". The evaluation will give an indication on the extent to which the above outcomes are being achieved. The current budget estimate of the Programme is R754 724 000 for the next three years from 2012/13 to 2014/15.

### Purpose of the evaluation

This evaluation will provide strategic information on whether the grant is achieving its policy goals; operational information on where, how and why its implementation achieves the best results, and show how its performance can be improved.

### Key questions to be addressed

- Are the objectives of BPS being achieved?
- Is the design of the Programme supporting the achievement of Programme objectives?
- What is the current rate of job creation through the BPS scheme? (Why are jobs being created at this rate?)
- What is the absorption rate of the Monyetla graduates by the firms that took up the BPS incentive scheme?
- How cost-effective and competitive is South Africa's BPS Programme relative to those of competing countries?
- How can the programme be up-scaled for greater impact and what are the barriers to growing BPS in South Africa?

**Principal audience** Policy makers and government officials

**Type of evaluation** Implementation and will include design and economic evaluations

### Methodology

A mixed method consisting of literature review, review of the theory of change and logical framework, cost-effectiveness analysis, interview with internal and external stakeholders and site visits.

### Management strategy

The evaluation will be managed jointly by the Department of Trade and Industry and the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.

### Cost estimate

The evaluation will cost R1 million, funded by DPME.

### Timing and Duration

The duration of the evaluation will be 9 months. It will start in June 2012 and should be completed by March 2013.

## 4.7 Implementation Evaluation of the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)

**Implementing department** Department of Human Settlements (DHS)

### Background to the evaluation

The Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements was adopted by Cabinet in 2005. It introduced a paradigm shift for the Department of Housing, offering an enhanced range of programmes to tackle a wider scope of emerging housing trends (like rapid growth of informal settlements and increased demands for private finance) and induce more integrated human settlement development. In 2009 this shift was politically mandated with the renaming of the Department of Housing to Human Settlements. As part of the policy emphasis the Department introduced the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP), which provided for a settlement-wide, comprehensive development approach striving to address the exclusion of the poor and the inability of the housing programme to bring about integration of different races, economic classes and mixed land uses. To promote the establishment of mixed income neighbourhoods, implementation of the Programme typically occurs through a phased development approach that allows for the allocation of serviced residential stands at the final stage of housing construction to qualifying beneficiaries, as well as the sale of other residential stands to persons who do not qualify for subsidies at a variety of prices depending on the income and profile of the households. The Programme furthermore allows for the construction of various typologies and tenure types in accordance with the basket of housing development options available within the national housing programmes as well as the provision of serviced sites for a variety of non-residential uses essential to the creation of integrated human settlements. A number of archetype projects have been developed in the country that have piloted effectively the IRDP principles.

### Importance of the evaluation

Building sustainable human settlements with improved quality of life is a focus of outcome 8 (Sustainable human settlements and improved quality of household life). Outcome 8 is predicated on the logic proposed in the Comprehensive Plan towards improved integrated development planning by accrediting the municipalities with the housing function, targeting informal settlement upgrading, and utilising strategic state land and social housing to trigger improved performance of the private sector in the homeown-

ership and rental markets. Though much is written about these pioneering integrated project initiatives, there has not been systematic learning from the implementation of the IRDP projects or those developed on the same principles as the IRDP. In addition the Housing Grant Framework points out that up to 20% of the grant framework should demonstrate high priority projects based on these principles. The IRDP programme is meant to make up the largest slice of the Human Settlements Grant over the MTEF, approximately R50 billion that should service more than 400 000 households. The time frames, resourcing and institutional capacity to ensure successful implementation of such complex projects requires critical appraisal of their application and performance to desired outcomes. The evaluation is important therefore to draw out lessons in order to assess the strength of the programme and how best to moderate the programme to achieve the desired outcome to scale.

### Purpose of the evaluation

To draw lessons from the IRDP case study projects in order to improve the design and the implementation of the IRDP.

### Key questions to be addressed

- To what extent have the IRDP projects achieved the intended outcomes of the Programme i.e. addressed the exclusion of the poor in urban areas, social integration, resulted in better functioning urban spaces, etc?
- How does the Programme interface with other programmes of the Department?
- Going beyond pilot projects, what are the lessons learned from the implementation of the projects?
- Are resources used efficiently? Is value for money obtained?
- Should the Programme be up-scaled? If so, how can it be strengthened and up-scaled?

**Principal audience** Politicians, policy makers, government officials

**Type of evaluation** Implementation evaluation which will include basic design evaluation and basic economic evaluation





## Methodology

Case studies of the pilot projects will be undertaken, using a mixed method approach, including document reviews, site visits and interviews.

## Management strategy

The evaluation will be managed by the Department of Human Settlements in collaboration with the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.

## Cost estimate

The evaluation will cost approximately R2 million, which will be covered by the Department of Human Settlements.

## Timing and Duration

The evaluation will start in June 2012 and should be completed within the 2012/13 financial year.

## 4.8 Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)

**Implementing department** Department of Human Settlements (DHS)

### Background to the evaluation

The USDG is a financial instrument introduced in 2011 as a direct grant from national government to metros and major cities, with the aim of supplementing their capital investments to enhance the overall performance of the urban built environment with particular reference to where the poor live. In this way it intended to contribute to the development of sustainable human settlements and improved quality of life for households, the outcomes desired in Outcome 8. By supplementing the capital budgets of large cities, it seeks specifically to augment and support the housing grant allocations from provinces to municipalities under the Human Settlement Development Grant, and ensure integrated national, provincial and municipal planning, thus leveraging municipal resources in the development of sustainable human settlements. It prioritises assisting metropolitan municipalities to improve urban land production in appropriate locations to the benefit of poorer households providing basic services especially tackling the sub-output on informal settlement upgrading, connector and bulk infrastructure, improving

spatial densities and linking them to economic growth opportunities- thus the link to the output on well located land. The USDG in its current form is a step along the process to rationalise grants to the local government sphere so as to more effectively target the production and improvement of affordable shelter and the overall quality of the human settlement environment, contributing towards improved efficiency in urban development and management making the link to the sub-output on accrediting the municipalities with the housing function. It is envisaged that the USDG will increasingly over time improve the coordination of investments in the built environment.

The USDG was initiated in the 2011/12 municipal financial year and implemented by eight metros with an MTEF allocation of some R26 billion starting in 2012/13 intending to benefit a significant number of the 2.3 million households living in informal settlements, backyards and hostels. With the first year of implementation underway there is an opportunity for government to learn whether the underlying assumptions and theory of change is correct and to determine how metros are responding to the immediate grant framework and its interface with the other housing, infrastructure and built environment related grant frameworks towards integrated human settlement development whilst tackling poor service conditions for those in the worst settlement conditions.

### Importance of the evaluation

With the grant amounting to R6.2 billion in the 2011/12 financial year and some R26 billion over the MTEF period, it is of great importance that the Grant's theory of change and the logic framework should be tested early. It is hoped that lessons will be used to improve implementation of the programme. Building sustainable human settlements with improved quality of life is a focus of outcome 8 (Sustainable human settlements and improved quality of household life). This relates in particular to the suboutput in output 1 relating to municipal accreditation of the housing function.

### Purpose of the evaluation

To purpose of the evaluation is to understand the lessons learned and challenges experienced in the first year of implementation of the USDG and how implementation can be strengthened.

## Key questions to be addressed

- Is the conceptual/theoretical framework that informs the USDG logically valid and a right response to human settlements issues in cities?
- Is the Grant implemented according to its design and is it reaching its targeted beneficiaries?
- Have appropriate institutional adjustments have been made in the cities linking the Grant to the financing of other built environment development priorities?
- What is the interface with the shelter deficits and programmes to improve the quality of the built environment and tackle inadequate housing provision?
- To what extent has the USDG through the Built Environment Performance Plans found its place within the current programmatic plans (such as Business Plans, the municipal budgetary process and their IDPs, Housing Sector Plans, Annual Performance Plans, Multi Year Housing Development Plans?)
- To what extent does the USDG interface with the municipal accreditation process?
- Are resources used efficiently? Is value for money obtained?
- How could the structure of the Grant and its application be improved and strengthened?

**Principal audience** Politicians, policy makers, government officials

**Type of evaluation** Implementation evaluation, which will include design evaluation

## Methodology

A mixed method approach will be used. There will be a review of documentation including: existing research, the submissions of the required grant documentation, the Built Environment Performance Plan Assessments (BEPPs) including earlier versions of the MIG Cities reports, associated National Treasury processes like the Benchmark Exercise, quarterly reports, Annual Reports, reports of the Municipal Accreditation Panel Assessment Reports. It will also include interviews with relevant stakeholders.

## Management strategy

The Project will be managed by the Department of Human Settlements in collaboration with the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation. A steering committee will be established which will include programme and evaluation staff from these departments.

## Cost estimate

The evaluation will cost R1 million, which will be covered by the Department of Human Settlements.

## Timing and Duration

The evaluation will commence in June 2012 and should be completed within the 2012/13 financial year.



## 5 Outline of evaluations for 2013/14 and 2014/15

For the 2012/13 Plan, there has not been time to develop the outlines for evaluations beyond the initial year. The call for evaluations for the 2013/14-2015/16 Plan will be issued with the tabling of this Plan in May 2012, and the 2013/14-2015/16 Plan will include the one page concepts for the first year and outlines for evaluations in the subsequent two years.

## 6 Key implementation issues

### 6.1 Reporting on the Plan, and reviewing the Plan

Quarterly reports will be provided to Cabinet on progress with implementation of the Plan, highlighting key lessons, as well as emerging findings, and progress with implementation of improvement plans around each evaluation.

The Plan will be rolled annually, linking to the budget process so that departments are budgeting for evaluations at the same time as they are submitting them to be considered for the multiannual plan. The 2013/14-2015/16 process will start with a call for proposals for evaluations for the three year plan with the tabling of this Plan to Cabinet.

### 6.2 Funding of the evaluations in the Plan

This Plan has had to be developed after the budget process for 2012/13 was already complete. Some departments have resources available to fund the evaluations in their entirety, whereas in others the funding comes from DPME or donors. In the two impact evaluations donor funding is being sought, from DFID and from 3ie.

### 6.3 Next steps once the plan is approved

The draft Plan was submitted to the meeting of Director Generals of the Governance and Administration Cluster on 12 April 2012. From that approval departments have started to prepare terms of reference for each evaluation, in the process thinking through more carefully the methodological aspects of each evaluation. This needs to be finalised before the evaluation can actually be initiated.

The aim will be to proceed immediately with approved evaluations in June 2012, so that most can be completed within the 2012/13 financial year.



Image copyright © 1999 Guy Stubbs.



THE PRESIDENCY  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION



Contact: Dr Ian Goldman, DPME

East Wing, Union Buildings, Pretoria, 0001, South Africa.

Tel: +27 12 308 1918

Email: [nkamang@po.org.za](mailto:nkamang@po.org.za)

Web: [www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za](http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za)



THE PRESIDENCY  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION