



THE PRESIDENCY  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

# National Evaluation Plan 2015-16 to 2017-18

24 October 2014

Contact: Dr Ian Goldman, DPME  
East Wing, Union Buildings, Pretoria, 0001, South Africa.  
Tel: +27 12 312 0155  
Email: [nkamang@po-dpme.org.za](mailto:nkamang@po-dpme.org.za)  
Web: [www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za](http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za)

## Foreword

We now have 39 evaluations on their way covering some R50 billion of government expenditure over the Medium Term Expenditure Framework, with 11 reports completed and departments acting on the findings. In some sectors we are now building up a significant body of knowledge notably around the outcomes for human settlements, rural development, basic education, and employment, which are enabling strategic reflection on a broader scale of what we should be doing to strengthen development in these sectors. In other sectors this is happening to a much lesser extent and we need to undertake more evaluations.

The Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT) results for 2013/14 have shown a rise from 13% of national and provincial departments complying with monitoring requirements and planning or undertaking an evaluation in 2011/12 to 19% in 2012/13 and 23% in 2013/14. 15 of 46 national departments have now participated in the National Evaluation Plan with new departments participating each year. Two provinces have taken on board the system (Gauteng and Western Cape) and are implementing a number of evaluations themselves, with four more provinces busy developing their provincial evaluation plans. Five national departments now have departmental evaluation plans (Trade and Industry, Science and Technology, Rural Development and Land Reform, Social Development and Higher Education and Training). One provincial department has an evaluation plan (Western Cape Department of Agriculture). The success of DPME is when evaluations are being conducted right across government and being used to make a significant difference to government's effectiveness and efficiency.

We have 6 improvement plans being implemented, but I note that some departments are reluctant to report on progress with implementing these – something to work on going forward.

Our evaluation system is now recognised internationally and our Evaluation Policy Framework has even been translated into Russian for use in Kyrgystan! We continue with our strong links with peer countries in Uganda, Benin, Mexico, and Colombia, where we are actively sharing experiences and tools around evaluation. We are also making considerable efforts to learn and improve the system as we go and we are documenting and communicating what we are learning, with our first Annual Report produced on evaluations for 2013/14.

We will be starting an evaluation next year to look at the lessons from our first years of implementing the system, and the difference it is making.

We look forward to collaborating with you in using evaluation to strengthen governments performance and impact on citizens.

Mr Jeff Radebe, MP  
Minister of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation and Administration  
November 2014

## Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Contents</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Glossary</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>7 Key implementation issues</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 The Framework	1
1.2 Purpose of the National Evaluation Plan (NEP)	2
1.3 Criteria and process used for selection	2
<b>2 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system in 2013/14 and underway in 2014/15</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Guidelines	3
2.2 Evaluation standards and competences	3
2.3 Training	3
2.4 Audit of evaluations	4
2.5 Annual report	4
<b>3 Progress with evaluations</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Progress with evaluations undertaken in 2011/12 - Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development (ECD)	5
3.2 Evaluations in 2012/13 National Evaluation Plan	5
3.3 Progress with evaluations in 2013/14 National Evaluation Plan	6
3.4 Progress with evaluations in 2014/15 National Evaluation Plan	8
3.5 Status of improvement plans	10
<b>4 Summary of approved evaluations for 2015/16</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5 Concepts for evaluations for 2015/16</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1 Implementation Evaluation of Non-Profit Organisation Regulatory System	17
5.2 Diagnostic/implementation evaluation of the National Drug Master Plan	19
5.3 Implementation evaluation of the Curriculum and Policy Statements (CAPS)	21

---

5.4	Implementation and Formative Evaluation of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Act	22
5.5	Implementation Evaluation of the Agricultural Extension Recovery Programme	24
5.6	Evaluation of the Asset Forfeiture unit sub-programme	26
5.7	Evaluation of evaluations	28
5.8	Diagnostic/implementation evaluation of citizen-based monitoring programme	29
5.9	Impact evaluation: Improving Early Grade Reading	31
5.10	Implementation evaluation of the mining charter	33
5.11	Implementation evaluation of the Service Delivery Improvement Planning system	35
<b>6</b>	<b>Outline of evaluations proposed for 2016/17</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Key implementation issues</b>	<b>40</b>
7.1	Emerging implementation issues	40
7.2	Funding of the evaluations in the Plan	40
7.3	Next steps	41
<b>Annex 1:</b>	<b>Evaluations in the Repository</b>	<b>42</b>

## Glossary

3ie	International Initiative for Impact Evaluation
ACTT	Anti-Corruption Task Team
AET	Adult education and training
AFU	Asset Forfeiture Unit
AMTS	Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (of DST)
APP	Annual performance plan
AVAWC	Audit of Violence Against Women and Children
BNG	Breaking New Ground
CAPS	Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement
CASP	Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme
CBM	Citizen Based Monitoring
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CLEAR	regional Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results (based at the University of Witwatersrand)
COGTA	Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs
CRDP	Comprehensive Rural Development Programme
CSO	Civil society organisation
CWP	Community Works Programme
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
DBE	Department of Basic Education
DCOG	Department of Co-operative Governance
DDG	Deputy-Director General
DFI	Development Finance Institution
DFID	Department for International Development
DG	Director General
DOH	Department of Health
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
DPME	Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation
DHS	Department of Human Settlement
DMV	Department of Military Veterans
DoL	Department of Labour
DPME	Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (now Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation)

---

DPCI	Directorate of Priority Crime Investigations
DRDLR	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
DSD	Department of Social Development
DST	Department of Science and Technology
dti	Department of Trade and Industry
DWA	Department of Water Affairs
DWCPD	Department of Women, Children and People with Disabilities
ECCE	Early Child Care and Education
ECD	Early Childhood Development
EEGM	Effectiveness of Environmental Governance in the Mining Sector
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMIA	Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive programme
EPWP	Social Sector Expanded Public Works Programme
ERP	(agricultural) Extension Recovery Plan
ERU	Evaluation and Research Unit, DPME
EQTA	Education and Training Quality Assurance Bodies
FBOs	Faith-Based Organisations
FBS	Free Basic Services
FDI	Foreign direct investment
FIC	Financial Intelligence Centre
FLBP	Funza Lushaka Bursary Programme
HDI	Historically Disadvantaged Individuals
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ICDM	Integrated Chronic Disease Management
IDC	Industrial Development Corporation
IKSP	Indigenous Knowledge Systems Policy
IMC	Inter-ministerial committee
IRDP	Integrated Residential Development Programme
JCPS	Justice, Crime Prevention and Security Cluster
MAFISA	Micro Agricultural Financial Institutions of South Africa
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MoA	Memorandum of Agreement
MPAT	Management Performance Assessment Tool
MRPDA	Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act
MTSF	Medium-Term Strategic Framework

---

NACI	National Advisory Council on Innovation
NARYSEC	National Rural Youth Service
NDMP	National Drug Master Plan
NDP	National Development Plan
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act
NEP	National Evaluation Plan
NEPF	National Evaluation Policy Framework
NES	National Evaluation System
NGO	Non-Government Organisations
NHFC	National Housing Finance Corporation
NHI	National Health Insurance
NPOs	Non-Profit Organisations
NPS	National Prosecutions Service
NRDS	National Research and Development Strategy (of DST)
NRF	National Research Foundation
NSC	National Senior Certificate (matric)
NSI	National System of Innovation
NSNP	National School Nutrition programme
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
PCETS	Policy on Community Education and Training Colleges
PHC	Primary health care
POCA	Prevention of Organised Crime Act
PSPPD	Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy Development (a partnership between the Presidency and the European Union)
RCG	Reconstruction capital grant
RCJS	Review of the Criminal Justice System
RCT	Randomised controlled trial
RECAP	Land Recapitalisation and Development Programme
RoCPP	Resolving of Criminal Proceeds Process
RZ	Restructuring zone
SALGA	South African Local Government Association
SAPS	South African Police service
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SCCU	Specialised Commercial Crime Unit
SEP	Socio-Economic Partnerships Programme (of DST)
SETA	Sector education and training authority

SHI	Social housing institution
SHP	Social Housing Programme
SHRA	Social Housing Regulatory Authority
SIU	Special Investigating Unit
SMMEs	Small, micro and medium sized enterprises
SPII	Support Programme for Industrial Innovation
THRIP	Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme
ToR	Terms of reference (for evaluations)
UCT	University of Cape Town
UISP	Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USDG	Urban Settlements Development Grant



## 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 underlying purpose is:

- Improving policy or programme **performance** - 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.

The NEPF focuses on different government interventions including policies, plans, programmes and systems. 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 National Evaluation Plan (NEP) which is updated annually including the key interventions across government which are seen as a national priority. These are those that are large (in budget or footprint), link closely to the priority outcomes, are strategic or innovative, or address topics which are of considerable public interest. 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 is undertaken by a cross-government Evaluation Technical Working Group. The first National Evaluation Plan developed for 2012/13 covered eight evaluations, the 2013/14 and 2014/15 National Evaluation Plans each had 15 evaluations.

### 2 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system in 2013/14 and underway in 2014/15

DPME has developed 18 guidelines and templates on various components of the evaluation process to support departments undertaking evaluations. A major guideline on Planning Implementation Programmes has been issued which should have a major influence on the quality of programme design and this has been approved by Cabinet. Evaluation standards and competencies for programme managers, M&E specialists and evaluators are being used to develop quality assessment tools and for recruitment.

DPME has developed a range of capacity development tools to build government capacity. These range from sessions to raise awareness; learning-by-doing support through direct experience of undertaking evaluations; developing competencies for evaluation; provision of short

courses; building capacity of senior managers and MPs to demand and use evaluation results; and peer support. DPME's training has focused on staff involved in NEP evaluations directly, whether M&E staff or programme managers. Seven training courses have been developed, of which five have been rolled out in 2013/14. The course for Directors General and Deputy Directors General/Senior Managers on Evidence-Based Policy-Making and Implementation is being run again in October 2014.

DPME has created on the DPME website a centralised web-based repository of evaluation reports, which have been quality assessed, using the evaluation standards which DPME has developed. The Evaluation Repository was officially launched at the SAMEA conference in Johannesburg in September 2013. As at 30 September 2014, there are 109 evaluations that have been quality assessed. Of the 109 evaluations, 90 had a score of between 3 and 5 (passed as reliable evaluations) and 19 scored less than 3. 93.79% of the visitors to the Repository have been from South Africa, with hits also from the UK, USA, Australia, Switzerland, France, Kenya, Russia, Namibia, Brazil and the Netherlands. The Evaluation Repository can be accessed at: <http://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/sites/EvaluationsHome/SitePages/Home.aspx>

### 3 Progress with evaluations

3.1 The Early Childhood Development evaluation was the pilot for the National Evaluation System. The report was approved in June 2012, and the Improvement Plan (Plan of Action for ECD) produced in October 2012. The Plan of Action has been approved by Cabinet. DPME has received the first 6 monthly progress report on implementation of the Improvement Plan, but the second was requested in February 2014 and has not yet been received.

3.2 The evaluations underway and completed from the 2012/13 plan are:

Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report
Evaluation of Business Process Services Programme	Trade and Industry	May 2013
Impact Evaluation of Grade R (reception year of schooling)	Basic Education	June 2013
Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing under 5s	Health; Rural Development; Social Development; Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	March 2014
Implementation Evaluation of Land Recapitalisation and Development (RECAP) programme	Rural Development	October 2013
Implementation Evaluation of Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)	Rural Development	October 2013
Implementation Evaluation of Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)	Human Settlements	December 2014
Implementation Evaluation of Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)	Human Settlements	November 2014

In addition to these seven an Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme was stopped due to poor performance by the service provider, but included again in the 2014/15 Plan.

3.3 The evaluations being conducted during the 2013/14 financial year are shown in the table below:

<b>Name of Evaluation</b>	<b>Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated</b>	<b>Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report</b>
Implementation Evaluation of Government Coordination System	Presidency	January 2014
Implementation Evaluation of the Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme (EMIA)	Trade and Industry	May 2014
Evaluation of the Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII)	Trade and Industry	May 2014
Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)	Trade and Industry	October 2014
Evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme	Military Veterans	November 2014
Evaluation of Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (AMTS)	Science and Technology	December 2014
Evaluation of Tax compliance cost of small businesses	SA Revenue Service	December 2014
Evaluation of Community Work Programme (CWP)	Cooperative Governance	November 2014
Evaluation of Land Restitution Programme	Rural Development	28 February 2014
Evaluation of Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme	Agriculture	October 2014
Evaluation of Upgrading of Informal Settlement	Human Settlements	November 2014
Evaluation of Access to the City	Human Settlements	
Evaluation of Provision of State Subsidised Housing (Assets)	Human Settlements	October 2014
Evaluation of Impact Evaluation of the Outcomes Approach	DPME	May 2015
An Impact Assessment of the Micro Agricultural Financial Institution of South Africa (MAFISA)	Agriculture	November 2014
<i>Evaluation of quality of National Senior Certificate (Matric)</i>	<i>Basic Education</i>	<i>Dropped</i>

3.4 The evaluations being conducted during the 2014/15 financial year are shown in the table below.

Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Current stage
Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Environmental Governance in the Mining Sector (EEGM)	Department of Environmental Affairs	Underway.
Design Evaluation of the Policy on Community Education and Training Colleges (PCC)	Department of Higher Education and Training	The evaluation has not yet begun. At this stage, preparations are underway for the finalisation of the terms of reference.
Impact/Implementation Evaluation of the Social Housing Programme (SHP)	Department of Human Settlements	A service provider will be selected in October and the evaluation will start.
Evaluation of the Indigenous Knowledge Systems Policy (IKSP)	Department of Science and Technology	The evaluation is currently at procurement stage.
Diagnostic Evaluation/Programme Audit for Violence Against Women and Children (AVAWC)	Department of Social Development	A service provider has been selected and work has begun on the evaluation. The evaluation is anticipated to be completed in February 2015.
Diagnostic Review of the Social Sector Expanded Public Works Programme	Department of Social Development	A service provider has been selected and work has begun. The evaluation should complete in January 2015
Economic Evaluation of the Incremental Investment into the SAPS Forensic Services (SAPS)	South African Police Service	The service provider has been selected to conduct the evaluation but there have been some delays.
Implementation Evaluation of the Ilima Letsema Programme and cost-benefit analysis of the revitalisation of existing Irrigation Schemes	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries/ Rural Development and Land Reform	Proposals for service providers received and work is underway for selecting the service provider.
Impact evaluation of MAFISA (quantitative) including establishing a baseline	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Evaluation on hold following termination of the programme.
Policy Evaluation of Small Farmer Support	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Proposals received and work is underway for the selection of service providers.
Evaluation of the Funza-Lushaka Bursary Scheme	Department of Basic Education	Evaluation underway, evaluation expected to complete soon.
Implementation Evaluation of the National School Nutrition	Department of Basic Education	The preferred Service Provider selected to conduct the evaluation and the evaluation is currently

Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Current stage
		underway.
Impact evaluation of Land Restitution Programme (quantitative) including establishing a baseline	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Service provider selected. 3ie managing evaluation
Impact/implementation evaluation of the MPAT system	Department of Performance M&E	Work is currently underway following completion of the inception phase and field work.
Impact/implementation evaluation of the Strategic Planning/APP system	Department of Performance M&E	The evaluation has not started yet but work has been done on developing terms of reference.

3.5 The following evaluations have improvement plans developed and being followed up.

Evaluation	Date improvement plan submitted to DPME	Progress reports
Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development		The first report was received but lacked detail. Several letters have been sent to DSD requesting the other reports but they have not been received. However there has been significant progress.
Evaluation of Business Process Services Programme	9 June 2014	A formal progress report has not been received yet. Informal updates indicate significant progress.
Impact Evaluation of Grade R (reception year of schooling)	14 April 2014	First progress report on improvement plan requested from DBE. The progress report was due end July 2014. Reminder letter on the progress report sent.
Evaluation of Land Restitution	September 2014	First progress report on improvement plan due November 2014.
Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing under 5s	Still draft	.
Implementation Evaluation of Land Recapitalisation and Development (RECAP) programme	10 February 2014	A letter was sent to the department requesting the progress report for the end of August 2014. Not yet received.
Implementation Evaluation of Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)	10 February 2014	A letter was sent to the department requesting the progress report for the end of August 2014. Not yet received.
Implementation Evaluation of Government Coordination System	Produced but needs to be finalised.	Work has started on implementation of the findings.

#### 4 Summary of Approved Evaluations for 2015/16

4.1 The evaluations that have been proposed for 2015/16 are shown in the table below.

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Agricultural Extension Recovery Plan
Department of Basic Education	Evaluation of the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement ( CAPS)
National Prosecuting Authority	Evaluation of the Asset Forfeiture Unit Sub-programme
Department of Social Development	Diagnostic evaluation of the Non-Profit Organisations Regulatory Framework and Legislation.
Department of Social Development	Implementation Evaluation of the National Drug Master Plan in addressing all forms of Substance abuse
Department of Higher Education and Training	Implementation and Formative Evaluation of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Act
Department of Public Service and Administration	Evaluation of Service Delivery Improvement Planning System
Department of Mineral Resources	Evaluation of the Mining Charter
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact/implementation evaluation of the evaluation system
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Implementation evaluation of citizen-based monitoring programme

#### 5 Concepts for evaluations for 2015/16

This section has summaries of each of the evaluations proposed for 2015/16.

#### 6 Outline of evaluations proposed for 2016/17

Name of Department	Name of intervention
National Treasury	Government Supply Chain Management System
Social Development	National Social Crime Prevention Strategy
Correctional Services	Rehabilitation Programmes for Offenders
Health	Reducing Maternal and Child Mortality using Campaign for Accelerated Reduction of Maternal Mortality
Department of Environmental Affairs	Environmental Impact Assessment

## 7 Key implementation issues

7.1 An annual report was approved by Cabinet in October 2014 reporting on progress with regard to implementation of the Plan, highlighting key lessons, as well as emerging findings, and progress with implementation of improvement plans around each evaluation. In terms of funding, this Plan has been developed to link with the budget process for 2014/15 to 2016/17. Some departments have resources available to fund the evaluations in their entirety, whereas in others the funding comes from DPME or donors. Preparation for the 2014/15 evaluations have started so that the initial phases of getting the relevant stakeholders together, developing terms of reference, and the procurement process can be completed prior to 31 March 2016. Some of the issues emerging from implementation include:

- DPME procurement is much faster (6-8 weeks) than procurement by other departments. DPME will now do the procurement for the evaluations under the National Evaluation Plan, but all decisions around the evaluations would still be made by steering committees, which custodian departments chair so that they still have a strong role in all evaluations;
- The Capacity amongst service providers is varied and even the DPME panel of 42 service providers is insufficient. A new call has been made for extending the evaluation panel and this will be finalised in November 2014;
- When results are challenging, some departments are delaying the process of management response and improvement plans. This is delaying reports getting to clusters and Cabinet, and thence to portfolio committees. Once the report is approved this process must move ahead, and ideally departments will see the importance of moving quickly on improvement plans so they show they are responding to the findings. DPME is now seeking to speed up the process and will in some cases take the evaluations directly to clusters and Cabinet;
- Many departments are not submitting their evaluations to DPME to include in the Evaluation Repository, probably because of fears of these being made public. This reduces accountability as well as the knowledge base available to the public service and wider public, eg for planning future work. Follow-ups are needed on this;
- Improvement Plans are being developed and appear to serve as useful mechanisms for ensuring that the findings from evaluations are addressed. However departments are delaying on submitting progress reports on implementation of the improvement plans, correctly feeling that it is their responsibility to implement the improvement plans. However it is important that they are accountable for implementing the Plan, since they are using public funds. DPME will reinforce the need to report on progress.

7.2 This Plan has been developed to link with the budget process for 2015/16 to 2017/18. Some departments have resources available to fund the evaluations in their entirety, whereas in others the funding comes from DPME or donors. Indicative budgets are indicated in section 6.

7.3 Preparation for the 2015/16 evaluations started in September 2014 so that the initial phases of getting the relevant stakeholders together, developing terms of reference can be completed by the time the Plan is approved, and the procurement process can be completed prior to 31 March 2015 and the evaluations will be in full flow by the time the financial year begins in April 2015.

# 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** - 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 applied.

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 provide an average of R750 000 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.



Selection in the Plan means that the guidelines and minimum standards for the National Evaluation System must be used (for 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 summarise the evaluations approved by Cabinet as priority evaluations to undertake in 2014/15 to 2016/17, the situation with on-going evaluations as well as work on the national evaluation system.

## 1.3 Criteria and process used for selection

The Policy Framework prioritises evaluation of existing interventions, specifically those that:

1. Are a national priority:
  - Linked to the 14 outcomes, MTSF and a section of the NDP, 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 not been evaluated recently;
5. 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;
6. Ideally have **monitoring data** that can be used including background and previous documented performance, and/or current programme situation;
7. Have a **potential budget** for evaluation from the department, DPME or donors.

The call for proposals was issued in mid-April 2014 with letters sent to all national Directors-General. 13 proposals were received in total and selection of the successful 9 for 2015/16 was undertaken by a cross-government Evaluation Technical Working Group on 30 July 2013. FOSAD requested inclusion of evaluations in sectors where these were not being proposed and an additional two evaluations have been included for 2015/16 and also 4 for 2016/17. As the Plan is drafted midway through the year, it reports on progress to 30 September in 2014/15, but also on evaluations conducted in 2012/13, part of which could not be reported in the previous plan as they only completed in 2013.

## 2 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system in 2013/14 and underway in 2014/15

### 2.1 Guidelines

DPME has developed 18 guidelines/templates on various components of the evaluation process to support departments and to improve the quality of evaluations. The guidelines are also used as resource documents for training and they have been embedded in four courses that have been developed so far, namely Managing Evaluations, Deepening Evaluations, Evaluation Methodology and Planning Implementation Programmes. These guidelines are on the DPME website. It is envisaged that two more guidelines will be approved by end of March 2015.

### 2.2 Evaluation standards and competences

The evaluation standards produced in 2012/13, based on the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) standards have been revised based on the experience in quality assessing evaluations. They are also being utilised in the National Evaluation System (NES) by being incorporated into the steering committee evaluation process, and the training courses developed in support of the NES. They are available on the DPME website. The evaluation competences produced for programme managers commissioning evaluations, government M&E advisors and evaluators last year were revised in July 2014 and are on the website. They are currently being utilised in the NES by being incorporated into the ToRs for evaluation and bid evaluation criteria for assessing service providers, as well as being used to draft job descriptions and to evaluate candidates applying for evaluation related posts within the public service. We are engaging with DPISA on this. They are a key element of course development for the evaluation courses DPME develops and runs.

### 2.3 Training

Five courses have been developed, piloted and rolled out with the financial support of the UK's Department for International Development (DFID) with most of them developed in partnership with the Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results for Anglophone Africa (CLEAR-AA).

**Course 1 – How to manage an evaluation** was developed in 2012. This course was rolled out twice in 2013 and three times in 2014. The objective of the course is to equip departments whose evaluations were selected in the NEP and provincial governments to manage their evaluations utilising the NEP system. For provinces the aim was to help them develop their Provincial Evaluation Plans (PEPs). To date, 5 provinces (Gauteng, Western Cape, Limpopo, North West and Free State) have had the opportunity to run this course in partnership with the Offices of the Premier.

**Course 2 – Deepening evaluation** was rolled out in October and November 2013. This course is done with departments who have already been through the NEP process during the previous year. Gauteng and Western Cape have run this course in partnership with the Offices of the Premier.

**Course 3 – Evaluation methodology.** This course aims to help evaluation managers to identify appropriate methodologies for the different

types of evaluation identified in the NEPF. It was piloted and finalised during the last quarter of the 2013/14 financial year. This course will be run nationally and within the pilot provinces (Gauteng and Western Cape) which have developed and implemented their PEPs.

**Course 4 – Planning implementation programmes and design evaluation** was developed and piloted in 2013/14 and it targets the Planning and M&E Units in departments. The course on Planning Implementation programme was piloted in November 2013. A plan will be developed for large scale rollout of the course.

**Course 5 – Evidence- Based Policy Making for Senior Managers (EBPM)** was developed and piloted in October 2013 and targets DGs and DDGs and management teams from departments. It is implemented in partnership with the Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy (PSPPD), a partnership between the Presidency and the EU, and the Graduate Programme for Development Policy and Practice at the University of Cape Town, and is part-funded by DFID. Evidence-based policy-making seeks to ‘help people make well informed decisions about policies, programmes and projects by putting the best available evidence from research at the heart of policy development and implementation. This course is being repeated in October 2014, and there has been heavy demand.

**Course 6 – Logframe training** for Treasury and DPME was developed and piloted in August 2013 and will be run again before March 2014.

**Course 7 - Theory of Change (ToC):** This course has been developed to assist in the development of evaluation terms of reference and focuses on the theory of change underlying the programme or policy. This was run in September 2014 for the evaluations selected in July 2014 for the 2015/16 Plan.

**Design clinic:** After the theory of change training a design clinic is run where international and national evaluators assist teams of programme managers, M&E staff from departments and DPME evaluation staff to work on the design of the evaluation.

## 2.4 Audit of evaluations

DPME has undertaken an audit of evaluations undertaken since 2006 in the social and economic sectors. A quality assessment tool was developed based on the evaluation standards and 109 evaluations have been quality assessed. Of the 109 evaluations, 90 had a score of between 3 and 5 and 19 scored less than 3. The reports of those that scored above 3 (satisfactory) have been made available in an Evaluation Repository on the DPME website, available at <http://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/sites/EvaluationsHome/SitePages/Home.aspx>. The list of evaluations is in Annex 1.

## 2.5 Annual report

The first annual report has been produced for 2013/14 which covers emerging findings from the evaluations as well as important developments in the National Evaluation System.

### 3 Progress with evaluations

#### 3.1 Progress with evaluations undertaken in 2011/12 - Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development (ECD)

This was the pilot evaluation for the National Evaluation System and the report was approved in June 2012. The Improvement Plan (called the ECD Plan of Action) was produced in October 2012 but finally approved by Cabinet in September 2013. The first progress report on the Improvement Plan has been received from the Department of Social Development. There has been significant progress with implementing the recommendations and an assignment has been commissioned to revise the Children's Act. Costing has been done on the range of services proposed in the evaluation, and Treasury has been tasked by Cabinet to work with the Department of Social Development (DSD) to work out an affordable set of services. There have been delays in receiving later progress reports.

#### 3.2 Evaluations in 2012/13 National Evaluation Plan

Table 1 summarises the status of evaluations from the 2012/13 National Evaluation Plan.

**Table 1: Progress with NEP evaluations for 2012/13**

Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Current Stage	Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report
Evaluation of Business Process Services Programme	Trade and Industry	Evaluation report, management response and improvement plan completed. Will go to Cabinet in November 2014 and then be made public.	May 2013
Impact Evaluation of Grade R (reception year of schooling)	Basic Education	Evaluation completed in June 2013. The improvement plan was produced in December 2014 and received in May 2014. Approved by Cabinet and public. First progress report on improvement plan requested from DBE	June 2013
Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing under 5s	Health Rural Development Social Development Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Final evaluation reports approved. Management Response requested 16 May and Improvement Plan workshop held in September 2014. Will go to cluster in November 2014.	March 2014
Implementation Evaluation of	Rural Development	Evaluation report, management response and	October 2013

Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Current Stage	Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report
Land Recapitalisation and Development (RECAP) programme		improvement plan completed. First progress report on improvement plan was due end August 2014 but not yet received.	
Implementation Evaluation of Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)	Rural Development	Evaluation completed in October 2013. Improvement Plan received in February 2014 and final submitted in August. Reminder letter on the submission of the progress report sent. First progress report on improvement plan due August 2014. Reminder letter to be sent before the 3rd of October 2014	October 2013
Implementation Evaluation of Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)	Human Settlements	The evaluation has been stopped due to unsatisfactory performance of the service provider and is being re-advertised.	December 2014
Implementation Evaluation of Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)	Human Settlements	The draft report has been submitted and shared with the all 8 USDG implementing metros, treasury and provinces for review. Work is currently underway for the final report.	November 2014
Impact evaluation of National School Nutrition Programme	Basic Education	Dropped and included in 2014/15 Plan	N/A

### 3.3 Progress with evaluations in 2013/14 National Evaluation Plan

Table 2 summarises progress on the evaluations in the 2013/14 national Evaluation Plan.

**Table 2: Progress with NEP evaluations for 2013/14**

<b>Name of Evaluation</b>	<b>Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated</b>	<b>Current Stage</b>	<b>Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report</b>
Implementation Evaluation of Government Coordination System	Presidency	Report approved and being tabled at different clusters and goes to cabinet committee in October 2014. An improvement plan has been developed.	January 2014
Implementation Evaluation of the Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme (EMIA)	Trade and Industry	Report approved and presented at Cluster. Draft Improvement Plan developed on 25 September 2014.	May 2014
Evaluation of the Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII)	Trade and Industry	Final report approved and presented at Cluster. Improvement Plan Development Workshop scheduled to take place in October.	May 2014
Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)	Trade and Industry	Awaiting Final Report and approval in October.	October 2014
Evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme	Military Veterans	Evaluation is currently underway and the draft report has been submitted	November 2014
Evaluation of Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (AMTS)	Science and Technology	Underway but some issues with the service provider.	December 2014
Evaluation of Tax compliance cost of small businesses	SA Revenue Service	Draft report received and close to completion	December 2014
Evaluation of Community Work Programme (CWP)	Cooperative Governance	Draft report received.	November 2014
Evaluation of Land Restitution Programme	Rural Development	Report approved and improvement plan developed - to be presented to cluster then Cabinet.	February 2014
Evaluation of Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme	Agriculture	Awaiting final report. Likely to be approved at the end of October. Should go to cluster in November 2014.	October 2014
Evaluation of Upgrading of Informal	Human Settlements	Awaiting final report. Likely to be approved at the	November 2014

Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Current Stage	Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report
Settlement		end of October 2014.	
Evaluation of Access to the City	Human Settlements	Second call for proposal out, but extremely delayed through DHS complex procurement processes.	
Evaluation of Provision of State Subsidised Housing (Assets)	Human Settlements	Delays in finalising ToRs, delaying the evaluation for several months.	October 2014
Evaluation of Impact Evaluation of the Outcomes Approach	DPME	Underway.	May 2014
An Impact Assessment of the Micro Agricultural Financial Institution of South Africa (MAFISA)	Agriculture	Final report received.	November 2014
Evaluation of quality of National Senior Certificate (Matric)	Basic Education	Requested to drop and Cabinet agreed as a Ministerial Review is looking at this.	

### 3.4 Progress with evaluations in 2014/15 National Evaluation Plan

**Table 2: Progress with NEP evaluations for 2014/15**

Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Current stage	Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report
Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Environmental Governance in the Mining Sector (EEGM)	Department of Environmental Affairs	Underway.	May 2015
Design Evaluation of the Policy on Community Education and Training Colleges (PCC)	Department of Higher Education and Training	The evaluation has not yet begun. At this stage, preparations are underway for the finalisation of the terms of reference.	December 2014
Impact/Implementation Evaluation of the Social Housing Programme (SHP)	Department of Human Settlements	A service provider will be selected in October and the evaluation will start.	November 2015
Evaluation of the Indigenous Knowledge Systems Policy (IKSP)	Department of Science and Technology	The evaluation is currently at procurement stage.	March 2015

Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Current stage	Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report
Diagnostic Evaluation/Programme Audit for Violence Against Women and Children (AVAWC)	Department of Social Development	A service provider has been selected and work has begun on the evaluation. The evaluation is anticipated to be completed in February 2015.	February 2015.
Diagnostic Review of the Social Sector Expanded Public Works Programme	Department of Social Development	A service provider has been selected and work has begun. The evaluation should complete in January 2015	January 2015
Economic Evaluation of the Incremental Investment into the SAPS Forensic Services (SAPS)	South African Police Service	The service provider has been selected to conduct the evaluation but there have been some delays.	May 2015
Implementation Evaluation of the Ilima Letsema Programme and cost-benefit analysis of the revitalisation of existing Irrigation Schemes	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries/ Rural Development and Land Reform	Proposals for service providers received and work is underway for selecting the service provider.	March 2015
Impact evaluation of MAFISA (quantitative) including establishing a baseline	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Evaluation on hold following termination of the programme.	
Policy Evaluation of Small Farmer Support	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Proposals received and work is underway for the selection of service providers.	March 2015
Evaluation of the Funza-Lushaka Bursary Scheme	Department of Basic Education	Evaluation underway, evaluation expected to complete soon.	January 2015
Implementation Evaluation of the National School Nutrition	Department of Basic Education	The preferred Service Provider selected to conduct the evaluation and the evaluation is currently underway.	September 2015
Impact evaluation of Land Restitution Programme (quantitative) including establishing a baseline	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Service provider selected. 3ie managing evaluation	3ie to confirm 2 year evaluation
Impact/implementation evaluation of the MPAT system	Department of Performance M&E	Work is currently underway following completion of the inception phase and field work.	December 2014



Name of Evaluation	Department(s) responsible for the programme being evaluated	Current stage	Anticipated or actual date of receipt of final report
Impact/implementation evaluation of the Strategic Planning/APP system	Department of Performance M&E	The evaluation has not started yet but work has been done on developing terms of reference.	March 2015

### 3.5 Status of improvement plans

Evaluation	Date report approved	Date improvement plan submitted to DPME	Progress reports
Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development	October 2012		The first report was received but lacked detail. Several letters have been sent to DSD requesting the other reports but they have not been received. However there has been significant progress.
Evaluation of Business Process Services Programme	May 2014 (initially drafted November 2013)	9 June 2014	A formal progress report has not been received yet. Informal updates indicate significant progress.
Impact Evaluation of Grade R (reception year of schooling)	December 2013	14 April 2014	First progress report on improvement plan requested from DBE. The progress report was due end July 2014. Reminder letter on the progress report sent.
Evaluation of Land Restitution Programme	Improvement plan workshop 18-19 June	September 2014	First progress report on improvement plan due November 2014.
Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing under 5s	September 2014	Still draft of September 2014/ Not yet received formal submission.	.
Implementation Evaluation of Land Recapitalisation and Development (RECAP) programme	5 February 2014	10 February 2014	A letter was sent to the department requesting the progress report.for the end of August 2014. Not yet received.
Implementation Evaluation of Comprehensive Rural	5 February 2014	10 February 2014	A letter was sent to the department requesting the progress report.for the end of August 2014. Not yet received.

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Date report approved</b>	<b>Date improvement plan submitted to DPME</b>	<b>Progress reports</b>
Development Programme (CRDP)			
Implementation Evaluation of Government Coordination System	Improvement plan workshop held 26 September 2014	Produced but needs to be finalised.	Work has started on implementation of the findings.

## 4 Summary of approved evaluations for 2015/16

A call was issued at the beginning of April 2014 for proposals for evaluations to be included in the National Evaluation Plan for 2015/16 to 2017/18. 18 departments participated in briefings. Proposals were received from 5 national departments for the 2012/13 plan (plus 2 provinces), 12 in 2013/14, 13 in for 2014/15, and 6 for 2015/16 plus some carried over in the plans of previous years. Once again they are primarily being proposed for one year, and not ex-ante for new programmes but rather for existing programmes. What also seems to be emerging is that departments propose impact evaluations, but in practice when these are being scoped it is realised that this is not possible as the data is not available, and they are converted to implementation evaluations. Table 2 summarises the evaluations that will be conducted during the 2015/16 financial year.

**Table 3: Summary of approved evaluations for 2015/16**

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Agricultural Extension Recovery Plan	<p>Extension and Advisory Services provide agricultural information and advice, access to technology, institutional arrangements and skills development to agricultural producers. Clients of the service are mostly smallholder producers and the beneficiaries of land reform programmes (inclusive of inclusive of redistribution, restitution and tenure reform). This is a key component in agrarian transformation which is a key element of outcome 7 (Vibrant Rural Communities) in the NDP/MTSF.</p> <p>The ERP was introduced during the 2008/09 financial year and is aimed at revitalisation of Extension and Advisory Services in South Africa through the following strategic objectives (termed pillars): (i) Ensuring visibility and accountability of extension, (ii) Promoting professionalism and improving the image of extension, (iii) Recruitment of extension personnel, (iv) Reskilling and reorientation of extension, and (v) Provision of ICT infrastructure and other resources. The evaluation will assess programme delivery and performance of ERP as well as inform the programme design.</p>
Department of Basic Education	Evaluation of the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS)	<p>In July 2009 the Minister appointed a panel of experts to investigate the nature of the challenges and problems experienced in the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement and to develop a set of recommendations designed to improve the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement. The panel presented a five-year plan to improve teaching and learning through a set of short-term, medium and longer term interventions. Part of the recommendations and responses was the repackaged curriculum policy, namely, the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) which was gazetted in 2011. This is a key component of Outcome 1 where suboutcome 2 focuses on provision of appropriate learning materials, and suboutcome 3</p>

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
		assessment. CAPS contributes to both. This study will be a formative evaluation aimed at uncovering implementation challenges and highlighting good practice with a view to learning. It is aimed at improving the implementation of CAPS. It could also lead to the strengthening of CAPS in support of effective implementation.
National Prosecuting Authority	Evaluation of the Asset Forfeiture Unit Sub-programme	<p>The AFU was established in 1999 shortly after the Prevention of Organised Crime Act, 1998 (POCA) came into force. It is now a sub-programme of the NPA. The AFU was created as a dedicated unit to develop the necessary expertise to deal with the complexities of forfeiture. Its mission was to implement asset forfeiture measures effectively and aggressively as part of a strategy to deal better with organised and economically motivated crime. It aims to reduce crime, or at least the growth in crime, by reducing the profit and increasing the risk for criminals. It also aims to build faith in the criminal justice system by taking visible action to ensure that crime is seen as unprofitable. It is currently playing an important role in combatting corruption, which severely impacts service delivery. In many cases, it has also been able to make significant recoveries for the state of funds or property that had been lost due to corruption.</p> <p>The AFU contributes to outcome 3, viz. all people in SA are and feel safe and more specifically sub-Outcome 7 which aims to reduce corruption in the public and private sector. More specifically, it contributes to the fight against serious crimes and especially corruption as directed by the NDP.</p>
Department of Social Development	Diagnostic evaluation of the Non-Profit Organisations Regulatory Framework and Legislation.	<p>Non-Profit Organisations (NPOs) contribute significantly to the development of the country as they often play an intermediary role within society. With high levels of inequality and underdevelopment within market-based macro-economic government framework, NPOs are critical in improving access to constitutionally enshrined socio-economic rights for the poor. NPOs employ 9% of the total non-agricultural, formal workforce and 1.5 million volunteers (often unemployed youth seeking work experience) and serve approximately 72% of clients of welfare services.</p> <p>The NPO sector includes diverse institutions, all with varying capabilities such as CBOs, FBOs and NGOs. Despite recognition by government of the importance of NPOs, NPOs critical reflection of government performance has often been interpreted as anti-government. This can create uncertainties for NPOs, affecting delivery in areas where government depends on NPO system to deliver services to marginalised communities. NPOs are critical for adult education (Outcome 1), health services such as community health workers (Outcome 2), local food production (Outcome 7), in the environment sector (Outcome 10), in social protection (Outcome 13) and often play an important role in social cohesion (Outcome 14). Outcome 13 suboutcome 1</p>

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
		<p>specifically focuses on NPOs and society-state linkages.</p> <p>After the financial crisis of 2008, NGOs have also become increasingly reliant on government for funding for them to fulfil their roles. However, many have struggled to access state funding as a result of unclear or lack of standardised criteria for financing social services and difference in focus, wherein most NPOs have had a developmental approach to social development most state programmes have been oriented towards social protection.</p> <p>Government has established an array of legislation and management systems to govern and support the NPO sector. The different regulations improve transparency and governance for NPOs but others have argued that the demands for compliance are simply too onerous. Moreover, NPOs are subjected to varying standards and management systems across different government departments and this can make government monitoring of different NPOs challenging.</p> <p>Given these challenges, DSD intends to carry out a comprehensive review of the legislative framework and management systems that affect NPOs, including current delivery models used by different departments, with the intention to rationalise the system to improve governance and impact of NPOs.</p>
Department of Social Development	Implementation Evaluation of the National Drug Master Plan in addressing all forms of Substance abuse	<p>The use and abuse of illicit substances and misuse of over the counter substances (i.e. alcohol, nicotine, over the counter medication) is endemic in South Africa, especially amongst youth. Some studies have found children as young as 12 having experimented with substances. This often results in substance dependence. The South African youth risk behaviour survey among learners in Grade 8 to Grade 11 found that 13% of youth admitted to lifetime use of cannabis, 7% for mandrax, while 7% used crystal methamphetamine, or 'tik' . When considering the social, medical and fiscal burden associated with substance abuse, this is a serious challenge for South Africa as a middle income developing country. The degree of vulnerability to substance use and dependency differs according to individuals' characteristics and socio-cultural environment. This indicates that prevention measures also need to be diverse and cross-cutting, as risk factors are located at individual, family, school environment, interpersonal, community and society levels. New drugs enter the market regularly and newer ways of producing and trafficking illicit drugs are always emerging and they vary depending on the substance. Furthermore, regulating the production and distribution of legal dependence-forming substances such as alcohol is precarious; increased regulation and taxes are strongly associated with increased levels of illegal trade and use of unrecorded alcohol exposing users to greater risks of harm.</p> <p>Addressing substance abuse requires the coordinated efforts of various actors located in</p>

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
		different service sectors. The Department of Social Development (through the Central Drug Authority) has established a National Drug Master Plan (NDMP) which provides a multi-sectorial blueprint for South Africa's response to substance abuse. The use of substances is associated with numerous other social problems which place a heavy burden on the country's resources, particularly in poor communities. This evaluation will look at the implementation of the NDMP.
Department of Higher Education and Training	Implementation and Formative Evaluation of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Act	<p>The Quality Assurance regime was first established under the SAQA Act, Act 58 of 1995, through which the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) was given the responsibility to develop and implement the quality assurance system for the NQF. The implementation and monitoring of the quality assurance system between 1996 and 2008 relied on SAQA and the Education and Training Quality Assurance Bodies (ETQAs).</p> <p>Since the advent of the NQF Act, No. 67 of 2008, the quality assurance regime has changed and three Quality Councils are responsible for quality assurance across their sub-frameworks and across the institutions which deliver the qualifications and part qualifications for which the QCs are responsible. No audit or system-wide evaluation has been done since the last SAQA audit in 2007/2008. SAQA has been developed a new <i>Policy and Criteria for Implementing Assessment for NQF Qualification and Part Qualifications and Professional designations in South Africa</i>, but this is awaiting final approval by the SAQA board.</p>
Department of Public Service and Administration	Evaluation of Service Delivery Improvement Planning System	The MPSA SDIP directive of 30 October 2008 directs national and provincial departments to submit Service Delivery Improvement Plans (SDIPs) by 31 March every 3 years. Service delivery Improvement Plans (SDIPs) seek to provide a strategic focus on improving specific services supported by an appropriate allocation of human and financial resources, strengthened systems and processes whilst leveraging on technology to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of quality services. Despite the measures put in place to support implementation, compliance (especially among national departments), the credibility and the quality of the SDIPs remain major challenges. As these are supposed to be implemented by all departments this is an important system which is not working optimally.
Department of Mineral Resources	Evaluation of the Mining Charter	The 2010 Broad-Based Socio-Economic Charter (Mining Charter) has been developed with the primary purpose of redressing the historic inequalities and promoting equitable access to South Africa's mineral resources to all South Africans. The Mining Charter score card assesses eight seven critical areas to determine the domestic mining industry's contribution towards the realisation of the Mining Charter's objectives. The Mining Charter relates to three of the priority outcomes, 4 (employment), 8 (human settlements) and 9 (local government). The evaluation will review progress on this and how implementation can be strengthened.

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact/implementation evaluation of the evaluation system	<p>The Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency was established in January 2010, and started operating from April 2010. The initial rationale for the Department was the establishment of 12 priority outcomes, development and monitoring of plans against those priority outcomes. The basic evaluation system is now fairly well established based on national and provincial evaluation plans, with some departments having departmental evaluation plans. The system is expanding to provinces and departments during 2015/16 and 2016/17. In 2015/16 it will be three years of implementation and it is important to be able to be clear on the benefits from the system in advocating this expansion, as well as reflecting on areas where the system could be strengthened.</p>
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Implementation evaluation of citizen-based monitoring programme	<p>There is growing distance” between citizens and the government. This is seen through the outbreaks of violence in some community protests. There are also concerns that communities are not being listened to seriously.” (NDP:37). Involving citizens and civil society in monitoring service delivery has the potential to create spaces for this ‘listening’ to happen, and for this to incentivize improved performance in the state system.</p> <p>How to do this at scale is a question that DPME is trying to answer through its emerging citizen-based monitoring programme. This was conceptualised in the Framework for Strengthening Citizen-Government Partnerships for Monitoring Frontline Service Delivery, approved by Cabinet in 2013. It aims to support government to strengthen the involvement of citizens in monitoring service delivery. The three focus areas are: (i) policy interventions to support take-up of citizen-based monitoring (ii) a pilot/prototyping process to develop a citizen-based monitoring method for frontline service delivery and (iii) a knowledge sharing focus that aims to provide platforms and opportunities for government and civil society.</p> <p>The pilot is in its second phase and will conclude in September 2015. The suitability of DPME’s approach, and whether this should be taken to scale, needs to be assessed through a formative evaluation.</p>

## 5 Concepts for evaluations for 2015/16

### 5.1 Implementation Evaluation of Non-Profit Organisation Regulatory System

**Implementing Department:** Department of Social Development (DSD)

#### **Background to the evaluation**

Non-Profit Organisations (NPOs) in South Africa contribute significantly to the social, economic and political development of the country as they often play an intermediary role within society. With high levels of inequality and underdevelopment within market-based macro-economic government framework, NPOs are critical in improving access to constitutionally enshrined socio-economic rights for the poor, across education, health, welfare services, environment, food production.

The NPO sector includes diverse institutions, of varying capabilities, ranging from community based organisations (CBOs) and faith based organisations (FBOs) to professional Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) with international reach. Most organisations operating as NPOs can be characterised into two broad service categories; those providing goods and service in various sectors on behalf of government and organisations that fill the democratic vacuum by advocating and protecting human rights of the underprivileged and monitoring the impact of state and private sector activities. Recognising the importance of NPOs in the country, government has established an array of legislation and management systems to govern and support the NPO sector.

A four layer legislative framework currently governs NPOs: the first layer representing laws that recognise NPOs as legal entities. Secondly having legal recognition NPOs have to then register with social development as an NPO in terms of the Non-Profit Organisations Act (Act 71 of 1997). The third layer allows registered NPOs to register as Public Benefit Organisation with the South African Revenue Services (SARS). Further to this, PBOs can apply for a donor deductible status and have the right to receive tax-deductible donations. Though these different regulations improve transparency and governance for NPOs, others have argued that the demands for compliance are simply too onerous that smaller NGOs cannot afford and that this state-driven compliance has potential to alienate those the organisation exist to serve.

NPOs are subjected to varying standards and management systems across different government departments. This can make government monitoring of different NPOs challenging, particularly for those providing public goods. Despite recognition by government of the importance of NPOs, public discourse has often been inimical towards NPOs, whose critical reflection of government performance has often been interpreted as anti-government. This can create uncertainties for NPOs, affecting delivery in areas where government depends on NPO system to deliver services to marginalised communities. After the financial crisis of 2008, NGOs have also become increasingly reliant on government for funding for them to fulfil their roles. However, many have struggled to access state funding as a result of unclear or lack of standardised criteria for financing social services and difference in focus, wherein most NPOs have had a developmental approach to social development most state programmes have been oriented towards social protection.



Given these challenges, DSD intends to carry out a comprehensive review of the legislative framework and management systems that affect NPOs, including current delivery models used by different departments, with the intention to rationalise the system to improve governance and impact of NPOs.

**Importance of the evaluation**

NPOs employ 9% of the total non-agricultural, formal workforce and 1.5 million volunteers (often unemployed youth seeking work experience) and serves approximately 72% of welfare services sector clients. The MTSF underscores the need to strengthen partnership between government and NPOs, particularly those focused on the provision of services to marginalised communities. NPOs are critical for adult education (Outcome 1), health services such as community health workers (Outcome 2), local food production (Outcome 7), in the environment sector (Outcome 10), in social protection (Outcome 13) and often play an important role in social cohesion (Outcome 14). Outcome 13 suboutcome 1 specifically focuses on NPOs and society-state linkages. The evaluation will provide substantive material that can inform the process of restructuring government partnerships with NPOs to improve access to services and fulfilment of socio-economic rights for disadvantaged communities.

**Purpose of the evaluation:** To assess how effective the system of NPO delivery is and how it can be strengthened.

**Key questions to be addressed**

1. How effective is the NPO regulatory system in enabling NPOs to function optimally?
2. How have different departments partnered with NPOs in the delivery of statutory services? How effective are the current NPO delivery models used by government departments?
3. What has been the effect of current NPOs regulatory and management systems on service NPOs functionality and sustainability? Have the NPO support mechanisms (M&E systems, legislative requirements, implementation management from different departments) been able to improve governance, transparency and accountability for NPOs, and service quality to communities?
4. What are the lessons learned from the application of the regulatory system and how can the current regulatory systems and delivery model/s be rationalised and strengthened?

**Principal audience**

National and provincial policy makers, The Department of Trade and Industry, South African Revenue Services, Department of Justice and Correctional Services, NPO Intergovernmental Forum.

**Type of evaluation:** Implementation evaluation

**Management strategy**

The DSD is in the process of reviewing the NPO Act 71 of 1997 and in mid-2012 a discussion document on proposed amendments to the Act which sets out a policy framework on non-profit organisation law was issued. This evaluation will inform the refinement of the NPO Policy document and the review of the NPO Act.

**Cost:** The evaluation will cost approximately R2.5 million funded by both DPME and DSD.

**Timeline:** The evaluation will be undertaken between April 2015 and February 2016

## 5.2 Diagnostic/implementation evaluation of the National Drug Master Plan

**Implementing Department:** Department of Social Development (DSD)

### Background to the evaluation

The use and abuse of illicit substances and misuse of over the counter substances (i.e. alcohol, nicotine, over the counter medication) is endemic in South Africa. Particularly concerning is the high rates of substance use and abuse amongst the youth, and the young onset age for substance use. Some studies have found children as young as 12 having experimented with dependence-forming substances. The propensity of these children to go on to present with medical condition of substance dependence are extremely high. This is shown in that the South African youth risk behaviour survey among learners in Grade 8 to Grade 11 found that 13% of youth admitted to lifetime use of cannabis, 7% for mandrax, while 7% used crystal methamphetamine, or 'tik'. When considering the social, medical and fiscal burden associated with substance abuse, this is a serious challenge for South Africa as a middle income developing country.

Differences in individuals' characteristics and socio-cultural environment create variances in the degree of vulnerability to substance experimentation, continuous use and dependence, and impact of substance use disorder. This indicates that prevention measures also need to be diverse and cross-cutting, as risk factors are located at individual, family, school environment, interpersonal, community and society levels. Moreover, substance abuse in a context of increased global connectivity and growing urban populations is rapidly changing. New drugs enter the market regularly, outpacing international drug classification process (348 new substances entered markets in December 2013 well above the 234 international classifications) and newer ways of producing and trafficking illicit drugs are always emerging and they vary depending on the substance. Furthermore, regulating the production and distribution of legal dependence-forming substances such as alcohol is precarious; increased regulation and taxes are strongly associated with increased levels of illegal trade and use of unrecorded alcohol exposing users to greater risks of harm. Thus, globally it is recognised that addressing substance abuse requires coordinated efforts of various actors located in different service sectors; from law enforcement, through social development to reducing poverty and inequality and increasing access to basic service and life opportunities. As such, the Department of Social Development (through the Central Drug Authority) has established a National Drug Master Plan (NDMP) which provides a multi-sectorial blueprint for South Africa's response to substance abuse.

The Plan was first published in 1999 as a five year strategy based on the Prevention of and Treatment for Substance Abuse Act (70 of 2008). The NDMP is designed to bring together government departments and other stakeholders in the field of substance abuse to combat the use and abuse of, and dependence on dependence-forming substances and related problems. The aim is to provide a clear national policy statement, leadership and coordination of different activities. DSD intends to evaluate the implementation of the NDMP to test the relevance and appropriateness of the plan given the rapidly changing nature and complexity of the problem and its ability to improve quality of implementation and enhance cumulative impact of the different institutions and programmes.

**Importance of the evaluation**

The use of substances is associated with numerous other social problems including crime (60% of all crimes are drug related ) (Outcome 3), violence against women and children (Outcome 3). It also contributes to the spread of HIV and AIDS, and which places a heavy burden on the country's resources, particularly in poor communities. To successfully reduce prevalence and incidence of substance abuse requires institutional capability to set policy direction, implement preventative measures (i.e. enforce regulations and law, provide requisite support to vulnerable groups, etc.) and track performance.

**Purpose of the evaluation**

To determine the extent to which the plan has been implemented and facilitated efficient and effective service delivery for combating substance abuse.

**Key questions to be addressed**

1. Has the plan provided clear policy statements and direction for aligned operational planning, resource prioritisation and measurement of results across different institutions?
2. To what extent has the plan being internalised and implemented by implicated institutions and government departments? What are the barriers to implementation?
3. What is the likelihood of the plan contributing to enhanced state/agencies' capabilities to reduce demand and supply of dependant forming substances and improved access to treatment?
4. What are the lessons learnt in the implementation of the plan? And how can implementation be strengthened?

**Principal audience**

Departments of Social Development, Health, Basic Education, Higher Education and Training, Home Affairs, Justice and correctional services, Trade and Industry, Sport and Recreation, International Relations, and Transport; The South African Police Service; South African Revenue Service; Medicines Control Council; National Youth Development Agency; and National Prosecuting Authority.

**Type of evaluation:** Implementation Evaluation

**Management strategy**

The evaluation will be critical during the mid-term review and adjustments for the NDMP 2013-2018.

**Cost estimate:** This evaluation will cost approximately R1.75 million funded by both DPME and DSD.

**Time and duration:** The evaluation will be undertaken between April 2015 and December 2015.

### 5.3 Implementation evaluation of the Curriculum and Policy Statements (CAPS)

**Implementing Department:** Department of Basic Education (DBE)

#### **Background to the evaluation**

In July 2009, the Minister of Basic Education, Minister Motshekga, appointed a panel of experts to investigate the nature of the challenges and problems experienced in the implementation of the *National Curriculum Statement* and to develop a set of recommendations designed to improve the implementation of the *National Curriculum Statement*. The Minister's brief was in response to wide-ranging comments in writing and verbally from a range of stakeholders such as teachers, parents, teacher unions, school management and academics, over several years, on the implementation of the *National Curriculum Statement*. While there has been positive support for the new curriculum, there has also been considerable criticism of various aspects of its implementation, manifesting in teacher overload, confusion and stress and widespread learner underperformance in international and local assessments. Whilst several minor interventions have been made over time to address some of the challenges of implementing the curriculum, these changes had not had the desired effect.

The panel consequently set out to identify the challenges and pressure points, particularly with reference to teachers and learning quality, to deliberate on how things could be improved and to develop a set of practical interventions. The panel presented a five-year plan to improve teaching and learning via a set of short-term interventions aimed at providing immediate relief and focus for teachers; and medium and longer-term recommendations with the vision to achieve real improvement in student learning within a five year period.

Part of the recommendations and responses was the repackaged curriculum policy, namely, the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) which was gazetted in 2011. Curriculum implementation based on CAPS was phased across different grades. CAPS was introduced in schools in 2012 for the Foundation Phase and Grade 10. In 2013, it was then introduced in the intermediate phase and Grade 11, and in 2014, in the Senior Phase and Grade 12. To date, little is known about the experiences of schools, especially, teachers, in the implementation of the curriculum.

#### **Importance of the evaluation**

Outcome 1 of the MTSF focuses on basic education, and the curriculum is fundamental to its implementation. There has been much public consultation and discussion on curriculum implementation resulting in the Ministerial Committee review of the curriculum. This has been part of the curriculum debate in South Africa over the past ten years. Following the introduction of CAPS, there has been great interest amongst stakeholders including the public, education partners, teacher organisations and education Departments on the implementation of the curriculum. This study will be a formative evaluation aimed at uncovering implementation challenges and highlighting good practice with a view to learning. It is aimed at improving the implementation of CAPS. It could also lead to the strengthening of CAPS in support of effective implementation.

**Purpose of the evaluation**

To evaluate whether the curriculum has been implemented as specified in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) and how implementation can be strengthened

**Key questions to be addressed**

1. Is there evidence of the extent to which CAPS has been implemented?
2. Are teachers able & motivated to implement the curriculum according to CAPS?
3. Are the mechanisms to support CAPS implementation working?
4. Are the CAPS documents and the systems for implementing it relevant and appropriate for the context it operates in?
5. How should CAPS documents and the systems for implementing it be strengthened?

**Principle Audience:** Department of Basic Education, Provincial Departments of Education, DPME, Cabinet and Parliament

**Type of Evaluation:** Implementation evaluation

**Management strategy**

Recommendations for improvement in the evaluation Improvement Plan will be used to strengthen implementation of CAPS.

**Cost estimate:** The evaluation is estimated to cost R2 million, which will be shared equally by DBE and DPME, but procured by DPME.

**Timing and duration:** The evaluation will start in February 2015 and should be completed by February 2016.

## 5.4 Implementation and Formative Evaluation of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) Act

**Implementing Department:** Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET)

**Background to the evaluation**

The Quality Assurance regime was first established under the SAQA Act, Act 58 of 1995, through which the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) was given the responsibility to develop and implement the quality assurance system for the NQF. During this time, SAQA produced Criteria and Guidelines for *Assessment of NQF registered Unit Standards and Qualification (2001)* and *Guidelines for Integrated Assessment (2005)*. SAQA also conducted two audits, one in 2004 and one in 2007/8 which audited the quality assurance bodies which were established under the SAQA Act. Audit reports for both these were produced.

The implementation and monitoring of the quality assurance system between 1996 and 2008 relied on SAQA and the Education and Training Quality Assurance Bodies (ETQAs) of which all the Sector Education and Training Authorities (SETAs), the Council for Higher Education (CHE), Umalusi and some professional bodies were ETQAs. The system was guided by SAQA and the SAQA policies and audits. Since the advent of

the NQF Act, No. 67 of 2008, the quality assurance regime has changed and three Quality Councils are responsible for quality assurance across their sub-frameworks and across the institutions which deliver the qualifications and part qualifications for which the QCs are responsible. No audit or system-wide evaluation has been done since the last SAQA audit in 2007/2008. SAQA has developed a new *Policy and Criteria for Implementing Assessment for NQF Qualification and Part Qualifications and Professional designations in South Africa*, but this is awaiting final approval by the SAQA board. This intervention is important at this stage for further development and implementation of the NQF.

### **Importance of the evaluation**

It is of national interest (across the South African PSET system) to make the QA system more responsive and improve it. It also contributes to the further development of quality assurance regimes regionally and globally.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the implementation of the NQF Act in order to inform how the NQF may be strengthened to increase the quality assurance within the PSET system (is one of a series of evaluations focused on the quality assurance regime in the PSET sector)

### **Key questions to be addressed**

1. Conceptually, to what extent has the NQF Act been usefully articulated?
2. From an implementation lens, to what extent has SAQA managed and implemented NQF?
3. Design wise, to what extent is the current organizational structure and institutional mechanisms contributing or not to the successful implementation of the NQF?

**Principal audience** DBE, UMALUSI, SAQA, SETAs, COGTA (CWP), DTI, DoL, private sector industry bodies, government officials

### **Type of evaluation**

Implementation evaluation which is also formative because it will contribute towards the overall systems review of the quality assurance regime in the PSET sector

### **Management strategy**

The evaluation is part of a series of evaluation studies designed to focus down on the major components of the NQF system, and to ultimately feed into an overall system review of the quality assurance regime. All of the evaluations are to provide the evidence basis (empirical policy assessment) for amendments to the NQF Act.

### **Cost estimate**

DHET funding is comprised of R2.5m (NSF), R40,000 (NQF Directorate), plus R750,000 from DPME with a current indicative total of R3.4m. Additional funding is needed to fund a upper limit evaluation estimate of R4m.

**Time and duration:** The evaluation can start on 1 March 2015, to be completed by August 2015.

## 5.5 Implementation Evaluation of the Agricultural Extension Recovery Programme

**Implementing department:** Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF)

### Background to the evaluation

Extension and Advisory Services aims at providing agricultural information and advice, access to technology, institutional arrangements and skills development to producers. Clients of the service are mostly smallholder producers and the beneficiaries of land reform programme (inclusive of inclusive of redistribution, restitution and tenure reform). Extension and Advisory Services, falls under Technical and Advisory Assistance pillar of Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP). Currently the Extension and Advisory Services is supported financially through the Extension Recovery Plan (ERP) which is a grant funding, administered through the Division of Revenue Act as Schedule The ERP is a programme that was introduced during the 2008/09 financial year and is aimed at revitalisation of Extension and Advisory Services in South Africa through the following strategic objectives (termed pillars): (i) Ensuring visibility and accountability of extension, (ii) Promoting professionalism and improving the image of extension, (iii) Recruitment of extension personnel, (iv) Reskilling and reorientation of extension, and (v) Provision of ICT infrastructure and other resources.

### Importance of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess programme delivery and performance of ERP as well as inform revisions to the programme design.

### Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine if ERP has revitalised Extension and Advisory Services and how it can strengthened.

### Key questions to be addressed

The key evaluation questions are:

1. Is there any evidence of improved production or increased resilience arising from the extension advice? Has the capacity of producers increased?
2. Do producers value advice of extension practitioners and are they making changes to their practices as a result (and how does this compare to other role players e.g. commodity organisations, non-governmental programme (NGOs)?
3. Are the extension practitioners motivated to work effectively as a result of the ERP?
4. To what extent is extension advice reaching different producers and how is implementation of the ERP working for different clients?
5. To what extent is advice technically sound (reliable technical advice)?
6. How are the different pillars of the ERP working?
7. Are there good practices in different provinces to draw from?

8. What role are other stakeholders playing and how does that complement public sector extension advice?
9. How could the extension system be strengthened, what models should be taken forward for different clients, and how should this be linked to other services?

### **Principal audience**

The following is a list of stakeholders to be consulted (non-exhaustive):

- Officials of Provincial Departments of Agriculture (PDAs) (agricultural advisors, senior agricultural advisors, subject matter specialists, extension supervisors and management at local and district level, chief directors of district services, veterinarians, economists, crop and animal scientists, engineers, provincial directors of extension managing ERP, Heads of Departments (HODs) and officials responsible for Human Resource Development (HRD);
- Producers (those receiving and not receiving Extension and Advisory Services);
- Key informants (representatives of producers' Organisations, farmers unions;
- Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries officials, research institutions, professional bodies and the association for Extension Practitioners etc).

**Type of Evaluation:** Implementation evaluation (with some elements of impact assessment)

### **Management strategy**

Strategies for improvement in the evaluation Improvement Plan will be embedded in the Annual Performance Plan (APP) of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

### **Cost estimate**

The evaluation is estimated to cost R1.5 million, of which DAFF has committed R500 000 while DPME will provide R1 million.

### **Timing and duration**

The evaluation will take 8 months from the appointment of the service provider, targeted for April 2015 and should complete by November 2015.



## 5.6 Evaluation of the Asset Forfeiture unit sub-programme

**Implementing Department:** Asset Forfeiture Unit (AFU) of the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA)

### **Background to the evaluation**

Traditionally the main focus of law enforcement has been to send criminals to jail. However, from the 1980s organised crime grew rapidly, becoming an international business generating large profits with the ability to corrupt law enforcement, and even entire states. It became clear that effective action required measures to remove the profit from crime. In addition, focusing on money flows is also an important way of dealing with syndicate leaders who were seldom directly involved in committing crime, but usually received the money. From 1991 to 1996, South Africa adopted a range of legal measures to implement its international obligations. However, by 1999, almost no action had been taken due to the complexity of the new legislation, the lack of focus on this area, and the challenges of using civil litigation to fight crime. In addition, those prosecutors skilled enough to do the work normally carry a large workload.

After extensive consultation with local and international experts, it became clear that a specialist unit was required to ensure that the new measures are implemented effectively. The AFU was established in 1999 shortly after the Prevention of Organised Crime Act, 1998 (POCA) came into force. It is now a sub-programme of the NPA. The AFU was created as a dedicated unit to develop the necessary expertise to deal with the complexities of forfeiture, and its performance would be measured solely in terms of forfeiture. Its mission was to implement asset forfeiture measures effectively and aggressively as part of a strategy to deal better with organised and economically motivated crime. It aims to reduce crime, or at least the growth in crime, by reducing the profit and increasing the risk for criminals. It also aims to build faith in the criminal justice system by taking visible action to ensure that crime is seen as unprofitable. It is currently playing an important role in combatting corruption, which severely impacts service delivery. In many cases, it has also been able to make significant recoveries for the state of funds or property that had been lost due to corruption.

A multi-disciplinary approach has been adopted in the National Development Plan (NDP) as the long term approach to fighting corruption. It also gives effect to international protocols, conventions and international obligations such as the G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group, FAFT, UNCAC, etc. Dealing with the proceeds of crime, illicit money flows and corruption are also specific focus areas in the National Security Strategy approved by Cabinet in December 2013.

### **Importance of the evaluation**

The AFU contributes to outcome 3, viz. all people in SA are and feel safe and more specifically sub-Outcome 7 which aims to reduce corruption in the public and private sector. More specifically, it contributes to the fight against serious crimes and especially corruption as directed by the NDP. This is reflected in the multi-disciplinary Anti-Corruption Task Team (ACTT) set up by Cabinet. Because of the focus on the combatting of corruption in the NDP and the JCPS Delivery Agreement, the AFU has allocated much of its limited resources to the ACTT, and it has achieved significant success in this area due to good institutionalised cooperation with its key partners in the ACTT.

Although the AFU performance monitoring reports seems to suggest that it is performing well, there has not been any evaluation of its implementation, and its impact in the fight against crime. The AFU has been in existence for 15 years, but the tool is still relatively new in the fight against crime, and thus evaluation is an opportunity to learn from what has been done, and from relevant international experience, as well as improve on its performance and impact. Furthermore, the work of the AFU is extremely dependent on key partners. It has developed reasonably good cooperation frameworks with SAPS (especially the DPCI), the rest of the NPA, the FIC, SARS, the state attorney and others. However, the reality is that the institutional arrangements needed to facilitate cooperation are not optimal, and thus need to be evaluated.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

This study seeks to assess how well the AFU sub-programme is being implemented and whether it is delivering upon its desired results (outputs and outcomes). It also seeks to determine whether the cost of implementing the programme is congruent with the intended benefits.

### **Key questions to be addressed**

1. How well is the AFU sub-programme being implemented?
2. What are the operational and other constraints of implementing the AFU function and how can they be addressed?
3. How well are the services of the AFU used by the victims of crime and law enforcement agencies?
4. How well does the work of the AFU fit with and complement the work of its key partners and stakeholders and how can it be improved?
5. Is the design of the AFU Sub-programme optimal for achieving the intended objectives?
6. What are the costs in relation to the benefits of the sub-programme? (this does not only include financial return on investments, but also less tangible benefits in terms of its longer term outcomes)

### **Principal audience:**

In NPA: National Prosecutions Service (NPS), Specialised Commercial Crime Unit (SCCU).

External agencies: SAPS: Detective Service and the Directorate of Priority Crime Investigations (DPCI), Special Investigating Unit (SIU), Anti-Corruption Task Team (ACTT), SARS, FSB, FIC, National Treasury, SARB, and DoJ (State Attorney, CARU, Master's Office).

**Type of evaluation:** Implementation and economic evaluation

**Management Strategy:** The evaluation will be managed by the NPA supported by the DPME.

**Cost estimate:** The evaluation will cost approximately R4 million, with R3 million from the NPA and from R1 million DPME

**Time and duration:** The evaluation will be undertaken between March 2015 and March 2016.

## 5.7 Evaluation of evaluations

**Implementing Department:** Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation

### Background to the evaluation

The Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency was established in January 2010, and started operating from April 2010. The initial rationale for the Department was the establishment of 12 priority outcomes, development and monitoring of plans against those priority outcomes. In 2011 DPME also started to develop the concept for a National Evaluation System, and a National Evaluation Policy Framework was approved by Cabinet on 23 November 2011. It was decided to focus on a limited number of strategic priorities through a National Evaluation Plan. The first NEP for 2012-13 was approved by Cabinet in June 2012, and the first evaluations from this started in October 2012. In total some 39 evaluations have been completed or are underway and some 11 evaluations have completed. This evaluation is intended to see the impact on performance of the first evaluations supported by DPME.

The National Evaluation System sought to address the problem that “evaluation was applied sporadically and not informing planning, policy-making and budgeting sufficiently. DPME recognised a missed opportunity to improve government’s effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability”. The underlying purpose is:

- Improving policy or programme **performance** - 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.

### Importance of the evaluation

The basic evaluation system is now fairly well established based on national and provincial evaluation plans. However it needs to expand to further provinces and departments during 2015/16 and 2016/17, and it is important to be able to be clear on the benefits from the system in advocating this expansion. In addition it is important to reflect on areas the system could be strengthened.

### Purpose of the evaluation

To assess the uptake of evaluation findings/recommendations, wider impacts of the evaluation system and how the system can be strengthened.

### Key questions to be addressed

1. How much have programmes changed what they do as a result of evaluations?
2. Is there early evidence that performance of programmes has improved as a result of evaluations?
3. How far have decision-makers used the results of evaluations in decision-making processes?

4. Are there any unintended costs or benefits from the evaluation system?
5. How is the evaluation system working as a whole and how can it be improved, as well as specific components of the system (eg training, guidelines)?
6. What appears to be the cost-benefit of establishing an evaluation system, and what are the implications for expanding the system to provinces, departments and municipalities?
7. What changes need to be implemented to improve the effectiveness and value-for-money of the evaluation system, including rolling it out to provinces, departments and municipalities?

**Principle audience:** The Presidency, all governments departments, Parliament, Cabinet and FOSAD  
**Type of evaluation:** Implementation evaluation (but also showing whether there are early signs of impact)

#### **Management strategy:**

The evaluation steering committee will be drawn from the Evaluation Technical Working Group which supports the National Evaluation System. Recommendations for improvement in the evaluation Improvement Plan will be used to strengthen the National Evaluation System and to assist in planning how to roll it out more widely to provinces, departments and municipalities.

#### **Cost estimate**

The evaluation is estimated to cost R2 million, funded by the Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation, possibly with support from DFID.

**Timing and duration:** The evaluation will take 12 months, starting in January 2015 and should be completed by December 2016

## **5.8 Diagnostic/implementation evaluation of citizen-based monitoring programme**

**Implementing department:** Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME)

#### **Background to the evaluation**

The National Development Plan notes a “growing distance” between citizens and the government. “Outbreaks of violence in some community protests reflect frustration not only over the pace of service delivery, but also concerns that communities are not being listened to seriously.” (NDP:37). Involving citizens and civil society in monitoring service delivery has the potential to create spaces for this ‘listening’ to happen, and for this to incentivize improved performance in the state system. How to do this at scale is a question that DPME is trying to answer through its pilot citizen-based monitoring programme. This is conceptualised in the *Framework for Strengthening Citizen-Government Partnerships for Monitoring Frontline Service Delivery*, approved by Cabinet in 2013. The programme aims to support government to strengthen the involvement of citizens in monitoring service delivery. It currently has three focus areas: (i) policy interventions to support take-up of citizen-based monitoring

(ii) a pilot/prototyping process to develop a citizen-based monitoring method for frontline service delivery and (iii) a knowledge sharing focus that aims to provide platforms and opportunities for government and civil society.

The pilot is in its second phase and will conclude in September 2015. The pilot is currently being implemented in partnership with key government departments - South African Police Services (SAPS), Department of Health (DOH), Department of Social Development (DSD) and the South African Social Security Agency (SASSA) - in nine sites across the country. The pilot aims to evolve and test a method for using citizen feedback to drive service delivery improvements and is an important focus for the evaluation. It is intended to expand to other sites and sectors over the course of the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTSF) period. The evaluation will assess the pilot, as well as DPME's approach to strengthening citizen-based monitoring, to inform a five-year strategy for DPME's citizen-based monitoring programme.

Importance of the evaluation

The suitability of DPME's approach, and whether and how this should be taken to scale, needs to be assessed through a formative evaluation.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

To assess DPME's citizen-based monitoring pilot/programme and to determine if and how to scale-up.

### **Key questions**

1. What has been achieved through the DPME-led citizen-based monitoring pilot and policy process?
2. What was implemented in the pilot?
3. Is there sufficient evidence to motivate for scaling up a citizen-based monitoring programme/system, based on the pilot model?
4. How should citizen-based monitoring be taken to scale in South Africa, and what role should DPME and others play?

### **Principle Audience**

DPME, Offices of the Premier, DoH, SAPS, DSD, South African Social Security Agency (SASSA), Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA), Cabinet and Civil Society Organisations.

**Type of Evaluation:** Diagnostic and implementation evaluation

### **Management strategy**

The evaluation results will be used to make decisions on the way forward for frontline citizen-based monitoring, following the pilot phase.

**Cost estimate:** The evaluation is estimated to cost R1 million, which will be covered by DPME, through DFID grant funding.

**Timing and duration:** The evaluation will take 6 months, starting by March 2015 and completed by September 2015.

## 5.9 Impact evaluation: Improving Early Grade Reading

**Implementing Department:** Department of Basic Education

### **Background to the evaluation**

Although the DBE and Provincial Education Departments are implementing various strategies to support early grade reading, there is little or no sense of what is working and why. Moreover, there are competing models of support in the system. For example, the teacher union and PED collaboration initiative appears to favour the traditional model of teacher training workshops, the Western Cape LITNUM strategy has run in-service training courses (one focusing on teaching reading) through the Cape Teaching Institute, while Gauteng has provided additional graded readers and clearly scripted lesson plans and employs specialist reading coaches who visit teachers on monthly basis to observe lessons and offer assistance. It is important that a national reading strategy be based on scientific evidence regarding what most improves the acquisition of reading.

### **Importance of the evaluation**

The acquisition of reading is foundational to all subsequent learning; yet the majority of South African children are being left behind in this regard; The PIRLS study of 2006 showed that a striking 80% of South African children were not yet reading with comprehension after five years of schooling. The problem is particularly severe amongst poor children. Consequently, massive inequalities in educational achievement are established early in primary school and there is no evidence of these inequalities being reduced in later years. Therefore, early interventions, such as improving the acquisition of reading amongst poor children, can be expected to have larger effects than interventions later in the school programme,

The DBE are conducting an impact evaluation of interventions aimed at improving early grade learning in South Africa. Three alternative strategies to improve early grade reading will be evaluated: (i) a teacher training course focused specifically on teaching reading, accompanied by lesson plans and graded readers; (ii) an ongoing support programme to teachers consisting of reading coaches, lesson plans and graded readers; (iii) and a package designed to improve parent involvement in – and monitoring of – learning to read. The cost-effectiveness of these three programmes will be evaluated relative to each other and relative to a control group of schools using a rigorous impact evaluation design.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of the programme is to identify the most cost-effective interventions that improve early-grade reading proficiency, which can be implemented at a larger scale by government, if proved successful.

**Key questions to be addressed**

The key evaluation questions are the following:

1. Did Intervention one (once-off training) lead to improved reading proficiency?
2. Did Intervention two (reading coaches) lead to improved reading proficiency?
3. Did Intervention three (parental involvement) lead to improved reading proficiency?
4. Did the impact on reading proficiency differ between the three Intervention arms?
5. Which intervention was most cost-effective?

Beyond the question of reading proficiency, DBE also want to understand the mechanisms through which the programme worked. The evaluation will therefore collect measures of teacher and parent practice, effort, knowledge, beliefs and attitudes that may have changed due to the interventions. The evaluation will also collect data on basic school, teacher and parent characteristics to test if the size of the impact differs between types schools (e.g. school principal's instructional leadership), types of teachers (e.g. level of pedagogical training), or types of parents (e.g. education background).

**Principal audience:** DBE, DPME, NW PED, Research institutions (locally and internationally)

**Type of evaluation:** Impact evaluation

**Management strategy**

The Principal investigator for the project is Dr Stephen Taylor (Office of the DG, DBE). A steering committee made up of DBE, and representatives from the donors, will oversee both the implementation and evaluation sides of the project.

**Cost estimate**

The project has two main components: 1) The implementation of interventions and 2) The evaluation of intervention impact. The evaluation side of the project is funded by 3ie and will cost US\$ 522 366. The implementation side of the project is estimated to cost R12.3 million over the two years, and is jointly funded by ZENEX Foundation, Anglo American, UNICEF, the North West Provincial Department of Education, and DPME (who will contribute R300 000 per year).

**Timing and duration**

The project will start at the beginning of the 2015 academic year (January) and continue for two years until end of 2016.

## 5.10 Implementation Evaluation of the 2010 Broad-Based Socio-Economic Charter (Mining Charter)

**Implementing Department:** Department of Mineral Resources

### Background to the evaluation

The state is the custodian of South Africa's mineral resources. The Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, (MPRDA) Act No. 28, 2002 amended by Act No 49, 2008 is the law that regulates aspects relating to mineral resource development. Mineral regulation and promotion are conducted primarily from the national office located in Pretoria and the respective regional offices of the Department of Mineral Resources (DMR). Other pieces of legislation, e.g. the Precious metals Act and the Diamond Act regulate the mining products rather than mining per se. The 2010 Broad-Based Socio-Economic Charter (Mining Charter) has been developed with the primary purpose of redressing the historic inequalities and promoting equitable access to South Africa's mineral resources to all South Africans. The Mining Charter has been developed to be utilised by all industry mining stakeholders with the following elements being assessed by the regulator:

1. **Ownership:** It is a requisite instrument to effect meaningful integration of Historically Disadvantaged South Africans (HDSA) into the mainstream of the economy.
2. **Procurement and Enterprise Development:** It is attributable to economic transformation and growth to create opportunities for BEE entities participation in the mainstream economy.
3. **Beneficiation:** This intervention is premised on the comparative advantage based on the country's endowment to meaningfully contribute towards accelerated economic growth.
4. **Employment Equity:** Mining companies need to create and to effect a demographically representative workforce in the mining sector.
5. **Human Resources Development:** To recognise the sustainable growth and development in the workplace through skills development programmes.
6. **Mine Community Development:** This element obliges the mining companies to aggressively implement and support community development programmes.
7. **Housing and Living Conditions:** The industry must ensure improved and sustainable living conditions for the mine workers in the South African mining sector.
8. **Sustainable Development and Growth of the Mining Industry:** It is geared towards maximizing the development and economic benefits of mining, while improving the environmental and social sustainability of the mining sector.

### Importance of the evaluation

The 2010 Broad-Based Socio-Economic Charter (Mining Charter) has been developed with the primary purpose of promoting unbiased access to South Africa's mineral assets to all South Africans and to increase opportunities for Historically Disadvantaged South Africans (HDSAs). The Mining Charter score card assesses eight seven critical areas to determine the domestic mining industry's contribution towards the realisation of the Mining Charter's objectives.



The findings of the evaluation will guide policy decisions around implementation of the Mining Charter. Amongst others, the intervention is linked to the following government priority outcomes and sub-outcomes:

- **Outcome 4:** Decent employment through inclusive economic growth , especially sub-outcome 8, namely Economic opportunities for historically excluded and vulnerable groups are expanded and the numbers of sustainable small businesses and cooperatives are improved markedly
- **Outcome 8:** Sustainable human settlements and improved quality of household life, especially Sub-Outcome 01: Adequate housing and improved quality living environments
- **Outcome 9:** Responsive, accountable, effective and efficient developmental local government system especially Sub-Outcome 04: Promotion of social and economic development

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess how well the Mining Charter is being implemented and how to strengthen it to the ensure realisation of the objectives of the Charter.

### **Key questions to be addressed: Implementation evaluation questions**

- 4.1 Does the theory of change appear to be working?
- 4.2 How well is the mining Charter being implemented?
- 4.3 To what extent does the Mining Charter reach its appropriate target population?
- 4.4 What are the operational constraints of implementing the Mining Charter and how can they be addressed?
- 4.5 How well are the different elements of the Charter internalised and incorporated into existing organizational systems?
- 4.6 How do the service users experience the programme?

### **Outcomes/ Impact questions**

- 4.7 What beneficial impacts (intended and unintended) are being seen through the implementation of the Mining Charter?
- 4.8 Is it likely that the intended outcomes of the Charter will be achieved?

### **Principal audience**

Mining Industry stakeholders including Organised Labour, Organised Business, Government and communities in proximity to the mining operations and in labour sending areas

### **Type of evaluation**

Implementation and partly Impact Evaluation

**Management strategy**

The evaluation is a partnership between the Department of Mineral Resources (DMR) and the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME)

**Cost estimate**

The evaluation will cost approximately R2 500,000, R2 million from DMR and R500 000 from DPME.

**Time and duration**

The evaluation is expected to start in March 2015 and should be completed in March 2016.

**5.11 Implementation evaluation of the Service Delivery Improvement Planning system**

**Implementing Department:** Department of Public Service and Administration

**Background to the evaluation**

Service delivery Improvement Plans seek to provide a strategic focus on improving specific services supported by an appropriate allocation of human and financial resources, strengthened systems and processes whilst leveraging on technology to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of quality services. Despite the measures put in place to support implementation, compliance (especially among national departments), the credibility and the quality of the SDIPs remain a major challenge.

The DPSA continues to coordinate, support, monitor and report on the compliance and quality of the SDIPs of national and provincial departments across the public service in line with the MPSA SDIP directive of 30 October 2008. The 2008 Directive directs national and provincial departments to submit SDIPs by 31/03/ of every 3 years and the annual reporting is to be aligned with the MTEF to ensure resource allocations, efficiency and effectiveness towards enhanced productivity. It further requires the SDIPs to be signed off by the Head of Department (HOD) and Executing Authority (EA) and the submission should be in a prescribed standardised SDIP format with a clear indication of how the plan shall be cascaded to service points. The supporting mechanisms and focus has been towards making an improvement on the lives of South Africans by:

- Improving and sustaining compliance of SDIP submissions to ensure continuous improvement in the quality, implementation and monitoring thereof;
- Assessing and provide feedback on the quality of submitted SDIPs by national and provincial departments;
- Strengthening the engagements, discussions, and phasing in of improvement tools to sustain compliance, quality thereof and implementation of SDIPs;
- Exploring possible applicable institutional arrangements to strengthen coordination, facilitation, monitoring and reporting on

implementation and ultimately the impact of SDIPs in changing the lives of citizens through the quality of services provided.

### Importance of the evaluation

The significance of the SDIP evaluation will assist with the validation in response to the following key implementation challenges:

- **The slow rate of SDIP submission:** The inability of departments to submit the SDIPs cycle in line with the MPSA 2008 Directive and the FOSAD target of 100%. The SDIP submissions in the 2012/15 cycle are 68% submitted in year 1, 85% in year 2 and currently 87% in year 3. This slow rate of submission compromises the quality of implementation, monitoring and reporting.
- **The quality of the submitted SDIPs:** Quality of the submissions remains a challenge; 29% of the submitted SDIPs failed to utilise the prescribed template; only 18% are average whilst 43% are of poor quality SDIPs.
- **Implementation and monitoring** thereof by management: Implementation remains poor with most SDIPs not been monitored by senior managers. Mostly, managers are not part of the SDIPs development process and the involvement of cross-cutting teams across departments which compromise buy-in, transparency, etc.
- **Submission of progress reports:** Submission of progress annual reports against the SDIPs remains very poor across the cycles for both national and provincial departments, e.g. only 4 (2.7%) departments submitted during 2009/12 and 4 (2.6%) for the current 2012/15 cycle.
- **Impact of the SDIPs** to service delivery improvement: Impact not yet realized nor evaluated due to the maturity level of the programme. Support and focus is still mainly around submission quality, implementation and reporting.

### Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the implementation of the SDIP over the 2012-2015 cycle. The evaluation will assess the main SDIP outcomes (results) and make recommendations for programme improvements to improve its effectiveness. The study will inform the future of the SDIP.

### Key evaluation questions

1. To what extent is the current design of the SDIP valid, appropriate and coherent?
2. What are the main achievements and results of the SDIP to date?
3. To what extent has meaningful support been rendered to national and provincial departments through the SDIP cycle? (preparation, implementation, monitoring, and feedback and reporting.)
4. To what extent is the SDIP institutionalised and sustainable in departments in the long term?
5. What is the current sense of emerging impact of the SDIP?
6. What are the main lessons to date, and what recommendations are offered for the improvement of the SDIP?

**Principal audience:** DPSA, DPME, National Treasury, Offices of the Premiers, FOSAD, COHOD and Cabinet.

**Type of evaluation:** Implementation Evaluation (with diagnostic component)

**Management strategy**

The evaluation will be critical during the 2012/15 SDIP cycle review and the preparations for the 2015/18 cycle.

**Cost estimate**

The estimated cost is R1.5 million to be cost-shared between the DPME and DPSA.

**Time & duration**

The evaluation will be undertaken during the 2015/16 financial year, and will be executed over a 6-month period.

## 6 Outline of evaluations proposed for 2016/17

The evaluations proposed for 2015/16 are shown in table 4. These are not definite, as they will be reviewed when the Plan is rolled in mid 2014.

**Table 4: Summary of proposed evaluations for 2016/17**

Name of Department	Name of intervention	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
National Treasury	Government Supply Chain Management System	Government's supply chain processes have been problematic, with regulations from National Treasury but these often not being adhered too, hence the poor audit results at all levels of government, and significant incidences of corruption in supply chain processes. In addition the delay in making payments causes major problems for business, whose cash flow is adversely affected by late payments.
Social Development	National Social Crime Prevention Strategy	There are a number of social determinants that promote the likelihood of crime. This implies that the causes of crime is not just a security issue but it cuts across the work of a number of departments and sectors. To respond to this a National Social Crime Prevention Strategy has been approved by Cabinet which is driven by DSD. This evaluation will assess how it is being implemented, whether it is meeting the targets that were set, and how to strengthen its implementation.
Correctional Services	Rehabilitation Programmes for Offenders	When offenders enter correctional services, they are exposed to a number of rehabilitation programmes, whose purpose is to rehabilitate offenders and ensure that the chances of repeat offending are reduced. A key element are skills development programmes where offenders are taught skills that they can use to generate a livelihood when they go back into society. Some offenders are involved in recreational activities such as music, sports or religious affiliation. An evaluation is needed to determine the effectiveness of these programmes and how to strengthen them.
Health	Reducing Maternal and Child Mortality using Campaign for Accelerated Reduction of Maternal Mortality	<p>Pregnant women are at high risk of complications of pregnancy (of the order of one in five) and it is difficult to predict which women will develop a complication. Having modern medical care close at hand is one of the ways of dealing with these complications. A few interventions have been introduced and scaled up to assist with having pregnant women get the care that they need to deal with their complications more swiftly. This evaluation will see how effective these are and how they can be strengthened and scaled-up.</p> <p>The first of these interventions is maternity waiting homes. This caters for women, especially in rural areas, who may have difficulty in getting to the hospital for their delivery. Maternity waiting homes allow pregnant women approaching their delivery date to lodge in premises close to the hospital allowing them quick and easy access to sophisticated medical care if necessary. The second intervention is the provision of dedicated obstetric ambulances. These ambulances are designed to get pregnant women to the appropriate</p>

Name of Department	Name of intervention	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
		<p>level of care as soon as possible. They aim to get women already in the formal health system who develop pregnancy related problems to a higher level of care (eg a mother who is at a facility busy delivering but who needs a Caesarian section to get to a hospital that has resources to perform this operation). They also aim to get women who are going into labour outside of the formal health system to a facility where she can deliver.</p> <p>A third intervention addresses one of the most important causes of neonatal mortality, prematurity, with associated problems related to inadequate thermo-regulation by the under-developed baby. A simple and low cost intervention is commonly known as Kangaroo Mother Care (KMC), where the baby is kept warm by placing the baby on the mother's chest. This has shown to be cost-effective in a number of settings around the world (both developing and developed countries).</p>
Department of Environmental Affairs	Environmental Impact Assessment	<p>The objective of the EIA process is to ensure that the impacts of all significant new developments and activities that may potentially undermine everyone's right to an environment that is not harmful to health and well-being are effectively mitigated or managed to a level that is acceptable to South African Society as a whole. The total budget and the total budget for this work carried out by provincial departments is just under R300 million. Although the environmental impact management system is under continuous review and improvement, the rollout of the Strategic Integrated Projects (SIPs) and efforts to streamline the development authorisation process in this regard could be regarded as a critical stage in the evolution of the environmental impact management system in general and the EIA process in particular. The evaluation will assess whether NEMA's environmental impact management regime, especially the regulatory tool known as the EIA process, had a beneficial impact on the realisation of the people's right to an environment that is not harmful to health and well-being in particular, or sustainable development in general. The EIA intervention is linked to Outcome 10: Protected and Environmental Assets and Natural Resources</p>

## **7 Key implementation issues**

### **7.1 Emerging implementation issues**

The interest in evaluation is widening, with Gauteng and Western Cape having provincial evaluation plans which have been updated at least once. DPME is currently working with 3 provinces on provincial evaluation plans, and 5 departments already have departmental evaluation plans. The MPAT results for 2012/13 showed an increase in departments using or planning evaluations from 13% to 19%, rising to 23% in 2013/14. This is likely to rise over the next years. Evaluations are also showing up significant improvements that can be made the operation of programmes. This provides an opportunity to improve the value for money and impact that government is having.

The first Annual Report on the National Evaluation System was approved by Cabinet on 22 October 2014, and this outlines some of the emerging findings from evaluations, as well as some of the emerging challenges. Some of the issues emerging from implementation include:

- DPME procurement is much faster (6-8 weeks) than procurement by other departments. DPME will now do the procurement for the evaluations under the National Evaluation Plan, but all decisions around the evaluations would still be made by steering committees, which custodian departments chair so that they still have a strong role in all evaluations;
- The Capacity amongst service providers is varied and even the DPME panel of 42 service providers is insufficient. A new call has been made for extending the evaluation panel and this will be finalised in November 2014;
- When results are challenging, some departments are delaying the process of management response and improvement plans. This is delaying reports getting to clusters and Cabinet, and thence to portfolio committees. Once the report is approved this process must move ahead, and ideally departments will see the importance of moving quickly on improvement plans so they show they are responding to the findings. DPME is now seeking to speed up the process and will in some cases take the evaluations directly to clusters and Cabinet;
- Many departments are not submitting their evaluations to DPME to include in the Evaluation Repository, probably because of fears of these being made public. This reduces accountability as well as the knowledge base available to the public service and wider public, eg for planning future work. Follow-ups are needed on this;
- Improvement Plans are being developed and appear to serve as useful mechanisms for ensuring that the findings from evaluations are addressed. However departments are delaying on submitting progress reports on implementation of the improvement plans, correctly feeling that it is their responsibility to implement the improvement plans. However it is important that they are accountable for implementing the Plan, since they are using public funds. DPME will reinforce the need to report on progress.

### **7.2 Funding of the evaluations in the Plan**

This Plan has been developed to link with the budget process for 2015/16 to 2017/18. Some departments have resources available to fund the evaluations in their entirety, whereas in others the funding comes from DPME or donors. Indicative budgets are indicated in section 6. This may vary,

as the methodology for the evaluations has not yet been defined.

### **7.3 Next steps**

Preparation for the 2015/16 evaluations started in September 2014 so that the initial phases of getting the relevant stakeholders together, developing terms of reference can be completed by the time the Plan is approved, and the procurement process can be completed prior to 31 March 2015. This means the evaluations will be in full flow by the time the financial year begins and the substantive work can be completed by the December 2014 break, with work on improvement plans substantially completed by 15 March 2014. This means that the evaluations should in most cases be completed within the 2015/16 financial year.



## Annex 1: Evaluations in the Repository

Those which did not reach the quality threshold of 3 are at the end highlighted in grey

Evaluation Name	Department	Organisation Undertaking	Year	NEP	Score
Evaluation of the Monyetla Work Readiness Programme	Business Trust	BPO&O, Business Trust	2011		3.7
Rea Vaya Economic Evaluation	City of Johannesburg & UNDP Global Environmental Facility	Strategic Economic Solutions ITS Engineers	2012		3.3
Economic Assessment of Poverty Nodes and Nodal Economic Profiles	COGTA	Monitor Company	2007		3.7
State of Local Government in South Africa	COGTA	COGTA	2009		2.5
Impact of state of rivers reporting on people's attitude towards river conservation	CSIR	CSIR	2008		3.8
Formative Evaluation of Textbooks and Workbooks	DBE	ACER	2013		3.5
The Impact of the Introduction of Grade R on Learning Outcomes	Department of Basic Education	Stellenbosch University	2012	Y	4.4
State of Literacy Teaching and Learning in the Foundation Phase National Report 2012	Department of Basic Education	National Evaluation and Development Unit	2013		3.8
The State of Literacy Teaching and Learning in the Foundation Phase National Report 2012	Department of Basic Education	National Evaluation and Development Unit	2012		3.8
The status of the Language of Learning and Teaching (LoLT) in South African Public Schools: a quantitative review	Department of Basic Education	Department of Basic Education	2010		3.7
Basic Education Macro Indicator Report	Department of Basic Education	DBE	2013		3.5
Report on the Annual National Assessments of 2011	Department of Basic Education	DBE	2011		3.5
Developing and Evaluation the First Phase of the Grade 12 Mind the Gap Study Guide Series	Department of Basic Education	Dr S Taylor	2013		3.3
Expanding Opportunities for South African Youth through Maths and Science Impact of the Dinaledi Program	Department of Basic Education	World Bank	2010		4

<b>Evaluation Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Organisation Undertaking</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>NEP</b>	<b>Score</b>
Schools that work, ministerial committee report	Department of Basic Education	Pam Christie, Dawn Butter, Mark Potterton	2010		4.2
State of the Environment Report	Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism	Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism	2007		3.7
State of the Air Report	Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism	Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism	2005		3.6
An overview of Health and Health care in South Africa 1994-2010 Priorities, Progress and Prospects for new Gains	Department of Health	David Harrison	2010		4.4
Progress report on implementation of Comprehensive HIV and AIDS care management and treatment programme	Department of Health	Monitoring and Evaluation Unit	2004		2.8
Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the Impact and Outcomes of the Education System on South Africa's Population: Evidence from Household Surveys	Department of Higher Education and Training	Department of Higher Education and Training	2006		3.6
Report of the Ministerial Committee on the Review of the Nationals Student Financial Aid Scheme	Department of Higher Education and Training	Department of Higher Education and Training	2008		3.4
Rural Housing Programme	Department of Human Settlements	Department of Human Settlement	2009		3.8
Evaluating the performance of social and rental Housing Programme	Department of Human Settlements	Department of Human Settlement	2010		3.4
Mining Charter Impact Assessment Report	Department of Mineral Resources	Department of Mineral Resources	2009		2.6
Diagnostic Evaluation of Early Childhood Development	Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	HSRC	2011	Y	4.1
The State of South Africa's Economic Infrastructure Opportunities and Challenges 2012	Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	DPME	2010		3.4
Synthesis report of evaluations of selected EPWP projects	Department of Public Works	Department of Public Works	2006		2.9
Implementation Evaluation of the Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme (RECAP)	Department of Rural Development and Land	University of Pretoria	2012	Y	4.1

Evaluation Name	Department	Organisation Undertaking	Year	NEP	Score
	Reform				
Implementation Evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)	Department of Rural Development and Land Reforms	Impact Economix	2012	Y	3.7
Review of the First Ten years of the National Science Week Programme of the DST	Department of Science & Technology	Department of Science & Technology	2011		3.8
Independent Design Assessment of the Energy Research Development and Innovation Strategy	Department of Science and Technology	The Green House and DNA Economics	2012		3.6
A profile of social security beneficiaries in South Africa	Department of Social Development	Department of Social Development	2006		3.7
Implementation evaluation of the Ke Moja, I'm fine without drugs Programme	Department of Social Development (Western Cape)	Department of Social Development (Western Cape)	2009		3.7
Impact Assessment of the Department of Social Development of Home for the Aged	Department of Social Development (Western Cape)	F.E.M Research Consultants	2010		2.9
FIFA World Cup Legacy Audit	Department of Sports and Recreation	HSRC	2011		3.6
Evaluating the decline in THRIP applications between 2006 and 2007 and 2008 and 2009 and scenarios of possible intervention	Department of Trade & Industry	Department of Trade and Industry	2010		4.4
Implementation Evaluation of the Export Marketing and Industrial Assistance (EMIA) Incentive Programme	Department of Trade and Industry	DNA Economics	2013	Y	3.5
Impact Evaluation of Support Programme for Industry Innovation (SPII)	Department of Trade and Industry	Genesis Analysis	2013	Y	3.4
Summative evaluation of the DEA Social Responsibility Programme (SRP)	Department of Water Affairs	Department of Water Affairs	2012		4.1
Labour Reform in South Africa; Measuring Regulation and a synthesis of policy suggestion	Development Policy Research Unit	Development Policy Research Unit	2007		4.1
Minimum Wages, Employment and Household Poverty Investigating the Impact of Sectoral Determinations	DPRU	DPRU	2008		4.8
Analysing Wage Formation in the South African Labour Market The Role of Bargaining Councils	DPRU	DPRU	2007		3.7

<b>Evaluation Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Organisation Undertaking</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>NEP</b>	<b>Score</b>
Evaluation of Budget Support in South Africa	European Commission	EC	2013		4
A Gendered Review of South Africa's Implementation of the Millenium Development Goals	Gender Commission	Gender Commission	2010		3.5
The Impact of HIV/AIDS on the Labour Market	HSRC	HSRC	2005		4.4
Mid-Term Review of the Expanded Public Works Programme SYNTHESIS REPORT	HSRC	HSRC	2007		4.3
Evaluation of the Learnership Academy Model	HSRC	HSRC	2006		4.1
The Impact of Exchange Rate Movements on Employment	HSRC	HSRC	2006		4.1
Summative Evaluation of the West Coast FET College	HSRC	Education	2009		3.9
The Economy-wide Effects of Price Reducing Reforms in Infrastructure Services in South Africa	HSRC	HSRC	2006		3.7
Tracking Progress on the Implementation and Impact of the Employment Equity Act	HSRC	HSRC,DPRU; SWOP	2008		3.7
ASGISA and Economic Growth Implications for Skills Development	HSRC	DPRU; SWOP	2008		3.5
An Analysis of the Macroeconomic and Sectoral Impact of the Capital Expenditure Programmes of Transnet and Eskom	Industrial Development Corporation	Industrial Development Corporation	2010		3.8
Evaluation of the Business Enablement Fund	KZN Department of Economic Development	KZN Department of Economic Development	2011		4
Monitoring and Evaluation Status Quo and Recommendations	KZN Department of Economic Development	KZN Department of Economic Development	2007		3.6
Composite Report on Project Evaluations	KZN Department of Economic Development	Sihle Mkhize, Bheki Nowele, Tim Hadingham	2008		3
Ingwe Rail Project Impact Assessment Report	KZN Department of Economic Development	M&E unit of KZN Department of Economic Development	2007		3
Umdoni LED Strategy Impact Assessment Report	KZN Department of Economic Development	KZN Department of Economic Development M&E unit	2007		2.9
Zululand LED Strategy Support Impact Assessment Report	KZN Department of Economic Development	KZN Department of Economic Development M&E unit	2007		2.8

<b>Evaluation Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Organisation Undertaking</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>NEP</b>	<b>Score</b>
Project Output Monitoring Composite Report	KZN Department of Economic Development	KZN Department of Economic Development M&E unit	2007		2.7
Big Five False Bay LED Strategy Project Evaluation	KZN Department of Economic Development	KZN Department of Economic Development	2008		2.6
Ezimbuzinin Economic Development Node Phase 1 Project Evaluation	KZN Department of Economic Development	KZN Department of Economic Development	2006		2.6
Inqolobane Development Foundation Impact Assessment Report	KZN Department of Economic Development	M&E unit of KZN Department of Economic Development	2007		2.6
LED Impact Assessment Composite Report	KZN Department of Economic Development	M&E unit of KZN Department of Economic Development	2007		2.4
Impact Assessment of Learner ship and Apprenticeships	MERSETA	MERSETA	2008		3.7
Information Sharing and SMME Financing in South Africa	National Credit Regulator	National Credit Regulator	2008		4.8
National Credit Regulator Impact Assessment report	National Credit Regulator	National Credit Regulator	2010		3.9
Pricing and Access to Consumer Credit: A Review of the Impact of the National Credit Act one year after its Implementation	National Credit Regulator	National Credit Regulator	2009		3.9
The Cost of Credit, Access to Credit and Associated Market Prices	National Credit Regulator	The Cost of Credit, Access to Credit and Associated Market Prices	2011		3.8
Housing Subsidy Scheme Impact Evaluation	National Department of Housing	Nokusa Consulting	2005		2.1
Understanding the cause of defaults in the social housing sector	National Housing Finance Corporation	NHFC	2004		3.7
Mutual Evaluation Report - Anti-Money Laundering and Combatting the Financing of Terrorism	National Treasury	National Treasury	2009		4.1
The VAT Treatment of Merit Goods and Services	National Treasury	National Treasury	2005		3.9
Fiscal incident of social spending in south Africa	National Treasury	National Treasury	2009		3.4

Evaluation Name	Department	Organisation Undertaking	Year	NEP	Score
The Burgundy Cheese Project	None	Maria van Jaarsveld	2007		2.8
Making the Most of Climate Change Finance in Africa: Synthesis Report from Sic Country Studies	OECD	Multiple Agulhas Applied Knowledge (UK) researchers,	2011		3.2
Climate Change Financing and Aid Effectiveness: South African Country Analysis	OECD	Multiple Agulhas Applied Knowledge (UK) researchers,	2011		2.8
An Evaluation of Integration and Coordination in the Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme	PSC	PSC	2010		3.9
Evaluation of Employee Assistance Programmes in the Public Service	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2006		4
Evaluation of the Consistency of Sanctions Imposed for Misconduct in the Public Service	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2009		3.9
Report on the Evaluation of the Training Needs of Senior Managers in the Public Sector January 2008	Public Service Commission	Price Waterhouse Coopers (PwC)	2008		3.7
Evaluation of the Impact of the Policy and Procedure on Incapacity Leave and Ill-Health Retirement (PILIR) on Sick Leave Tr	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2010		3.6
Report on the Evaluation of Government's Poverty Reduction Programme	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2007		3.6
Report on the Evaluation of Service Delivery at the Department of Home Affairs Visa Applications and Port Control	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2008		3.6
Report on the Evaluation of the Batho Pele Principle of Value for Money in the Public Service	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2007		3.6
Report on the Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme	Public Service Commission	Qondisa Consulting together with the Public Service Commission	2008		3.4
Report on the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Batho Pele Principle of Information	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2009		3.3
The Evaluation of the Implementation of the Batho Pele Principle of Courtesy	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2009		3.3
An Evaluation of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support	Public Service	Public Service	2011		3.2

<b>Evaluation Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Organisation Undertaking</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>NEP</b>	<b>Score</b>
Programme (CASP)	Commission	Commission			
Evaluation of Performance and Compliance with the Batho Pele Principle of Access (2006)	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2006		3.2
Report on the Evaluation of Performance and Compliance with the Batho Pele Principle of Redress	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2006		3.1
Report on the Evaluation of the Implementation of the Batho Pele Principle of Consultation	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2007		3.1
Report on the assessment of effectiveness of Thusong Service Centres in Integrated Service Delivery	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2010		2.9
Seventh Consolidated Public Service Monitoring and Evaluation Report	Public Service Commission	Public Service Commission	2011		2.9
Evaluation of the Community Development Worker Programme	SAMDI	HSRC	2005		3.5
Review of the child support grant	SASSA	SASSA	2008		4
Cost-benefit Analysis of RDP versus Social Rental Housing	Social Housing Foundation	Rhizome Management Services	2009		3.8
The Socio-Economic Impact of Legalised Gambling in South Africa	South African Gambling Board	Bureau for Market Research UNISA	2009		3.9
The Impact of Crime on Small Businesses in South Africa	The Presidency	The Presidency	2008		3.6
Impact Assessment and Programme Evaluation of the Business Consultancy Services Voucher Programme	Umsobomvu Youth Fund	ECI Africa Consulting	2007		4
The South African Child Support Grant Impact Assessment Evidence from a survey of children, adolescents and their household	UNICEF South Africa	UNICEF South Africa	2012		4
Evaluation of the Impact of Agricultural Learnership in the Western Cape	Western Cape Department of Agriculture	Western Cape Department of Agriculture	2014		3.3
Evaluation of Clubs within the Club Development Programme	Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport	Sakaza Communication	2012		3.2
Work and Skills for 100 000 Programme Evaluation	Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport	Devnomics	2011		2.6

<b>Evaluation Name</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Organisation Undertaking</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>NEP</b>	<b>Score</b>
Evaluation of the Effective and Efficiency of the Western Cape Archives and Records Service Publicity and Marketing	Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport	Sakaza Communications (Pty) Ltd	2012		2.5
Red Door Impact Study Phase 2	Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism	HSRC	2008		3.6
Status Quo of Waste Management in the Consumer Formulated Chemical Sector of the Western Cape	Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning,	Process Optimisation and Resource Management (PORM)	2007		3.5
Cape Gateway Evaluation	Western Cape Provincial Government	Alan Levin, Pam sykes	2005		3.3
Harnessing Emotional Connections to Improve Financial Decisions Evaluating the Impact of Financial Education in Mainstream	World Bank	World Bank	2013		3.8