



planning, monitoring  
& evaluation

Department:  
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

# National Evaluation Plan 2018-19 to 2020-21

1 November 2017

Contact: Dr Ian Goldman, DPME

Tel: +27 12 312 0155

Email: [evaluations@dpme.gov.za](mailto:evaluations@dpme.gov.za)

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

## Foreword

The national evaluation system has taken root in government, with a total of 59 evaluations completed or are underway covering R143 billion; with evidence from completed evaluations being fed into Cabinet. Most of the earlier evaluations have resulted in significant changes to the programmes or policies evaluated, indicating the commitment of departments to use the findings for learning. The system is now spread widely across government with 8 provincial plans, over 100 provincial evaluations, and 67 departments with departmental evaluation plans and over 500 evaluations in departmental evaluation plans. An evaluation of the entire system is currently underway to take stock of progress and see how to strengthen the system and its impact.

This is the seventh National Evaluation Plan (NEP), with 8 new evaluations proposed for 2018/19. Two of the evaluations assess the implementation of DPME programmes, the Socio-economic Impact Assessment System (for policy development) and Operation Phakisa (an integrated approach to designing and monitoring large scale government programmes). We do this with the aim of improving how government works in light of tightening fiscal conditions. Correspondingly, a synthesis evaluation will examine the Lessons from Implementation across existing national and provincial evaluations; whilst a second synthesis evaluation will shed light on the relationship between government and the NPO sector in delivering services to citizens. Evaluations on corporate governance in SOEs and the 2010 Mining Charter will help us improve performance in these two key economic sectors. The EPWP Environment & Culture sector evaluation will add to an existing set of evaluations looking into the successes and challenges of public employment programmes. Lastly, an evaluation of Specialised Commercial crimes interventions in South Africa will focus on how the investigation and prosecution system currently operates and how it can be strengthened. These evaluations are touching on important areas of the economy and people's lives.

DPME continues to foster strong international links with peer countries in Benin, Colombia, Mexico and Uganda. The Twende Mbele African M&E Programme is underway with our partners Uganda and Benin, the CLEAR Initiative and the African Development Bank, and new additions Kenya, Ghana and Niger. We will use these projects to share experiences across Africa on using M&E and other evidence to improve policy-making and implementation, and develop and implement M&E systems collaboratively. We are committed to learning about our own experience, documenting, reflecting, and sharing this experience.

Many thanks to the partners we have been working with over the last year, including the many national and provincial departments undertaking evaluations, SAMEA, the Graduate School of Policy and Practice at UCT the UK's Department for International Development, the International Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR), and the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie).

Minister: J T Radebe  
Minister of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation



## Contents

<b>Glossary</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 The Framework	9
1.2 Purpose of the National Evaluation Plan (NEP)	9
1.3 Criteria and process used for selection	9
1.4 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system	10
<b>2 Progress with evaluations</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1 Progress with implementation of evaluations to date	11
2.2 Status of improvement plans	15
<b>3 Summary of approved evaluations for 2018/19</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4 Concepts for evaluations for 2018/19</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1 Implementation Evaluation of Specialised Commercial Crime interventions in South Africa with specific focus on Investigation and Prosecution Systems	22
4.2 Implementation Evaluation of the EPWP Environment and Culture Sector	24
4.3 Implementation/Impact Evaluation of the 2010 Broad-based Socio-economic Empowerment Charter (Mining Charter)	26
4.4 Synthesis Evaluation of NPO/Government Partnerships	27
4.5 Synthesis evaluation of government programmes implementation lessons	29
4.6 Evaluation of Corporate Governance in South African State-Owned Enterprises	31
4.6 Implementation Evaluation of the Socio-economic Impact Assessment System (SEIAS)	34
4.8 Implementation Evaluation of the Operation Phakisa Model	35
<b>5 Way forward</b>	<b>38</b>

## Glossary

3ie	International Initiative for Impact Evaluation
AFU	Asset Forfeiture Unit
AMTS	Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (of DST)
APP	Annual performance plan
AVAWC	Audit for Violence Against Women and Children
CAPS	Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement
CASP	Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme
CBM	Citizen Based Monitoring
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
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
CSP	City Support Programme
CWP	Community Works Programme
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
DBE	Department of Basic Education
DCOG	Department of Co-operative Governance
DDG	Deputy-Director General
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 Settlements
DMV	Department of Military Veterans
DOT	Department of Transport
DPME	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

---

DTPS	Department of Telecommunications and Postal Services
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	Expanded Public Works Programme
EPWP E&C	Expanded Public Works Programme Environmental and Culture Sector
EPWP SS	Expanded Public Works Programme Social Sector
ERP	Extension Recovery Plan
ERU	Evaluation and Research Unit, DPME
EQTA	Education and Training Quality Assurance Bodies
FBOs	Faith Based Organisations
FLBP	Funza Lushaka Bursary Programme
HEI	Higher Education Institution
IKSP	Indigenous Knowledge Systems Policy
IMC	Inter-ministerial committee
IRDP	Integrated Residential Development Programme
JCPS	Justice, Crime Prevention and Security
MAFISA	Micro Agricultural Financial Institutions of South Africa
MPAT	Management Performance Assessment Tool
MTSF	Medium-Term Strategic Framework
NDMP	National Drug Master Plan
NDP	National Development Plan
NEP	National Evaluation Plan
NEPF	National Evaluation Policy Framework
NES	National Evaluation System
NGO	Non-Government Organisations
NPA	National Prosecuting Authority
NPOs	Non-Profit Organisations
NSNP	National School Nutrition Programme
NSS	National Space Strategy
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)
RCJS	Review of the Criminal Justice System
RECAP	Land Recapitalisation and Development Programme
SANSA	South African National Space Agency
SAPS	South African Police service
SAQA	South African Qualifications Authority
SETA	Sector education and training authority
SEIAS	Socio-economic Impact Assessment System
SMMEs	Small, micro and medium sized enterprises
SOEs	State owned enterprises
SOPs	Standard operating procedures
SPII	Support Programme for Industrial Innovation
SST	Space Science and Technology
STEM	Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics
THRIP	Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
ToRs	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. The NEPF foresaw national evaluations agreed as national priorities to be implemented as part of a National Evaluation Plan, as well as provincial and later departmental evaluation plans. These stages are now well underway. 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.

### 2 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system in 2016/17 and underway in 2017/18

DPME has developed 27 guidelines and templates on various components of the evaluation process to support departments undertaking evaluations. 8 provinces have provincial evaluation plans and 102 provincial evaluations are planned or underway. The MPAT standard on evaluation was piloted in 2015/16 and 67 departments now have Departmental Evaluation Plans (from 29 last year).

### 3 Progress with evaluations

67 evaluations are completed or underway, excluding the 2018/19 evaluations proposed in this plan as shown in the table below.

**Table 1: Status of evaluations as at 30 September 2017**

No evals NEPs	of in	Dropped	Active	IPs	Served at Cabinet	Approved reports	Underway	TORs approved	Pre-impl
73		7	67	23	22	36	14	6	11

Those dropped include Asset Forfeiture Unit, Outcomes System, Ilima Letsema, Mining Charter (timing bad in relation to Mining Phakisa), National Senior Certificate (Ministerial Review happening), Impact evaluations of Agricultural Extension Recovery Programme (failed to get suitable bids) and MAFISA (programme's future uncertain).

**Table 4: Summary of proposed evaluations for 2018/19**

The evaluations that have been proposed for 2018/19 are shown in the table below.

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated
NPA	Specialised commercial crimes interventions
DEA	EPWP Environment & Culture sector
DPME/DMR	Mining Charter
DPME/DSD	NPO-government relations
DPME	Implementation lessons
DPME	SOE governance
DPME	SEIAS
DPME	Operation Phakisa

## 5 Way forward

Preparation for the 2018/19 evaluations started in September 2017 with a 3-day theory of change workshop and design clinic. This brought the relevant stakeholders together to generate the initial information for the summary for the NEP, and to develop the basis for the terms of reference. Most TORs are set to be completed so that procurement can start in February 2017. The intention is for the evaluations to be in full flow by the time the financial year begins and the substantive work can be completed by the December 2017 break, with work to develop improvement plans substantially completed by 15 March 2019. This means that the evaluations should in most cases be completed within the 2018/19 financial year.



# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The Framework

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) was approved on 23 November 2011. The purpose underlying the system 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 foresaw national evaluations agreed as national priorities to be implemented as part of a National Evaluation Plan, as well as provincial and later departmental evaluation plans. These stages are now well underway.

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 2018/19 to 2020/21, give a status update on on-going evaluations as well as coordination and management of 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 April 2017 with letters sent to all national Directors-General. The National Evaluation Technical Working Group met with DPME and National Treasury on 10 August 2017 to select priority evaluations, with two more added by DPME. In total six of the eight are proposed by DPME/National Treasury to address specific gaps. As the Plan is drafted midway through the year, it reports on progress for evaluations of previous NEPs up to 30 September 2017; and gives a summary of the proposed evaluations for 2018/19.

#### **1.4 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system**

The Annual Report for 2016-17 summarises progress on implementing the national evaluation system, as well as the findings and stage of individual evaluations. A total of 27 guidelines and templates have are available for use in the system, and 7 training courses have been offered and attended by more than 2100 people to date. Eight provinces have now produced provincial evaluation plans and more than 100 provincial evaluations are planned or underway. The MPAT standard on evaluation, includes the requirement for each department to produce a departmental evaluation plan, have staff with evaluation training, and carry out evaluations. Presently 67 departments have departmental evaluation plans and so scored a 4 in the MPAT –this is a significant increase from 29 departments that scored a 3 in the previous year.

## 2 Progress with evaluations

### 2.1 Progress with implementation of evaluations to date

The table below summarises progress as at 31 October 2017 with 60 evaluations completed or underway to date covering R110 billion of government expenditure, not including the 8 new evaluations.

**Table 1: Status of evaluations as at 31 October 2017 Including 8 for 2018/19)**

No evals NEPs	of in	Dropped	Active	IPs	Served at Cabinet	Approved reports	Underway	TORs approved	Pre-impl
73		7	67	23	22	36	14	6	11

Those dropped are Asset Forfeiture Unit Outcomes System, Ilima Letsema, Mining Charter (timing bad in relation to Mining Phakisa), National Senior Certificate (Ministerial Review happening), Agricultural Extension Recovery Programme, MAFISA (quantitative).

**Table 2: Status of evaluations as at 30 September 2017**

Key: Green= completed, yellow = underway, red=stuck or dropped

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Status as at 30 September 2017
<b>2011/12</b>		
Social Development, Basic Education, Health	Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development	New policy gazetted and Improvement Plan process completed with close-out meeting held with DSD.
<b>2012/13</b>		
Trade and Industry	Implementation/ design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme (BPS)	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan phase complete. Scheme relaunched.
Basic Education	Impact Evaluation of Grade R	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan being implemented. Interventions to address quality.
Health (with Social Development, DAFF,	Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes	Final report approved by Cabinet. Food and Nutrition

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Status as at 30 September 2017
DRDLR, DWCPD)	addressing Children Under 5	Security Plan 2017-2022 approved.
Rural Development and Land Reform	Implementation Evaluation of the Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan being implemented.
Rural Development and Land Reform	Implementation Evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan being implemented.
Human Settlements	Implementation Evaluation of the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)	Final report approved by steering committee. Improvement plan to be developed
Human Settlements	Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)	Final report approved by Cabinet. Changes made already to guidelines.
Basic Education	Impact Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP)	Stopped and restarted in 2014/15. Report approved by steering committee. Tabled at Cabinet. Improvement plan being implemented.
<b>2013-14</b>		
Trade and Industry	Evaluation of Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive programme (EMIAI)	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan phase complete.
Trade and Industry	Evaluation of Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII)	Scheme revised.
Trade and Industry	Impact Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan phase complete. Scheme relaunched.
Military Veterans	Evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme.	Report approved. Improvement plan drafted. DMV has taken on board evaluation report findings and recommendations. Delayed by DMR regarding approved Management response and improvement plan, in order to take forward to Cabinet.
Science and Technology	Evaluation of National Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (AMTS)	Stuck due to administrative and technical difficulties. Evaluation stopped.
South African Revenue Services	Impact Evaluation on Tax Compliance Cost of Small Businesses	Final report approved by steering committee and awaiting management response.
Co-operative Governance	Impact evaluation of the Community Works Programme (CWP)	Report approved by steering committee, management response received. Awaiting Improvement Plan.
Rural Development and Land Reform	Evaluation of the Land Restitution Programme	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan being implemented.
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Impact Evaluation of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP)	Report approved by steering committee and tabled at cluster. Improvement plan being developed as part of improvement plan for Smallholder evaluation and will be tabled together.
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Implementation Evaluation of MAFISA	Report approved by steering committee. Improvement

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Status as at 30 September 2017
		plan being developed as part of improvement plan for Smallholder evaluation and will be tabled together.
Human Settlements	Setting a baseline for future impact evaluations for the informal settlements targeted for upgrading	Final report approved by steering committee. Report to be tabled at Cabinet in October 2017.
Human Settlements	Evaluating interventions by the Department of Human Settlements to facilitate access to the city.	Delayed by DHS procurement and failure to get suitable SP. New appointment being made. Stuck.
Human Settlements	Diagnostic of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities	Report approved by steering committee. Improvement plan underway. Was tabled at Cabinet in February 2017
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact Evaluation of the Outcomes Approach	Major problems with implementation of the evaluation by the service provider. Stopped.
Presidency	Implementation Evaluation of Government's Coordination Systems	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan approved by FOSAD Manco June 2015. Improvement plan being implemented.
Basic Education	Evaluation of the quality of the National Senior Certificate (NSC)	Dropped as a Ministerial Review underway
<b>2014-15</b>		
Environmental Affairs	Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Environmental Governance in the Mining Sector (EEGM)	Report approved by steering committee and improvement plan developed. Being used as input for Mining Phakisa. Tabled at cluster and about to go to Cabinet.
Higher Education and Training	Design Evaluation of the Draft Policy on Community Colleges (PCC)	Report approved. Changes already made to policy before releasing it. To be tabled at Cluster and Cabinet.
Human Settlements	Impact/Implementation Evaluation of the Social Housing Programme (SHP)	Report approved by steering committee and improvement plan developed. To be tabled at Cabinet.
Science and Technology	Evaluation of the Indigenous Knowledge Systems Policy (IKSP)	Report being finalised.
Social Development	Diagnostic Evaluation/ Programme Audit for Violence Against Women and Children (AVAWC)	Report approved by steering committee and improvement plan drafted. About to go to cluster and then Cabinet.
Social Development	Diagnostic Review of the Social Sector Expanded Public Works Programme	Report approved by Cabinet and tabled at IMC on Public Employment. Improvement Plan being implemented
South African Police Service	Economic Evaluation of the Incremental Investment into the SAPS Forensic Services (SAPS)	Approved by the JCPS Cluster and improvement plan being implemented.
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries/ Rural Development and Land Reform	Implementation Evaluation of the Ilima Letsema Programme and cost-benefit analysis of the revitalisation of existing	Dropped – due to no budget.

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Status as at 30 September 2017
	Irrigation Schemes	
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Impact evaluation of MAFISA (quantitative) including establishing a baseline	Dropped due to challenges in how MAFISA would move forward following evaluation and Expenditure Review.
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Policy Evaluation of Small Farmer Support	Report approved by steering committee. Improvement plan being finalised. To be tabled at cluster and Cabinet.
Basic Education	Evaluation of the Funza-Lushaka Bursary Scheme	Report and improvement plan approved. Approved by Cabinet and made public on the website. 1st progress report received on the improvement plan.
Basic Education	Implementation Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme	Approved by cabinet and IP being implemented
Rural Development and Land Reform	Impact evaluation of Land Restitution Programme (quantitative) including establishing a baseline	Service provider selected. 3ie managing evaluation. Treasury secured additional funding to enable a 7 year impact study.
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact/implementation evaluation of the MPAT system	Cabinet has approved report. Improvement plan being implemented
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact/implementation evaluation of the Framework for Strategic and Annual Performance Planning (FSAPP)	Report to be approved.
<b>2015-16</b>		
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Agricultural Extension Recovery Plan	Draft final report.
Basic Education	Evaluation of CAPS/New School Curriculum	Approved by SPHCD Cluster and improvement plan being implemented
National Prosecuting Authority	Evaluation of the Asset Forfeiture Unit Sub-programme	New management in NPA not clear on value. Dropped
Social Development	Diagnostic evaluation of the Non-Profit Organisations Regulatory Framework and Legislation	Report approved by steering committee.
Social Development	Implementation Evaluation of the National Drug Master Plan in addressing all forms of Substance abuse	Report approved by steering committee. Improvement plan being developed.
Higher Education and Training	Evaluation of the National Qualifications Framework Act (NQFA)	Underway. Report to be approved.
Basic Education	Evaluation of Early Grade Reading in SA	Underway
Mineral Resources	Implementation evaluation of the mining charter	Dropped as having Operation Phakisa on mining.
Public Service and Administration	Service Delivery Improvement Planning System	TORs not finalised
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Implementation evaluation of citizen-based monitoring (CBM)	Report approved by G&A working group and Improvement plan being implemented .
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact/implementation evaluation of the evaluation system	Underway
<b>2016-17</b>		
Higher Education and Training	Evaluation of the Technical and Vocational Education and	Draft report submitted

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Status as at 30 September 2017
	Training (TVET) Colleges Expansion and Capacity Development Programme	
Justice and Constitutional Development	Implementation/Design Evaluation of the Integrated Justice System	Underway
Department of Social Development	Implementation Evaluation of Older Persons Act	Draft report submitted
National Treasury	Evaluation of City Support Programme	Procurement process underway
Home Affairs	Evaluation of Birth Registration Programme	Draft report submitted
Environmental Affairs	Implementation Evaluation of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process and its contribution towards sustainable development	Service provider appointed
Science and Technology	Design and Implementation Evaluation of the National Space Strategy	Procurement process underway
National Treasury	Government Business Incentives	Underway
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Implementation Evaluation of the National Evaluation System	Procurement process underway
<b>2017/18</b>		
Small Business Development	Evaluation of the Integrated Strategy for the Promotion of Entrepreneurship and Small Enterprises	Underway
SAPS	Implementation Evaluation of Detective Services and Crime Investigation	TORs approved and procurement underway (re-advertised)
Social Development	Implementation Evaluation of the Integrated Social Crime Prevention Strategy	TORs approved and procurement underway
DPME/DOH/DSD etc	Rationalisation of community-based worker models	TORs approved and procurement underway
DBE/DOT	Scholar Transport	Service provider appointed
DPW	Accommodation Provision Programme	TORs being finalised

## 2.2 Status of improvement plans

Table 3 summarises the status of improvement plans to date, indicating a number of delays in submission of progress reports. The Management Information System includes an element of tracking improvement plans which will help in this regard.

**Table 3: Status of improvement plans**

<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Date Evaluation Report approved and improvement plan submitted</b>	<b>Expected/Received date of 1<sup>st</sup> IP report</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Report Received/ Expected</b>	<b>3rd Report Received/Expected</b>	<b>4th Report Received/Expected</b>
Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development (ECD)	Report: 15 June 2012 IP: 16 October 2015	Received 19 August 2014	Received 5 June 2015	Received 4 August 2016	Received 2 August 2017
Evaluation of Business Process Services Programme	Report: 16 May 2013 IP: 9 June 2014	Received 17 July 2015.	Received 3 August 2015	Received 2 March 2016	
Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing Children under 5	Report: 31 March 2014 IP produced 6 Sept 2014	Improvement plan process collapsed into Food and Nutrition Security Strategy			
Impact Evaluation of Grade R	Report:15 June 2013: IP: 14 April 2014	Received 26 May 2015	Received 5 March 2016	Received 5 April 2017	Expected 31 August 2017
Implementation Evaluation of Land Recapitalisation and Development Programme (RECAP)	Report: 27 Sept 2013 IP: 10 February 2014	Due end August 2014. Received 20 October 2015	Report due 31 October 2014	Expected 30 June 2016	
Implementation Evaluation of Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)	Report: 1 November 2013 IP: 10 February 2014	Report due end of November 2013. Received 11 February 2014	Received 30 October 2015	Expected 30 June 2016	
Implementation Evaluation of the Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme (EMIA)	Report: 26 May 2014 IP: 6 January 2015	Received 3 August 2015	Received 3 March 2016	Received 2 September 2016	Received 5 June 2017
Implementation Evaluation of Government Coordination Systems (clusters/MinMECs and Implementation Forums)	Report: 28 October 2014 by FOSAD Manco IP: 4 May 2015 FOSAD Manco	Report due 30 July 2016	No expected date		
Implementation evaluation of Restitution Programme	Report: 28 February 2014 IP: 2014	Received 30 September 2016	Expected 31 March 2016	Expected 30 June 2016	Expected 30 January 2017
Evaluation of the Support Programme for Industrial	Report: 21 May 2014 IP: 8 January 2015	Received in July 2015	Report expected December 2015	Expected June 2016	Expected December 2016



<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Date Evaluation Report approved and improvement plan submitted</b>	<b>Expected/Received date of 1<sup>st</sup> IP report</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Report Received/ Expected</b>	<b>3rd Report Received/Expected</b>	<b>4th Report Received/Expected</b>
Innovation (SPII)					
Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)	Report: 30 March 2015 IP: 12 June 2015	Received 18 March 2016	Received 4 November 2016	Received 12 June 2017	Expected 31 August 2017
Implementation Evaluation of the Social Sector Expanded Public Works Programme	Report : IP:	Received 28 September 2016	Received 7 March 2017	Expected 28 August 2017	Expected 28 February 2017
Implementation Evaluation of Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT)	Report: IP: 1 April 2016	Received 16 February 2016	Received 7 September 2016	Reived 6 April 2017	Expected October 2017
Evaluation of the Funza-Lushaka Bursary Scheme	Report: 31 March 2016 IP: 6 September 2016	Received 20 April 2017	Expected 30 September 2017	Expected 30 March 2018	Expected 28 September 2018
Design Evaluation of the Draft Policy on Community Colleges (PCC)	Report: 4 September 2015 IP: 20 October 2016	Received 15 May 2017	Expected 31 October 2017	Expected 20 April 2018	Expected 22 October 2018
Diagnostic Evaluation/ Programme Audit for Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC)	Report: 14 March 2016 IP: 25 July 2017	Expected 30 September 2017	Expected 30 March 2018	Expected 29 September 2018	Expected 31 March 2019
Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)	Report: February 2015 IP: 16 April 2015	Received 7 July 2016	Expected 7 October 2016	Expected 7 April 2017	Expected 7 October 2017
Diagnostic of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities	Report : IP:	Expected 21 October 2016	Expected 21 April 2017	Expected 23 October 2017	Expected 24 April 2018
Implementation/impact Evaluation of Effectiveness of Environmental Governance in the Mining Sector	Report: IP: 11 August 2015	Expected 28 February 2017	31 August 2017	28 February 2018	31 August 2018

Table 4 shows the implementation of the findings indicating that most completed evaluations are having an impact on the programmes or policies evaluated.

**Table 4: Implementation of findings of some of the evaluations to date**

<b>Programme evaluated</b>	<b>Progress in implementing findings</b>
Early Childhood Development	New policy gazetted responding to findings
Business Process Services Incentive Scheme	Scheme relaunched and operating
Grade R	DBE undertaking issues to address quality of provision not just quantity, including teacher qualifications
SPII	Scheme relaunched and operating
CRDP	Substantial revisions to operations
Recapitalisation and Development Programme (RADP)	Substantial revisions to operations
Nutrition interventions for children under 5	Food and Nutrition Security Plan 2017-2022 approved. Target introduced in MTSF to reduce stunting of children under 5 from 21% to 10%.
Restitution	Progress in creating independence of Commission on Land Claims. Substantial revisions to operations. Impact evaluation starting.
Support Programme for Industrial Innovation	Changes to operation including addition of commercialisation stage. Relaunched.
Urban Settlements Development Grant	Even before evaluation completed changes made to guidelines
Export Marketing Incentive (EMIA)	Changes to operation.
Policy on Community Colleges	This was a design evaluation and before the policy was released significant changes were made as a result

### 3 Summary of approved evaluations for 2018/19

A call was issued in April 2017 for proposals for evaluations to be included in the National Evaluation Plan for 2018/19 – 2020/21. Over 20 departments participated in the concept note development workshop. Four evaluations were proposed centrally by DPME, and four of the eight evaluation proposals were selected to be part of the NEP. However 2 of the successful proposals were withdrawn for various reasons. DPME thus put forward 2 further strategic evaluations for inclusion in this NEP.

**Table 5: Summary of approved evaluations for 2018/19**

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (e.g. budget, beneficiaries)
NPA	Specialised commercial crimes interventions	Deterioration of investigation and prosecutions of commercial crime and the resurgence of commercial crimes in South Africa coupled with the low conviction rate is of great concern not only to the South African Government and its citizens but to the international investors as well. The results of the evaluation will contribute to improving the performance of the SAPS's DCPI/Hawks and the NPA's SCCU both who have received extensive media scrutiny in recent history. The reduction of commercial crimes will expedite the achievement of Outcome 3 in the Medium Term Strategic Framework of the National Development Plan, namely: "All people in South Africa are and feel safe."
DEA	EPWP Environment & Culture sector	The Environment and Culture Sector (E&C) component of EPWP specifically seeks to build and protect South Africa's natural resources and cultural heritage, and while doing so, dynamically use this preservation work to create both medium-term work and social benefits. DEA leads and coordinates this sector. This evaluation will be used to inform and design implementation of the fourth phase of EPWP in the environment and culture sector. The evaluation complements other evaluations on public employment programmes (CWP, EPEP Social Sector) and will add new evidence to the cluster of public employment evaluations.
DPME/DMR	Mining Charter	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. The Mining Charter score card assesses eight critical areas (ownership; procurement and enterprise development; beneficiation; employment equity; human resource development; mine community development; housing and living conditions; sustainable development) to determine the domestic mining industry's contribution towards the realisation of the Mining Charter's objectives. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess transformation of the mining industry through the 2010 Mining Charter to assist with implementation of the 2017 Mining Charter. The findings of the evaluation will guide policy decisions to implement the Mining Charter.
DPME/DSD	NPO-government relations	Non-Profit Organisations are a critical part of South African society. They fill the service provision gap in communities, working together with government or independently. For NPOs to operate optimally and

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (e.g. budget, beneficiaries)
		<p>maximise contribution to social and economic development a conducive environment, inclusive of an effective regulatory system, supportive political sentiments and good relationship with the state is needed. However, there are indications that state-NPO relations are increasingly strained. An evaluation about to go to Cabinet is on NPO Regulation. This pointed to the strains in NPO-Government relationships. Meanwhile strengthening government's partnerships with NPOs is recognised by the National Development Plan as a means of improving service delivery and strengthening democratic governance. This was reiterated in the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2014-2019. This evaluation will provide evidence to inform the implementation of the NDP objectives by synthesising findings from the various studies and evaluations conducted in the sector to determine the underlying impediments to NPO-government collaboration around policy and services and how this can be strengthened.</p>
DPME	Implementation lessons	<p>The government budget is R1,6 trillion, with 1,3 million public servants. However, evidence from the MTSF, from evaluations and expenditure reviews points to significant problems in performance. While this is a problem it also represents an opportunity – if we can improve performance of these programmes there is the possibility of major improvement in governments impact, with no significant increase in budget. If the government is to achieve the NDP, there is a need to transform its ability to turn policy intent into effective implementation. The evaluation aims to draw key lessons from all national and provincial evaluations or studies, and draw lessons on the causes of poor implementation and how it can be strengthened.</p>
DPME	SOE governance	<p>President Zuma commissioned a Presidential Review Committee (PRC) in May 2010 to strengthen the role of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) in South Africa. The PRC undertook a macro review of all SOEs covering a period dating back from 1994 under four main thematic areas: development and transformation, ownership and governance, the viability and funding of SOEs and strategic and operational effectiveness. Following the PRC study, the NDP identified State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) as a driving force for service delivery and structural development. As the key stakeholder in SOEs, Government has identified this sector as one of the key pillars to drive the country's national strategic economic agenda. However, to achieve this goal, SOEs should adhere to good corporate governance principles and regulatory frameworks by which SOE's are held to account. Despite several government interventions, there has been negative publicity in the media on South Africa's SOEs ranging from financial crisis, corruption to governance challenges. This evaluation is planned to assess the state of governance in South African SOEs and how to strengthen this, to maximise their impact and value for money.</p>
DPME	SEIAS	<p>In February 2015, the Cabinet made a decision to introduce the Socio-economic Impact Assessment System (SEIAS) putting all policy initiatives, legislation and regulations through the SEIAS process. The SEIAS is a uniquely designed methodology for assessing the social and economic impact of policies; legislation, regulations and other subordinate legislation in line with national priorities. It is aimed at improving the</p>

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (e.g. budget, beneficiaries)
		legislative environment to ensure that assessments help departments to analyze risks and propose ways to mitigate them. Since June 2015 to 30 September 2017, 358 proposals were subjected to SEIAS of which 161 were Bills, 63 Regulations and 76 Sector Policies. In September 2016 the President's Coordinating Council took a resolution to extend the system to provinces and municipalities during 2017/2018. This evaluation is intended to reflect on implementation of the system and how it could be strengthened.
DPME	Operation Phakisa	<p>The Operation Phakisa methodology draws from the Malaysian Big Fast Results methodology. It consists of eight sequential steps and focuses on bringing together key stakeholders from the public and private sectors, academia as well as civil society organisations to collaborate in detailed problem analysis; priority setting; intervention planning; and delivery. These collaboration sessions are called laboratories (labs). The results of the labs are detailed (3 foot) plans with ambitious targets as well as public commitment on the implementation of the plans by all stakeholders. The implementation of the plans is rigorously monitored and reported on. Implementation challenges are actively managed for effective and efficient resolution.</p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Operation Phakisa implementation model, the extent to which it has achieved its objectives, and how it can be strengthened.</p>

## **4 Concepts for evaluations for 2018/19**

### **4.1 Implementation Evaluation of Specialised Commercial Crime interventions in South Africa with specific focus on Investigation and Prosecution Systems**

**Implementing Department:** National Prosecution Authority of South Africa (NPA) and South African Police Service (Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation)

#### **Background to the programme**

The Specialised Commercial Crime Unit (SCCU) is a business unit within the NPA, tasked with guiding the investigation of commercial crime, and the prosecution thereof. The deteriorating situation pertaining to the investigation, prosecution and adjudication of commercial crime resulted in the establishment of the SCCU on 1 August 1999. It was initially established as a pilot project, and commenced its operations in Pretoria only. It soon proved to be effective, and a decision was taken that it should be rolled out to all provinces. The SCCU previously coexisted with the Directorate of Special Operations (the Scorpions). However, the Scorpions were disbanded in January 2009, and the SCCU was required to inherit all commercial crime prosecutions which had previously been dealt with by the DSO. As a result, its intake of work increased substantially, and more complex commercial matters were, and are currently being referred for prosecution.

With regard to crime investigation, the South African Police Service (SAPS) established the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation (DCPI/ Hawks) as an independent directorate in terms of Section 17C of the South African Police Service Act, 1995 as amended by the South African Police Service Amendment Act, 2008 (Act 57 of 2008) The Hawks are now responsible for the combating, investigation and prevention of national priority crimes such as serious organized crime, serious commercial crime and serious corruption in terms of Section 17B and 17D of the South African Police Service Act, 1995 as amended.

During July 2010, the Anti-Corruption Task Team (ACTT) was established to better coordinate government's efforts to deal with issues of corruption and fraud. It is responsible for ensuring that there is coordinated approach to fight corruption, by ensuring that all role players in the task team dedicate investigative and prosecutorial resources, and further ensure that other agencies which have law enforcement capabilities assist in fast tracking activities to speed up investigations of corruption involving R5 million and more (serious corruption). The SCCU forms part of the ACTT, as it is tasked with guiding investigations of, amongst others, serious corruption, and the prosecution thereof.

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

Deterioration of investigation and prosecutions of commercial crime and the resurgence of commercial crimes in South Africa coupled with the low conviction rate is of great concern not only to the South African Government and its citizens but to the international investors as well.

The results of the evaluation will contribute to improving the performance of the SAPS's DCPI/Hawks and the NPA's SCCU both who have received

extensive media scrutiny in recent history. The reduction of commercial crimes will expedite the achievement of Outcome 3 in the Medium Term Strategic Framework of the National Development Plan, namely: "All people in South Africa are and feel safe."

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether the government's system for prosecution and investigation of specialised commercial crime is implemented as envisaged and how it can be strengthened.

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

1. Is the prosecution and investigation of specialized commercial crime in South Africa by the NPA's SCCU and SAPS' Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation (DCPI/ Hawks) implemented as envisaged in the relevant regulatory framework?
  - 1.1. Is the current Theory of Change for the system of investigation and prosecution working as envisaged?
  - 1.2. Are the outcomes being achieved? (including set targets)
2. Do the NPA and SAPS's specialised units have adequate capacity to investigate and prosecute commercial crimes?
  - 2.1. Are there enough resources (sufficient budget, personnel and infrastructure) to attend to cases?
  - 2.2. Are there skilled investigators and prosecutors to investigate and prosecute commercial crime?
  - 2.3. Overall, is government prioritising the investigation and prosecution of priority crimes. If not, how can this be addressed?
3. To what extent is the coordination between NPA and SAPS working? If not, how can this working relationship/ coordination be strengthened?
4. How can the investigation and prosecution system of commercial crime be enhanced to maximise impact?
  - 4.1 What are the turn-around times for resolving commercial crimes? If low, how can this be improved?
  - 4.2 To what extent are the prosecution and investigation services cost-effective? If not, how can this be addressed?

### **Principle audience**

Parliament, SAPS, DPME, National Treasury, Department of Justice & Constitutional Development (DOJ & CD), Independent Police Investigative Directorate (IPID).

**Type of Evaluation:** Implementation Evaluation

### **Management Strategy**

The evaluation will be managed by the DPME in collaboration with the NPA.

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

**Timeline:** 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019

## 4.2 Implementation Evaluation of the EPWP Environment and Culture Sector

**Implementing Department:** Department of Environmental Affairs

### Background to the programme

The Expanded Public Works Programme, Environment and Culture Sector (EPWP E&C sector) is one of seven pillar programmes of the Department of Environmental Affairs. The main purpose of the EPWP as a public employment programme is to provide work opportunities to unemployed citizens through a labour intensive approach to development and service delivery. The Environment and Culture Sector (E&C) component of EPWP specifically seeks to build and protect South Africa's natural resources and cultural heritage, and while doing so, use this preservation work to create both medium-term work and social benefits. DEA leads and coordinates this sector of the EPWP working together with other departments, including the Departments of Energy and Mineral Resources (in Mining Rehabilitation); Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries (in the Fisheries programme); and Arts & Culture (in the Heritage Buildings Rehabilitation, and Performance Arts Training programmes). Implementation of the EPWP cuts across national, provincial as well as municipal government. The EPWP is now in its third phase of implementation (2014/15 – 2018/19), and the results of this evaluation will be used to inform and design implementation of the fourth phase.

The objectives of the EPWP E&C sector are aligned with the broader objectives of government such as poverty reduction, transformation, empowerment, urban and rural development, growth and job creation. The EPWP E&C sector sought to create 200 000 work opportunities within EPWP phase I (2004/05 – 2008/09), 1 560 000 work opportunities within phase II (2009/10 – 2013/14), and 1 151 150 work opportunities within phase III (2014/15 – 2018/19).

Over the years one of the major challenges experienced in sustaining the performance of the EPWP E&C sector is retaining labour during periods of high seasonal agricultural employment, as many participants find private jobs in agriculture more appealing, and therefore regularly stop participation in the EPWP. Whilst it is recognised that the EPWP is intended to provide temporary work opportunities, the shifting in and out of participants tends to negatively affect the achievement of sector targets around environment and culture. As this employment pattern is almost certain, it is an important aspect to consider in the design of the programme going forward so as to improve sustainability in the sector.

### Importance of the evaluation

The evaluation complements other evaluations including the Community Work Programme (2013/14), EPWP social sector (2014/15), and the Community-Based Worker programme (2017/18) and will add new evidence to a cluster of evaluations on public employment programmes. It will provide a comprehensive picture of how public employment programmes have been implemented and their contribution to poverty alleviation. This



evaluation will be used to inform and design implementation of the fourth phase of EPWP in the environment and culture sector.

**Purpose of the evaluation:**

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess implementation of the EPWP within the Environment and Culture Sector from its inception (Phase 1) to the current phase of implementation (Phase 3), to determine whether existing programme design remains relevant for planning and preparing to go into phase 4.

**Key questions to be addressed**

1. What are the **measurable results** of the E&C sector, specifically with regards to its goal(s), objectives, outputs, and outcomes? To what extent has the E&C sector been **effective** in achieving these?
2. Is the **design** of the E&C sector appropriate, and to what extent is the intervention design consistent with sector outcomes, partnerships with all relevant stakeholders, job promotion priorities and policies?
3. To what extent has the E&C sector been **efficient** in its implementation, with specific reference to administration and management (including coordination) arrangements?
4. Is there any evidence that the intended **impacts** of the E&C sector have been achieved? Are there any unintended impacts?
5. How **sustainable** is the E&C sector? What key insights, lessons, and recommendations are offered, with a view on the future direction E&C sector within EPWP?

**Principal audience**

DEA, DPW, DoE, DMR, DAC, DAFF; municipalities and provinces

**Type of evaluation:** Implementation

**Management strategy**

The evaluation will be managed by DPME in collaboration with the Department of Environmental Affairs, which will chair the steering committee that will comprise of other key stakeholder departments.

**Cost:** R1m from DPME and R2 from DEA

**Timeline:** April 2018 to December 2018

### 4.3 Implementation/Impact Evaluation of the 2010 Broad-based Socio-economic Empowerment Charter (Mining Charter)

**Implementing Department:** Department of Mineral Resources/DPME

#### **Background to the programme**

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. The state is the custodian of South Africa's mineral resources. Mineral regulation and promotion are by the Department of Mineral Resources (DMR). The 2010 Broad-Based Socio-Economic Charter (Mining Charter) was developed with the primary purpose of redressing the historic inequalities and promoting equitable access to South Africa's mineral resources to all South Africans with a specific focus on Historically Disadvantaged South Africans (HDSA's). The Mining Charter was developed to be utilised by all mining industry stakeholders.

The Mining Charter scorecard assessed eight critical areas (ownership; procurement and enterprise development; beneficiation; employment equity; human resource development; mine community development; housing and living conditions; sustainable development) to determine the domestic mining industry's contribution towards the realisation of the Mining Charter's objectives.

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

The findings of the evaluation will guide policy decisions around implementation of the Mining Charter.

#### **Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess transformation of the mining industry through the 2010 Mining Charter to assist with implementation of the 2017 Mining Charter.

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

1. What is the role of stakeholders in the implementation of the charter?
2. What are the enforcement, monitoring and reporting mechanisms to ensure implementation of the charter?
3. How is information verified to track progress of implementation of charter targets?
4. How does the charter align with other legislative prescripts?
5. What is the link and role of other departments in the implementation of the charter? Taking into consideration coordination in monitoring of charter implementation.
6. Have the targets of the charter been met; to what level; and what compliance actions have been exercised?
7. To what extent has the mining industry been transformed?
8. What lessons can be drawn from implementation of the Charter towards monitoring of the 2017 Charter?

**Principal audience**

Mining Industry stakeholders including organised labour, organised business, government (national; provincial and local) and communities in proximity to the mining operations and in labour sending areas

**Type of evaluation**

Implementation and partly Impact Evaluation

**Cost** The total cost of the evaluation is estimated to be R3.5 million, with DPME contributing R1 million and sector departments (DMR, NDHS, dti, DSBD, and Cogta) directly impacted by this evaluation contributing R500 000 each.

**Timeline** The evaluation is expected to start in January 2018 and should be completed in December 2018

#### 4.4 Synthesis Evaluation of NPO/Government Partnerships

**Implementing Department:** DPME

**Background to the evaluation**

Non-Profit Organisations are a critical part of South African society. They fill a service provision gap in communities, working together with government or independently. They also advocate for the protection of human rights and monitor the impact of state and private sector activities. For NPOs to operate optimally and maximise contribution to social and economic development a conducive environment, inclusive of an effective regulatory system, supportive political sentiments and good relationship with the state is needed. However, there are indications that state-NPO relations are increasingly strained. This is often attributed to a number of factors including the sector the NPO is operating, the kind of service it offers or work it does, funding source/arrangements, political ideology of the NPO, the regulatory regime and capacity of the state regulators, etc. State-NPO relations have been the subject of a number of evaluations and research. This includes work that was done in the 20-year review, a recent evaluation of the NPO regulatory framework, Expenditure and Performance Review of the NPO regulation, and Raith Foundation's work on social justice organisations working with the state. However, despite all this work, not much progress has been made to achieve the National Development Plan goals in this area. Partly this is because the studies were either limited to a particular sector (mostly social sector), or an issue, limiting the reach of their recommendations. To overcome this, the current evaluation aims to synthesise different studies traversing different sectors NPOs operate, and offer better direction on how partnership between government and civil society can be strengthened.

**Importance of the evaluation**

Strengthening government partnership with NPOs is recognised by the National Development Plan as a means of improving service delivery and strengthening democratic governance. This was reiterated in the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2014-2019. This evaluation will provide evidence to inform the implementation of the NDP objectives.

**Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of this evaluation is to synthesise findings from the various studies and evaluations conducted in the sector to determine the underlying impediments to NPO–government collaboration around policy and services and how to strengthen it.

**Key questions to be addressed**

1. What is the nature and quality of the relationship between government and NPOs in different service sectors?
2. What factors are shaping the relationships between government and civil society organisations?
3. What needs to change to improve and strengthen partnerships between government and the NPO sector to improve democratic governance, protection of human rights and service delivery?

**Principal audience**

Stakeholder	Likely use of the results
DSD	Strengthen the NPO directorate sector wide regulatory and oversight function
SARS	Improve access to tax exemption benefits to variety of NPOs currently excluded from the system
Other Government Departments (DBE, DoH, DAFF, COGTA, DPSA)	Improve partnership with NPOs in delivery of services, democratic governance, etc.

**Type of evaluation:** Synthesis Evaluation

**Management strategy**

The Department of Social Development is in the process of Amending the NPO Act of 1997. The finding of this study will complement previous studies and provide incisive recommendations particularly on how the NPO directorate can play its broader sector regulatory function and how this can be better linked with work by other regulators including Companies and Intellectual Property Commission in relation to Not for profit Companies, South African Revenue Services, The Master of the Supreme Court registration of Not for Profit Trusts and different line function departments partnering with NPOs.

**Cost:** Approximately R1.2 million funded by DPME.

**Time:** 1 April 2018 to December 2018.

## 4.5 Synthesis evaluation of government programmes implementation lessons

**Implementing Department:** DPME

### **Background to the evaluation**

The government budget is R1,6 trillion, with 1,3 million public servants. However, evidence from the MTSF, from evaluations and expenditure reviews points to significant problems in performance. While this is a problem it also represents an opportunity – if we can improve performance of these policies and programmes there is the possibility of major improvement in governments impact, with no significant increase in budget. If the government is to achieve the NDP, there is a need to transform its ability to turn policy intent into effective implementation.

### **Importance of the evaluation**

Implementation of government's policy intent is important to all South Africans; and is important for the performance of the country as an economic player in the global political economy arena.

South Africa's NDP is a guiding outline, or vision to tackle and ultimately eliminate poverty, reduce inequality and halve unemployment by 2030. Its application is that of a greater good to grow investment and stimulate economic growth. Its achievement is directly related to the effective implementation of the policy intent that underpins the NDP. Without effective policy implementation, the country runs the risk of not fully realising the NDP by 2030.

### **Purpose of the evaluation:**

The evaluation aims to draw key lessons from various implementation evaluations or studies, on the inability of government to implement policy intent effectively.

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

1. Are policies poorly planned?
  - 1.1 Do they address root causes?
  - 1.2 Do they have a clearly structured ToC?
  - 1.3 Are policies appropriate to context (mimicry of policies)?
  - 1.4 Is the policy cycle clarified and framework agreed, linking to the NDP?
  - 1.5 Policy cycle tested and revised on selected priority areas (diagnosis, experimentation).
2. Is poor implementation planning as a result of the following:
  - 2.1 Is the operational planning model developed and revised to align departmental and programme planning and individual plans?
  - 2.2 Lack of articulation of policies into implementation plans

- 2.3 Stakeholders not adequately involved in the planning process
- 2.4 Interference in the planning
- 2.5 Do we have models for unblocking implementation challenges (research, develop, test, scale-up)?
- 3. Is there adequate alignment of plans, policies, etc. across government:
  - 3.1 Independence of the different spheres of government and implication thereof on implementation of policies.
  - 3.2 To what extent do systems support (or not) alignment?
  - 3.3 Is there sufficient will for alignment?
  - 3.4 Competing political priorities?
- 4. Are resources a constraint in implementing efficiently.
  - 4.1 Are we doing too many things?
  - 4.2 Is there well thought out prioritisation?
  - 4.3 Do we have requisite and sufficient capacity and expertise to implement?
- 5. Is implementation blocked by particular and/or individual interests?
- 6. Is there sufficient individual and organisational capacity to execute the plans?
  - 6.1 Is recruitment comprehensive?
  - 6.2 Is the culture of performance conducive for effective implementation?
  - 6.3 Are there requisite technical and soft skills?
- 7. Is there enough learning from experience?
  - 7.1 Are evaluations done systematically to understand programme performance?
  - 7.2 Are there incentives to learn from past experience?

**Principal audience**

The audience ultimately would be the whole of government. However, in order to test implementation, DPME in collaboration with the Steering Committee would select a few sectors (no more than 3) to do a pilot. Possible sectors would include education, water and economic.

**Type of evaluation:** Synthesis evaluation

**Cost:** R 1.5 million to be funded by DPME

**Timeline:** 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019

## 4.6 Evaluation of Corporate Governance in South African State-Owned Enterprises

**Implementing Department:** DPME and line function departments overseeing SOEs such as Department of Public Enterprises, National Treasury and Department of Communications.

### Background to the Evaluation

All over the world governments constantly have to answer questions around how State-owned Enterprises “should be harnessed in order to promote economic development and what the relationship between SOE and the State as owner should be ...”<sup>1</sup>To this end, President Zuma commissioned a Presidential Review Committee (PRC) in May 2010 to strengthen the role of state-owned enterprises (SOEs) in South Africa. The PRC undertook a macro review of all SOEs covering a period dating back from 1994 under four main thematic areas: development and transformation, ownership and governance, the viability and funding of SOEs and strategic and operational effectiveness. The PRC presented 21 recommendations, key amongst these was that government should enact a single over-arching law: the “State-Owned Entities Act” which would govern all SOEs, as the legislation was (and still is) fragmented and often conflicting.<sup>2</sup>

Following the PRC study, the National Development Plan (2012) identified the State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) as the driving force for service delivery and structural development. As the key stakeholder in SOEs, Government has identified this sector as one of the key pillars to drive the country’s national strategic economic agenda. However, to achieve this goal, SOEs should adhere to good corporate governance principles and regulatory frameworks by which SOE’s are held to account. These include the Companies Act, the precepts of the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) and the principles contained in the King III Report on Corporate Governance. In terms of these prescripts, oversight of the performance of SOEs rests with Parliament, the line ministries and the boards of SOEs. All governance role players have a duty to address performance of SOEs. Amongst others,

---

<sup>1</sup> Presidential Review Committee Report, 2010: (Foreword)

<sup>2</sup> Presidential Review Committee Report, 2010, page 15

Parliament reviews the annual reports, whilst the responsibility for financial management and the implementation of mandates resides with the Accounting Authority (the Board), which in turn may delegate powers to executive management. King III Report stipulates that:

- Boards should be at the centre of corporate governance;<sup>3</sup>
- Boards should ensure SOEs have effective risk-based internal and internal financial controls;<sup>4</sup>
- The performance of the board, its committees, individual directors and CEO should be evaluated annually;<sup>5</sup>

### **Importance of the evaluation**

Despite several government interventions, there has been negative publicity in the media on South Africa's SOEs ranging from financial crisis, corruption to governance challenges. Some of the biggest SOEs, such as South African Airways (SAA) and Eskom, cannot survive without government guarantees enabling them to borrow. These guarantees, however, also pose a risk to the government's own financial position, which is being closely monitored by international credit ratings agencies. Consequently, increase in borrowing costs poses a threat to other items in the budget devoted to social spending. The evaluation will shed light on the current challenges and provide solutions on how SOE governance can be strengthened.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

To assess the state of governance in South African State Owned Enterprises. The findings will inform how governance of SOEs can be strengthened to maximise their impact and value for money.

### **Key Evaluation Questions**

1. To what extent are the current governance strategies of SOEs effective?
  - 1.1 To what extent is the regulatory framework (governance policies, legislation and regulations) supporting/enabling SOEs performance?
2. What is the overarching Theory of Change for SOEs? Is it working? If not, why?
3. Are there clear performance expectations set out in the state's shareholder's compact with SOEs?
  - 3.1 To what extent are SOE boards empowered in terms of a shareholder's compact to perform their responsibilities?

---

<sup>3</sup> King III 1.16

<sup>4</sup> King III 1.19

<sup>5</sup> King III 1.23



- 3.2 Are performance assessments for SOE board members formalised in individual performance agreements, linked to the shareholder's compact?
  - 3.3 Do board members have requisite skills to execute their responsibilities effectively?
  - 3.4 Are there clear performance standards with regard to ethical leadership for the board members and executives?
  - 3.5 Are roles of various levels of oversight bodies clear and codified?
4. To what extent are the recruitment practices in SOEs effective?
  5. Do line ministries and Parliament have capacity to monitor performance of SOEs with respect to the shareholder's compact? If not, how can this be addressed?
    - 5.1 To what extent do SOE internal monitoring and evaluation systems working?
    - 5.2 Are there relevant indicators linked to the country's priorities such as the nine-point plan and the National Development Plan?
  6. How can performance of SOEs be strengthened to enhance inclusive economic growth?
    - 6.1 Does South Africa realise a return on investment from these SOEs?

**Principal Audience**

The Presidency, Cabinet, Parliament, line ministries providing oversight over SOEs, SOE Boards

**Type of Evaluation:** Diagnostic and Implementation

**Management Strategy:** The evaluation will inform DPME's strategy of supporting SOEs. It will be managed by DPME in conjunction with line function departments responsible for overseeing SOEs.

**Estimated Cost:** R4 million funded by DPME

**Timeline:** April 2018 to July 2019

## 4.6 Implementation Evaluation of the Socio-economic Impact Assessment System (SEIAS)

**Implementing Department:** DPME

### **Background to the programme**

In 2005, the Presidency and National Treasury commissioned a study in response to concerns about the failure in some cases to understand the full costs of regulations and especially the impact on the economy. Subsequent to the study the Cabinet decided on the need for a consistent assessment of the socio-economic impact of policy initiatives, legislation and regulations. In February 2015, the Cabinet made a decision to introduce the Socio-economic impact assessment system (SEIAS) to implement the Cabinet decision all policy initiatives, legislation and regulations had to be subjected to SEIAS. The SEIAS is a unique methodology for assessing the social and economic impact of policies; legislation, regulations and other subordinate legislation in line with our national priorities. SEIAS is aimed at improving the legislative environment to ensure that assessments help departments to analyze risks and propose ways to mitigate them. Since June 2015 to 30 September 2017, 358 proposals were subjected to SEIAS of which 161 were Bills, 63 Regulations and 76 Sector Policies. This evaluation is intended to see whether policy initiatives, legislation and regulations have been thought through such that the intended consequences that burden the inclusive growth are addressed prior to approval by Executive Authorities and Cabinet.

The primary objective of SEIAS is to assist departments to better formulate policies, legislation & regulations and ensure:

- Alignment with national priorities in promoting inclusive growth, addressing inequality, spatial imbalances, and environmental degradation;
- Risks associated with the implementation of such laws are thereof mitigated, thus unintended consequences are minimised;
- Costs of implementing such prescripts are reduced while benefits by the deprived service recipients are optimised; and
- Regulatory burden is reduced, thus a better and efficient administrative mechanisms of implementing the national priorities.

### **Importance of the evaluation**

The SEIA system has been implemented for two years through national departments. However, the President's Coordinating Council took a resolution in September 2016 to extend the system to provinces and municipalities during the 2017/2018. It is therefore, important to reflect on the areas the system could be strengthened.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

This evaluation will assess whether the SEIAS is succeeding in minimising the unintended consequences and outcomes; unnecessary implementation and compliance costs and unanticipated risks from policy initiatives, regulations and legislation are mitigated. The findings will assist DPME to understand how the intervention is working and how it can be strengthened.

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

1. To what extent is SEIAS minimising the unintended consequences that are brought by the implementation of policies, regulations and legislation to inclusive growth

2. Are current institutional arrangements conducive for effective implementation of the system within national government departments?
3. Does the DPME has enough capacity to guide and support assessment processes and quality assure SEIA reports from all national government departments?
4. To what extent do national departments engage and consult with each other during policy development and implementation to avoid overlapping and/ or contradictions in their policies?
5. To what extent is the system duplicating other assessment tools applied within government?
6. How far have decision makers used the SEIA report in approving the policy, regulations and legislation?
7. How can the system be strengthened to maximise the benefits and minimise the cost of implementation and compliance?

**Principal audience:** Cabinet, President's Coordinating Council, all departments and Parliament

**Type of evaluation:** Implementation evaluation

### **Management strategy**

The evaluation has a transverse impact across government. The Steering Committee will be made up of interdepartmental Senior Officials from the Presidency (Cabinet Office), DPME, Economic Development Department, National Treasury, Department of Trade and Industry, Department of Environmental Affairs, Department of Labour, Department of Social Development, State Security and the Chief State Law Advisors. Recommendations for improvement in the Improvement Plan will be used to strengthen the system and to assist in planning the roll out to Provinces and Municipalities.

**Cost estimate:** Approximately R2.5 million funded by the DPME.

**Timeline:** April 2018 to March 2019

## **4.8 Implementation Evaluation of the Operation Phakisa Model**

**Implementing Department** DPME

### **Background to the programme**

In 2013 President Jacob Zuma visited Malaysia where he was introduced to the Big Fast Results Methodology which the Malaysian government uses to improve delivery of services and achieve desired results within a very short period. Through this approach, they address priority areas such as poverty, crime and unemployment. The Big Fast Results Methodology was adopted by the South African government and given the name Operation Phakisa ("phakisa" means "hurry up" in Sesotho). Operation Phakisa is a results-based approach, involving setting clear plans and targets, on-going monitoring of progress and making these results public.

The Operation Phakisa methodology consists of eight sequential steps and focusses on bringing key stakeholders from the public and private sectors, academia as well as civil society organisations together to collaborate in detailed problem analysis; priority setting; intervention planning; and delivery. These collaboration sessions are called laboratories (labs). The results of the labs are detailed (3 foot) plans with ambitious targets as well as public commitment on the implementation of the plans by all stakeholders. The implementation of the plans is rigorously monitored and reported on. Implementation challenges are actively managed for effective and efficient resolution.

### **Importance of the evaluation**

Operation Phakisa has since been implemented seven times in the health, education, economy, environment and agricultural sectors. The seven components include: (1). Oceans Economy; (2) Scaling up the Ideal Clinic Realisation and Maintenance Programme; (3) Leveraging Information Communication Technology (ICT) ICT in Basic Education; (4) Galvanising Growth, Investment and Employment Creation along the Mining Value Chain and Mining Related Communities; (5) Biodiversity; (6) Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development and (7) Chemical and Waste Economy.

The health Phakisa alone aims to have an impact on 47 million people while the education one aims to improve the experience of 12 million learners. The oceans economy aims to create 800 000 jobs by 2030. It is clear that the footprint of this model aims to improve the lives of many south Africans.

### **Purpose of the evaluation:**

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the Operation Phakisa implementation model and the extent to which it has achieved its objectives.

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

1. To what extent is the Phakisa methodology relevant and appropriate?
  - 1.1 Is the theory of change relevant and credible?
  - 1.2 Is the methodology relevant to national priorities?
  - 1.3 Is the methodology relevant to the manner in which government works?
2. To what extent has Operation Phakisa been effective in achieving its objectives?
  - 2.1 Have results been achieved and are they implementable?
  - 2.2 Are the results measurable?
3. To what extent has the Operation Phakisa model been effectively implemented?
  - 3.1 To what extent has the Operation Phakisa implementing model been effective, relevant and appropriate?

- 3.2 To what extent has the implementation been assimilated into government plans and operations?
- 3.3 To what extent has the capacity to implement plans been requisite and relevant?
- 3.4 Have the monitoring mechanisms been effective?
4. To what extent has the Programme been efficiently implemented?
  - 4.1 How efficiently has the implementation been managed?
  - 4.2 Has the Programme been cost-effective in terms of funds spent and the achievement of outputs and targets?
- 5 To what extent is Operation Phakisa sustainable?
  - 5.1 Is the model sustainable financially?
  - 5.2 Are there long term partnerships that have been established through implementation and are these potentially sustainable?  
What key lessons can be learnt for improvement and continuation of Operation Phakisa?
- 6 Is there good practice emerging from the implementation?
- 7 What lessons can be learnt?
- 8 What are the recommendations from the evaluation that can inform the way forward for this model?

### **Principal audience**

The primary audience would be those departments who have led the implementation of the various Operation Phakisa projects namely; Departments of Environmental Affairs, Transport, Health, Education, Mineral Resources, Rural Development and Land Reform, Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries.

Other departments could also be interested in the evaluation for potential Operation Phakisa projects.

**Type of evaluation:** Implementation evaluation which looks into aspects of design.

**Cost:** R 2.5 million- R3 million  
**Timeline:** April 2018 – March 2017

## 5 Way forward

Preparation for the 2018/19 evaluations started in September 2017 with a 3-day theory of change workshop and design clinic. This brought the relevant stakeholders together to generate the initial information for the summary for the NEP, and to develop the basis for the terms of reference. Most TORs are set to be completed so that procurement can start in February 2018. The intention is for the evaluations to be in full flow by the time the financial year begins and the substantive work can be completed by the December 2018 break, with work to develop improvement plans substantially completed by 15 March 2019. This means that the evaluations should in most cases be completed within the 2018/19 financial year.

As we broaden the reach of the NES by starting to engage with SOEs and municipalities, we will also seek to strengthen monitoring the use of improvement plans in the national and provincial sphere. Tracking the use of improvement plans is imperative to determining the impact of the system.