



planning, monitoring
and evaluation

Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

National Evaluation Plan 2016-17 to 2018-19

26 April 2016

Contact: Dr Ian Goldman, DPME
East Wing, Union Buildings, Pretoria, 0001, South Africa.
Tel: +27 12 312 0155
Email: evaluations@presidency-dpme.org.za
Web: www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za

Foreword

45 evaluations are now completed or underway, and the results are coming through regularly to Cabinet. Cabinet is taking these very seriously, and Ministers are reading the reports carefully. These evaluations are showing us where we need to improve if we want to have the impacts on citizens that government is committed to achieve. These evaluations will be part of ensuring these better services, and that these services have bigger impacts on people's lives. In these evaluations we talk to citizens about their experience of the programmes, which is then fed back into the redesign. Most of the first evaluations have resulted in significant changes to the programmes or policies being evaluated, indicating the commitment of departments to use the findings for learning.

This National Evaluation Plan (NEP) for 2016-7 to 2018-19 is the fifth NEP, proposing the next 9 programmes and policies to focus on – important ones such as the Integrated Justice System, the Older Person's Act, government's business incentives, or the City Support Programme – all touching on important areas of people's lives. The wider National Evaluation System is increasingly established with 19 approved guidelines and templates, evaluation standards, competencies for evaluators and government staff managing evaluations, a suite of courses being developed and over 800 people trained so far. Seven provinces now have approved Provincial Evaluation Plans (Western Cape, Gauteng, Mpumalanga, Free State, E Cape, N Cape and Limpopo). Six departments now have approved departmental evaluation plans and a new MPAT standard on evaluation is driving the need for departmental evaluation plans. This demonstrates evaluations becoming institutionalised in government.

We have also established strong links with peer countries in Mexico, Colombia, Uganda, Benin and Kenya, where we are actively sharing experiences and tools around evaluation. We are starting a new African M&E Partnership through the Twende Mbele Programme, with our initial partners Uganda, Benin and the CLEAR Initiative. We will use this to share experiences 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 nationally and internationally.

Many thanks to the development partners who have been assisting us over the last year, including the UK's Department for International Development, the International Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR), the World Bank and the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie).

Minister: J T Radebe
Minister of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
April 2016

Photo of minister

Contents

Glossary	iv
Executive summary	viii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Framework	1
1.2 Purpose of the National Evaluation Plan (NEP)	2
1.3 Criteria and process used for selection	2
1.4 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system	3
2 Progress with evaluations	4
2.1 Progress with implementation of evaluations to date	4
2.2 Status of improvement plans	8
3 Summary of approved evaluations for 2016/17	10
4 Concepts for evaluations for 2016/17	14
4.1 Implementation Evaluation of Integrated Justice System (IJS)	14
4.2 Implementation evaluation of the Birth Registration within 30 days Programme	16
4.3 Design/Implementation Evaluation of National Space Strategy	18
4.4 Implementation Evaluation of Environmental Impact Assessments and its contribution toward sustainable development	20
4.5 Implementation Evaluation of Older Persons Act 13 of 2006	22
4.6 Evaluation of the TVET Colleges Expansion and Capacity Development Programme	24
4.7 Evaluation of Government Business Incentives	27
4.8 Evaluation of evaluations	29
5 Outline of evaluations proposed for 2017/18	31
6 Way forward	32

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 for Violence Against Women and Children
BNG	Breaking New Ground
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
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 Financial Institutions
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 Settlements
DMV	Department of Military Veterans
DoL	Department of Labour

DPME	Department of Performance 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
DWA	Department of Water Affairs
DWCPD	Department of Women, Children and People with Disabilities
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	Sector Expanded Public Works Programme
ERP	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
JCPSC	Justice Crime Prevention and Security Cluster
LRB	Late Registration of Birth
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
NPR	National Population Register
NRDS	National Research and Development Strategy (of DST)
NRF	National Research Foundation
NSC	National Senior Certificate (matric)
NSDS	National Skills Development Strategy
NSF	National Skill Fund
NSI	National System of Innovation
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
PIVA	Person Identification and Verification Application
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
SANSA	South African National Space Agency
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
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
TOD	transit oriented development
TVET	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. 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 projects. It envisages evaluation as a process carried out throughout the intervention lifecycle, including prior to development of an intervention (a diagnostic evaluation), to confirm the design (design evaluation), to assess progress and how implementation can be improved (implementation evaluation), to assess impact (impact evaluation), and to see the relationship between costs and benefits (economic evaluation). The NEPF envisages a 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.

2 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system in 2014/15 and underway in 2015/16

DPME has developed 21 guidelines and templates on various components of the evaluation process to support departments undertaking evaluations. An important new guideline was developed in 2015 on how to develop Departmental Evaluation Plans. All guidelines are being revised to cater for Provincial Evaluation Plans. 141 Evaluations are now on the evaluation repository which is available to the public on the DPME website, <http://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/sites/EvaluationsHome/SitePages/Home.aspx>.

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. Over 1200 staff have been trained.

3 Progress with evaluations

54 evaluations are completed or underway, including the 2016/17 evaluations proposed in this plan as shown in the table below:

Table 1: Status of evaluations as at 31 March 2016

Approved evaluation reports	Improvement plans being implemented	Served at Cabinet	Research process underway	Preparation stage	Stuck	Dropped
25 (up from 15 on 30 September 2015)	16	13	16	12	1 ¹	5 ²

4-5 Summary of Approved Evaluations for 2016/17 and 2017/18

The evaluations that have been proposed for 2016/17 and 2017/18 are shown in the table below

¹ Asset Forfeiture Unit

² Outcomes (problem with service provider), Ilima Letsema (delayed and no budget), Mining Charter (timing bad in relation to Mining Phakisa), National Senior Certificate (Ministerial Review happening), National School Nutrition Programme (dropped from 2013/14 and reinstated 2015/16)

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated
2016/17	
Trade and Industry, Treasury, plus others	Business incentives
Higher Education and Training	Evaluation of the Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Colleges Expansion and Capacity Development Programme
Justice	Implementation/ Design Evaluation of the Integrated Justice System / Programme
Social Development	Implementation Evaluation of Older Persons Act
National Treasury	Evaluation of City Support
Home Affairs	Evaluation of Birth Registration Programme
Environmental Affairs	The Impact of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regime of sustainable development
Science & Technology	Design and Implementation Evaluation of the National Space Strategy (
2017/18	
Basic Education	Evaluation of Kha Ri Gude Programme
Public Enterprises	Competitive Supplier Development Programme

6 Way forward

Preparation for the 2016/17 evaluations started in September 2015 with a theory of change workshop and a 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 completed so that procurement can start in February 2016. 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 2016 break, with work on improvement plans substantially completed by 15 March 2017. This means that the evaluations should in most cases be completed within the 2016/17 financial year.

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 R1 million 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 2016/17 to 2018/19, 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 April 2015 with letters sent to all national Directors-General. Three evaluations were carryovers and so there was space for five new evaluations, for a total of eight evaluations for the year. 15 proposals were received in total and selection of the additional 5 for 2016/17 was undertaken by a cross-government Evaluation Technical Working Group on 28 July 2015. In addition a very high priority national evaluation was added on Business Incentives, with funds allocated directly through the MinComBud process for this. As the Plan is drafted midway through the year, it reports on progress to 30 September in 2015/16.

1.4 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system

The Annual Reports for 2013-14 and 2014-15 summarise progress on implementing the national evaluation system, as well as the findings and status of individual evaluations. 21 guidelines have now been produced, standards, competences, 5 courses with over 1200 staff trained. Key is the widening of the system to 7 provinces, and the introduction of a MPAT standard on evaluation, which includes the requirement for staff with evaluation training, production of a departmental evaluation plan, and carrying out of evaluations. This is driving behaviour and we can expect to see at least 40 non-NEP evaluations being carried out in 2016/17, with the likelihood of numbers rising to 200 per year by 2021.

2 Progress with evaluations

2.1 Progress with implementation of evaluations to date

The Plan was actually written in October 2015, but has been revised in March 2016 as the Plan was not tabled in Cabinet in November 2015 as expected. The table below summarises progress as at 31 March 2016 with 54 evaluations completed or underway to date, including the 2016/17 evaluations. The detailed report on progress is still at 30 September 2015.

Table 1: Status of evaluations as at 31 March 2016

Approved evaluation reports	Improvement plans being implemented	Served at Cabinet	Research process underway	Preparation stage	Stuck	Dropped
25 (15 as at 30 September 2015)	16	13	16	12	1 ³	5 ⁴

A 2015-16 Annual Report will have detail on each evaluation as at 31 March 2016, including the key findings, and what has happened in those evaluations where there is already use of the findings. Table 2 shows the status of each evaluation.

³ Asset Forfeiture Unit

⁴ Outcomes (problem with service provider), Ilima Letsema (delayed and no budget), Mining Charter (timing bad in relation to Mining Phakisa), National Senior Certificate (Ministerial Review happening), National School Nutrition Programme (dropped from 2013/14 and reinstated 2015/16)

Table 2: Status of evaluations as at 30 September 2015

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Status as at 30 September 2015
2011/12		
Social Development, Basic Education, Health	Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development	New policy gazetted
2012/13		
Trade and Industry	Implementation/ design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme (BPS)	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan being implemented. 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, DRDLR, DWCPD)	Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing Children Under 5	Final report approved by Cabinet. Nutrition Plan being developed with Food Security.
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)	Evaluation underway.
Human Settlements	Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)	Report approved. Changes made already to guidelines. About to be tabled at cabinet.
Basic Education	Impact Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP)	Stopped and restarted in 2014/15.
2013-14		
Trade and Industry	Evaluation of Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive programme (EMIAI)	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan being implemented.
Trade and Industry	Evaluation of Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII)	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan being implemented. Scheme relaunched.
Trade and Industry	Impact Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)	Report approved. About to be tabled at cabinet.
Military Veterans	Evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme.	Report approved.
Science and Technology	Evaluation of National Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (AMTS)	Stuck due to illness in evaluators. Stopped.
South African Revenue Services	Impact Evaluation on Tax Compliance Cost of small businesses	Draft report

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Status as at 30 September 2015
Co-operative Governance	Impact evaluation of the Community Works Programme (CWP)	Report approved.
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. About to be tabled at cluster and cabinet.
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Implementation Evaluation of MAFISA	Report approved. About to be tabled at cluster and cabinet.
Human Settlements	Setting a baseline for future impact evaluations for the informal settlements targeted for upgrading	Delayed by DHS procurement. Final report expected in October 2015.
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.
Human Settlements	Diagnostic of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities	Delayed by DHS procurement. Draft report being revised.
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact Evaluation of the Outcomes Approach	Major problems with implementation of the evaluation by the service provider. Stopped. Will restart at appropriate time for MTSF.
Presidency	Implementation Evaluation of Government's Coordination Systems	Final report approved by Cabinet. Improvement plan approved by FOSAD Manco June 2015.
Basic Education	Evaluation of the quality of the National Senior Certificate (NSC)	Dropped as a Ministerial Review underway
2014-15		
Environmental Affairs	Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Environmental Governance in the Mining Sector (EEGM)	Report approved. Being used as input for Mining Phakisa. Tabled soon at cluster/Cabinet.
Higher Education and Training	Design Evaluation of the Policy on Community Education and Training Colleges (PCETC)	Report approved. Changes made to policy. Tabled soon at cluster/Cabinet.
Human Settlements	Impact/Implementation Evaluation of the Social Housing Programme (SHP)	Draft report
Science and Technology	Evaluation of the Indigenous Knowledge Systems Policy (IKSP)	Underway
Social Development	Diagnostic Evaluation/ Programme Audit for Violence Against Women and Children (AVAWC)	Evaluation stopped due to inadequate performance. Will be readvertised.
Social Development	Diagnostic Review of the Social Sector Expanded Public Works Programme	Report approved, been to cluster and being tabled soon at Cabinet.
South African Police Service	Economic Evaluation of the Incremental Investment into the SAPS Forensic Services (SAPS)	Stuck – problems accessing information.
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries/ Rural	Implementation Evaluation of the Ilima Letsema Programme and	Dropped – due to delays carried over to

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Status as at 30 September 2015
Development and Land Reform	cost-benefit analysis of the revitalisation of existing Irrigation Schemes	2015-16 and no budget.
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Impact evaluation of MAFISA (quantitative) including establishing a baseline	Evaluation stopped following termination of the programme by Treasury. Instead doing impact evaluation of Extension Recovery Programme
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Policy Evaluation of Small Farmer Support	Underway.
Basic Education	Evaluation of the Funza-Lushaka Bursary Scheme	Report approved. Awaiting management response and improvement plan.
Basic Education	Implementation Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme	Draft report received.
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 Strategic Planning/APP system	Service provider appointed.
2015-16		
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Agricultural Extension Recovery Plan	Underway
Basic Education	Evaluation of CAPS/New School Curriculum	Underway
National Prosecuting Authority	Evaluation of the Asset Forfeiture Unit Sub-programme	Stuck due to changes in NPA.
Social Development	Diagnostic evaluation of the Non-Profit Organisations Regulatory Framework and Legislation	Underway
Social Development	Implementation Evaluation of the National Drug Master Plan in addressing all forms of Substance abuse	Service provide appointed
Higher Education and Training	Evaluation of the National Qualifications Framework Act (NQFA)	TORs not yet finalised
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)	Draft report received.
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact/implementation evaluation of the evaluation system	Delayed to 2016/17 as insufficient budget

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

Evaluation	Date Evaluation Report approved and improvement plan submitted	Expected/Received date of 1 st IP report	2 nd Report Received/Expected
Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development (ECD)	Report: 15 June 2012 IP: 16 October 2015	Received 19 August 2014	Report received 5 June 2015
Evaluation of Business Process Services Programmes	Report: 16 May 2013 IP: 9 June 2014	Two progress reports have been received. Last progress report received 17 July 2015.	Report received on 3 August 2015
Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing Children under 5	Report: 31 March 2014 IP produced on 6 September 2014	Report was due 30 September	Report expected 15 December
Impact Evaluation of Grade R	Report: 15 June 2013: IP: 14 April 2014	Report received 25 June 2015	Expected 24 December 2015
Implementation Evaluation of Land Recapitalisation and Development Programme (RECAP)	Report: 27 September 2013 IP: 10 February 2014	Report was due end of August 2014. First report received 20 October 2015	Report was due 31 October 2014
Implementation Evaluation of Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)	Report: 1 November 2013 IP: 10 February 2014	Report was due end of August 2014. First report received 20 October 2015	
Implementation Evaluation of the Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme (EMIA)	Report: 26 May 2014 IP: 6 January 2015	1 st report received on 3 August 2015	Next report is due December 2015
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 was due 30 July 2015	No expected date
Implementation evaluation of Restitution Programme	Report: 28 February 2014 IP: 2014	First report received 20 October 2015	
Evaluation of the Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII)	Report: 21 May 2014 IP: 8 January 2015	Received in July 2015	Report expected December 2015
Evaluation of Technology and Human	Report: 30 March 2015	Report expected in November	

Evaluation	Date Evaluation Report approved and improvement plan submitted	Expected/Received date of 1 st IP report	2 nd Report Received/Expected
Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)	IP: 12 June 2015	2015	
Diagnostic Review of the Social Sector Expanded Public Works Programme	Report: 19 June 2015 IP developed 26 June 2015	Report expected 31 March 2016	Report expected September 2016

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 evaluations to date

Programme evaluated	Progress in implementing findings
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
CRDP	Substantial revisions to operations
Recapitalisation and Development Programme (RADP)	Substantial revisions to operations
Nutrition interventions for children under 5	Nutrition plan being developed integrated with Food Security strategy. 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 2016/17

A call was issued at the end of April 2015 for proposals for evaluations to be included in the National Evaluation Plan for 2016/17 to 2018/19. 19 departments participated in briefings.

The evaluation technical working group met on 28 July 2015 to review proposals for the 2016/7+2 evaluations. There was a big challenge this year given that there were 15 proposals but only available places for 5 evaluations, as three evaluations were already decided.

Table 4: Summary of approved evaluations for 2016/17

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
Higher Education and Training	Evaluation of the Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) Colleges Expansion and Capacity Development Programme	The National Skills Fund (NSF) was established in 1999 in terms of the Skills Development Act, 1998 (as amended). In October 2011, the Minister of Higher Education and Training requested the NSF to release a portion of the surplus (uncommitted) funds from the Discretionary Projects Programme to support the expansion of student enrolment in TVET Colleges. Following the Minister's request, the NSF set aside a budget of R2.5 billion for the College Expansion Programme. It is expected that approximately 102,000 more students/learners will access learning opportunities at TVET Colleges through the above-mentioned NSF allocation of funding over the 3-year period (2012-2015). The College Expansion Programme has four main objectives; to support TVET Colleges to enrol a larger number of students, particularly in artisanal-related programmes and programmes that would support the needs of the economy; to support TVET Colleges to offer a broader set of programmes through an expanded programme-qualification mix; to support TVET Colleges to expand student access to workplace-based learning (WBL) through learnerships (including artisanships) and internships; and d) to support TVET Colleges to build the capacity of their staff. The evaluation will therefore inform the management structures of the DHET and the NSF whether to continue funding similar programmes such as the TVET College Expansion and Capacity Development Programme. This evaluation is important because it will inform the management structures of the DHET and the NSF whether to continue funding similar programmes such as the TVET College Expansion and Capacity Development Programme.
Justice	Implementation/ Design Evaluation of the Integrated Justice System / Programme	The IJS derives its mandate from the Justice Crime Prevention and Security (JCPS) Cluster's Strategy, which in turn derives its mandate from Outcome 3 (All People in South Africa are and feel safe) of the Delivery Agreement with the South African Government. The Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) Sub-outcome 2 {An Efficient and Effective Criminal Justice System(CJS) } seeks to realize Vision 2030 of the National Development Plan (NDP) Chapter 12 – Building Safe Communities, that requires that people living in South Africa feel safe at home, at school and at work and that they enjoy a community life free of fear. The implementation of the IJS programme is intended to provide South Africa with a world-class integrated criminal justice system that will address system blockages such, non-existence of functional and business integration amongst JCPS departments, policy misalignment, lack of timely access to criminal record history and

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
		notification of events, imbalances in the level of automation of departments and incompatible information technology platforms, and a lack of quality information and information sharing. Estimated total budget for the intervention (over 3 year MTEF period) is R1,5 billion.
Social Development	Implementation Evaluation of Older Persons Act	The Department of Social Development has developed the Older Persons Act (Act 13 Of 2006) to protect and empower older persons. The Act and its Regulations came into effect on the 1st of April, 2010 and calls for a developmental approach in dealing with ageing issues. The objective of the Act is to deal effectively with the plight of older persons by establishing a framework aimed at the empowerment and protection of older persons and at the promotion and maintenance of their status, rights, well-being, safety and security; and to provide for matters connected therewith. The aim of the Older Persons Act is to move services from institutional care to community-based care and support services. There are 4.5 million Older Persons in South Africa and this is about 8.3% of the population. The 2014/15 financial year budget for the intervention was R13 million for DSD national department and R1.1 billion for the DSD Provincial department. This evaluation is important and timely because the DSD is in the process of amending the Act and the findings of the evaluation will therefore strengthen the implementation of the amended Act.
National Treasury	Evaluation of City Support Programme (CSP)	<p>The CSP is a demand-driven and “umbrella” programme that covers a range of support mechanisms for metropolitan municipalities and the broader intergovernmental environment to contribute to the achievement of well governed, inclusive, productive, sustainable cities. These mechanisms are implemented in three main areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating an enabling intergovernmental environment for city transformation through changes in the policy and regulatory environment • Restructuring the fiscal and financial framework for the cities • City implementation support. Providing and integrated package of implementation support to cities <p>The CSP responds to the challenges of cities in South Africa - they are insufficiently productive, segregated and exclusionary, unsustainable and governance is fragmented and failing to deal with the legacy of apartheid. Productive, inclusive and sustainable cities are pre-requisites for urban economic growth and a reduction in poverty and inequality. The budget for intervention (not for the evaluation) for 2014/15 financial year is R225 million (R75 million in technical support and R150 million on grant support to cities for expenditure in integration zones), ie approximately R700 million over the MTEF period.</p>
Home Affairs	Evaluation of Birth Registration Programme	The early registration of birth is essential to ensure the integrity of the National Population Register, which is used to affirm the identity and status of citizens and gives them access to rights and services. The focus of the birth registration programme is to ensure that all births in South Africa are registered within 30 days to secure identity, civil status and the National Population Register. Under colonialism and apartheid the births of Africans in particular were not systematically captured, necessitating a Late Registration of Birth (LRB) procedure that led to widespread fraudulent acquisition of identities and citizenship. The number of children registered within the legislated 30 days of birth has increased from 46% in 2010-2011 to 64% in 2014-2015. A significant development is the replacement of the abridged birth certificate with a full birth certificate that can be printed in frontline offices. The capturing of both parents details to secure the identity of the child is an important feature and is now a

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
		<p>requirement for any minor travelling through a Port of Entry. Amendments to Legislation have also drastically increased penalties for identity and vital registration fraud. Another critical development is the ending of the current LRB regime in December 2015 and replacing it with much more rigorous requirements and escalating penalties for those who register births after 30 days. Of particular concern are the poor, the vulnerable, and the marginalised, rural and institutionalised populations. The evaluation will assess how the system is working and how it can be strengthened.</p>
Science and Technology	Design and Implementation Evaluation of the National Space Strategy	<p>South Africa needs to become a competitor globally and an exporter of technology in order to increase country's share in the global space and be an independent country. Space applications have already been useful from an overall societal perspective, and could be of further assistance in addressing major societal challenges over the coming decade. The five major societal challenges that space can address are related to the state of the environment, the management and use of natural resources, the increasing mobility of individuals and products and its consequences, growing security threats, and the shift towards the information society. The Department of Science and Technology resuscitated the national space programme in 2005. The policy and strategy of the programme were approved by 2008.</p> <p>The findings of the evaluation will enhance the DST's understanding on the implementation and effectiveness of the strategy through assessing the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support on targeted training and awareness programmes which promotes skills development in key space science and technology areas (satellite engineering and space applications development) for academia, public and private industry and also contributes towards outcome one and five. • Contribution of the Department in supporting manufacturing of satellite by upgrading existing and the development of new space infrastructure which contributes towards outcome six, ten, and eleven. • Contribution of the DST on acquiring, processing and distribution of space – based data for the development of space applications (products and services) for use by national and provincial government departments, parastatals, science councils, Non – government organisations and tertiary education institution which contributes to outcome two, three, seven, eight, 10 and 11. <p>The budget for the intervention for the 2014/15 financial year is R 355 million with an estimated total budget for the intervention (over 5 year MTEF period) of R 8 billion.</p>
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Evaluation of the evaluation system	<p>The Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency was established in 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. The basic evaluation system is now fairly well established based on National Evaluation Plans with 47 evaluations completed or underway covering around R75 billion of government expenditure (MTEF). The evaluation will look at the uptake of evaluation results, how the systems are working and proposed ways of strengthening it.</p>
Environmental	The Impact of the	NEMA's environmental impact management regime, particularly the process known as the Environmental Impact

Name of Department	Intervention to be evaluated	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
Affairs	Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regime of sustainable development	Assessment (EIA) process, has been South Africa's key regulatory instruments to mitigate and/or manage the impacts of new developments and activities that are considered to potentially undermine everyone's right to an environment that is not harmful to health and well-being. The evaluation is important as it will assess the effectiveness and credibility of the EIA process and its contribution toward sustainable development. The Department of Environmental Affairs is in the process of reviewing the EIA Regulations and developing a Coordinated Integrated Permitting System. This evaluation will inform the refinement of the Regulations and system development. The 2013/14 financial year budget for the intervention amounts to hundreds of million rands for the State and the developers. Around 100 000 South Africans participate directly in EIAs every year.
Dti, Treasury, plus others	Evaluation of Business Incentives	A number of evaluations have been conducted of specific incentives schemes – ranging from dti incentives such as Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII), SARS (Tax reform for small businesses), DRDLR - Land Recapitalisation and Development, to microfinance by DAFF (MAFISA). However these have been conducted as separate evaluations without a bigger picture of the incentives environment and how these add together. This year more than R7 billion will be transferred directly from the fiscus to private companies to support business activity. In addition, the government foregoes at least R25 billion in revenue each year as part of various tax incentives to the private sector. The Ministers' Committee on the Budget has requested a detailed assessment of the impact of business incentives on economic growth, productivity, empowerment, competitiveness, the balance of trade and employment creation.

4 Concepts for evaluations for 2016/17

4.1 Implementation Evaluation of Integrated Justice System (IJS)

Implementing Department: Department of Justice and Constitutional Development

Background to the programme

The IJS derives its mandate from the Justice Crime Prevention and Security (JCPS) Cluster's Strategy, which in turn derives its mandate from Outcome 3 (All People in South Africa are and feel safe) of the Delivery Agreement with the South African Government. The Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) Sub-outcome 2 {An Efficient and Effective Criminal Justice System(CJS) } seeks to realize Vision 2030 of the National Development Plan (NDP) Chapter 12 – Building Safe Communities, that requires that people living in South Africa feel safe at home, at school and at work and that they enjoy a community life free of fear. The IJS forms part of the “Seven Point Plan” of strengthening the Criminal Justice System. As part of the seven point plan departments participating in the IJS are expected to do the following:

- Electronically enable and integrate the end-to-end criminal justice business processes (i.e. from the report of a crime to the release of a convicted person), through technology solutions; and
- Manage the related inter-departmental information exchanges across the CJS

The following key five (5) focus priorities have been set for delivery by the IJS programme:

1. Establish a single person identifier across the Criminal Justice System (CJS);
2. Development and rollout of the Person Identification and Verification Application (PIVA), and other person related integrations for searches, fast criminal record checks and Fingerprint Identification.
3. The integration of the departmental case related systems.
4. The ongoing development of an integrated CJS performance information dashboard that will display the initially identified 28 Key Performance Indicators;
5. The establishment of a single data store for the JCPS cluster for statistical purposes.

Other key departments that are involved in the IJS Programme include: South African Police Services (SAPS), National Prosecuting Authority (NPA), Department of Social Development (DSD), Department of Home Affairs (DHA), Department of Correctional Services (DCS) and Legal Aid South Africa (Legal Aid SA) and Office of the Chief Justice (OCJ).

Importance of the evaluation

The implementation of the IJS programme is intended to provide South Africa with a world-class integrated criminal justice system that will address system blockages such, non-existence of functional and business integration amongst JCPS departments, policy misalignment, lack of timely access to criminal record history and notification of events, imbalances in the level of automation of departments and incompatible information technology platforms, and a lack of quality information and information sharing.

The evaluation should verify and validate whether:

- the implementation is on track,
- the right things are done right the first time,
- there's commitment and smooth coordination amongst the participating departments,
- the complex interdepartmental change effort is being managed effectively and in an integrated way.
- the programme organised appropriately and resourced adequately to achieve its intended objectives.

The evaluation should make recommendations that will help to address the gaps that exist and overcome shortcomings identified in development and implementation of IJS.

Purpose of the evaluation: To assess effectiveness and efficiency of implementation of the IJS Programme.

Key questions to be addressed

1. Is the programme designed in a manner that supports a plausible TOC and is conducive for effective delivery of IJS objectives?
2. What is the extent of stakeholder involvement and buy-in?
3. What are the successes and challenges within the key data systems?
4. Is the programme adequately resourced for effective implementation of its plans?
5. How do other external factors (Legislation, Delivery Agreements, and ICT Systems) influence the delivery of the IJS?

Principal audience

National and provincial law and policy makers, JCPS Cluster, IJS Board, IJS Programme Management Office, Department of Justice and Constitutional Development - Strategy, Monitoring and Evaluation in Office of the COO.

Type of evaluation: Implementation evaluation

Management strategy

The implementation strategy of the IJS programme has been divided into three steps:

- **Step1** - Creating / upgrading departmental system capability to support and automate business process flow;
- **Step2** - Integrating the criminal justice business process; and
- **Step3** - Criminal Justice System end-to-end business performance measurement capability.

The dependency on the departments to modernise their ICT system so that they can ultimately integrate should be monitored close and resources sufficiently in order ensure seamless integration.

Supplier and service level management is critical to the success of the programme as most of the delivery work is undertaken mostly by SITA and other external service providers.

Cost: The evaluation will cost approximately R3 million funded R1 million by DPME and R2 million by DOJCD (IJS Programme).

Timeline: The evaluation will be undertaken between April 2016 and February 2017

4.2 Implementation evaluation of the Birth Registration within 30 days Programme

Implementing Department: Department of Home Affairs

Background to the evaluation

The early registration of birth is essential to ensure the integrity of the National Population Register, which is used to affirm the identity and status of citizens and gives them access to rights and services. The births of Africans in particular were not systematically captured under colonialism and apartheid, necessitating a Late Registration of Birth (LRB) procedure that led to widespread fraudulent acquisition of identities and citizenship.

Since the National Population Registration Campaign was launched by the then Minister of Home Affairs, N C Dlamini-Zuma, supported by President Zuma in March 2010 the number of children registered within the legislated 30 days of birth has increased from 46% in 2010-2011 to 64% in 2014-2015. Outreach campaigns that covered the country, assisted by newly established Stakeholder Forums registered the births of about 1 million “invisible” citizens using LRB committees to interview and screen applicants. Other Departments joined Local Government and community leaders in the Stakeholder Forums, notably Health, Basic Education and Social Development. An innovative communications campaign used a range of media and events.

The DHA has invested in connecting a total of 398 hospitals and to DHA birth and deaths registration systems to improve access. The focus now is for local DHA office heads to manage service points in hospitals better and build stronger relationships with health facilities.

Another significant development is the replacement of the abridged birth certificate with a full birth certificate that can be printed in frontline offices. The capturing of both parents details to secure the identity of the child is an important feature and is now a requirement for any minor travelling through a Port of Entry. Amendments to Legislation have also drastically increased penalties for identity and vital registration fraud.

Another critical development is the ending of the current LRB regime in December 2015 and replacing it with much more rigorous requirements and escalating penalties for those who register births after 30 days.

In 2016/ 2017 a pilot project will be launched with the Department of Health, probably in Mpumalanga for hospitals to record all births so offices can set as a target the registration of 95% of these births. Gauteng, the top-performing province, achieves about 70% currently.

Importance of the evaluation

The focus of the birth registration programme is to ensure that all births in South Africa are registered within 30 days to secure identity, civil status and the National Population Register. Of particular concern are the poor, the vulnerable, the marginalised, rural and institutionalised populations.

These should not be general but should be taken from the original programme plan, policy document etc.

- 95% of births registered within 30 days.
- Introducing far more string late registration of birth regime.
- Securing documents and process against fraud.

Purpose of the evaluation: The evaluation will essentially be an impact study of policy, strategic and operational initiatives.

Key questions to be addressed

1. What are the main causes of the inaccuracies of the National Population Register (NPR)?
2. Why parents are not registering births within 30 days?
3. Why are birth certificates not issued correctly?
4. Why data inputs are not correctly captured?
5. Are control measures adequate and verified accurately?
6. Is the frontline footprint adequate and sufficiently resourced?
7. Why are the standard operating procedures (SOPs) not properly followed in some offices?
8. What needs to happen to strengthen the birth registration system?
9. How do we strengthen prevention of fraud and corruption?
10. What experiences can we draw from similar countries? (around birth registration processes and NPR)

Principal audience

Department of Health, Department of Basic Education, Statistics South Africa, Department of Social Development, Provincial Stakeholder Forums, Non-Governmental Organisations, UNICEF and

Type of evaluation: Implementation evaluation

Management strategy

The Department of Home Affairs focuses on the birth registration strategy, to ensure that all births in South Africa are registered within 30 days to secure identity, civil status and the National Population Register. Of particular concern are the poor, the vulnerable, the marginalised, rural and institutionalised populations.

Cost: The evaluation will cost approximately R 3 million funded R1 million by DPME and R2 million by DHA.

Timeline: The evaluation will be undertaken between April 2016 and February 2017

4.3 Design/Implementation Evaluation of National Space Strategy

Implementing Department Department of Science and Technology

Background to the evaluation

South Africa has been an active participant in the exploration of space since the dawn of the Space Age. From the 1950s to the 1970s satellites were tracked to determine the effects of the upper atmosphere on their orbits. Lunar and interplanetary missions were supported from a tracking station at Hartebeesthoek. This station received images of the planet Mars taken by the Mariner IV spacecraft - the first images of Mars and of another planet to be received on Earth. In the late 1980s South Africa commenced a military programme to develop a launcher and a reconnaissance satellite but this was discontinued in 1994. The Department of Science and Technology resuscitated the national space programme in 2005. The policy and strategy of the programme were approved by 2008. South Africa needs to become a competitor globally and an exporter of technology in order to increase country's share in the global space and be an independent country.

Space applications have already been useful from an overall societal perspective, and could be of further assistance in addressing major societal challenges over the coming decade. The five major societal challenges that space can address are related to the state of the environment, the management and use of natural resources, the increasing mobility of individuals and products and its consequences, growing security threats, and the shift towards the information society.

The rationale for pursuing space science and technology includes:

- South Africa owns space facilities and operational centers of excellence;
- South Africa retains a space heritage that is not completely lost, i.e., the Greensat programme
- A technology demonstrator micro satellite has already been flown and another prepared for launch;
- There are some world-class aerospace South African prime contractors in the country producing high quality products and operating within a sound industrial quality framework that can be expanded to encompass the essential processes required for a successful space programme;
- The country can rely on innovative engineers developing low cost systems and demonstrate a flair to invent and exploit niche market opportunities;
- The South African space community also owns some valuable proprietary technologies for space such as image processing and applications and micro satellite equipment.
- More broadly, South Africa can play a lead role in the development of the African Continent and space science and technology is a key instrument.

Importance of the Evaluation:

The findings of the evaluation will enhance the DST's understanding on the implementation and effectiveness of the strategy through assessing the;

- Support on targeted training and awareness programme which promotes skills development in key space science and technology areas (satellite engineering and space applications development) for academia, public and private industry and also contributes towards outcome one: improved quality of basic education, outcome five: skilled and capable workforce to support inclusive growth and the space science grand challenge by creating awareness of the importance of Space Science and Technology (SST) with the aim to increase the youth's interest and uptake of Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) subjects.
- Contribution of the Department in supporting manufacturing of satellite by upgrading existing and the development of new space infrastructure which contributes towards outcome six: an efficient, competitive and responsive economic infrastructure network, outcome seven: comprehensive rural development and outcome 10: protect and enhance our environmental assets and natural resources and 11: creating a better south Africa, better Africa and better world.
- Contribution of the DST on acquiring, processing and distribution of space – based data for the development of space applications (products and services) for use by national and provincial government departments, parastatals, science councils, Non – government organisations and tertiary education institution which contributes to outcome two, three, seven, eight, 10 and 11.

The findings of the evaluation will be utilised to inform policy development, decision making and the review of the National Space Strategy (NSS).

Purpose of the evaluation

To assess effectiveness of the implementation of the NSS to date, and explore the extent to which the anticipated outcomes have been achieved.

Main evaluation Questions

1. To what extent is the NSS design relevant and appropriate?
2. To what extent has the NSS been implemented?
3. What evidence exists that indicate that the NSS has been effective towards achieving its objectives?
4. To what extent do the space activities and programmes have the institutional capacity, human resource and financial support to ensure sustainably?
5. To what extent have the resources going into implementation of the strategy led to effective outputs?
6. What evidence exists that demonstrates the emerging impact of the NSS?

Principal Audience

DST executive and policy makers, South African National Space Agency (SANSa), Department of Trade and Industry (the dti), Department of Defence (DoD), Department of Telecommunications and Postal Services (DTPS), Department of Public Enterprise (DPE), Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), space industry, science councils and beneficiaries of the space programmes.

Type of evaluation: Implementation Evaluation

Management Strategy

The evaluation will be managed by the DST in collaboration with the DPME

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

Timeline: The evaluation will be undertaken between 2016/17 and 2017/18.

4.4 Implementation Evaluation of Environmental Impact Assessments and its contribution toward sustainable development

Implementing Department: Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA)

Background to the evaluation

NEMA's environmental impact management regime, especially the process known as the EIA process, has been South Africa's key regulatory instruments to mitigate and/or manage the impacts of new developments and activities that are considered to potentially undermine everyone's right to an environment that is not harmful to health and well-being. Hence, the EIA process is often considered to be one of the only processes that is actively promoting or ensuring sustainable development.

This notwithstanding, the EIA is sometimes cited as a key barrier to development due to its requirements for rigorous participatory processes and scientific investigation which may often be time consuming and expensive.

There is also a concern about the one-size-fits-all application of the EIA process to all developments. However, this weakness in the overall environmental impact management regime has been acknowledged and new, more appropriate and effective; impact management tools are being used or developed. Despite this, the EIA continues to play a key role in South Africa's impact management regime.

Importance of the evaluation

The evaluation aims to assess the effectiveness and credibility of the EIA process and its contribution toward sustainable development and to provide recommendations on how the implementation of the process can be strengthened.

The public perceptions of living in a just society through an EIA law-abiding society may be improved if there is a registration authority for consultants that carry out EIAs and improved capacity and enhanced technology for government officials to review the process.

This public perception of legitimate development happening can be improved if the results of the EIA process are issued timeously rather than being seen as dragging out development decisions.

Public confidence in the system as well as compliance from industry will can be built through the work of the Green Scorpions who have a

responsibility to monitor industrial non-compliance. The perceptions of the state being punitive with industry for non-compliance once developments are built will build public confidence in the state protecting the public from environmental pollution. There will be confidence in the decision-making process leading to an authorization being issued if it can be demonstrated that the process does mitigate detrimental and harmful environmental impacts and if there is a credible recourse process that demonstrates that appeals to this decision-making is possible.

Purpose of the evaluation: To assess how Environmental Impact Assessments are being implemented, to what extent it is likely to contribute toward sustainable development and how to strengthen the EIA process.

Key questions to be addressed

1. What is the likely impact of EIA on sustainable development?
 - a. Is it effectively protecting the environment? What is the extent to which EIAs have contributed towards the combat of environmental degradation?
 - b. How is the EIA process affecting economic development?
 - c. How does it influence social wellbeing?
2. What is causing delays in obtaining environmental authorisations and how can these delays be mitigated?
3. What is the general level of quality of EIA reports submitted to the competent authorities and are the reports in line with the legislative requirements? How will a registration certification by influence the quality of EIA reports submitted?
4. Is the EIA process efficiently implemented within competent authorities and how can implementation be improved?
 - a. Is there sufficient technical capacity within the competent authorities?
 - b. How can institutional arrangements (internal and external) which support the EIA process improve?
 - c. How can the coordinated integrated permitting system improve the efficient implementation of the EIA process?
5. How is the EIA process influenced by other environmental tools (EMFs, SDFs, SEAs, IDPs)?
6. Is the EIA process fair and objective?
 - a. What are the perceptions regarding the independence and objectivities of environmental assessment practitioners?
 - b. How effective is the quality review process?
 - c. Are the institutional mechanisms conducive to producing fair outcomes/ authorisations?

Principal audience

National drafters of regulations, Regulatory implementing authorities, Environmental Assessment Practitioners

Type of evaluation: Implementation evaluation

Management strategy

The DEA is in the process of reviewing the EIA Regulations and developing a Coordinated Integrated Permitting System. This evaluation may inform the refinement of the Regulations and system development.

Cost: The evaluation will cost approximately R2.5 million funded by both DPME and DEA.
Timeline: The evaluation will be undertaken between April 2016 and March 2017

4.5 Implementation Evaluation of Older Persons Act 13 of 2006

Implementing Department: Department of Social Development

Background to the evaluation

In Africa the care of older persons is regarded as the responsibility of the family; but urbanisation and migration have weakened the traditional family and many older persons are isolated, neglected or abused, particularly when they become frail. According to Statistics South Africa, there are 4.2 million older persons in the country and it is predicted that this number will rise. By 2030, the number would have increased to 6.8 million which constitute 9.3% of the total population. However, ageing should be viewed from a life cycle approach.

The burden of the HIV/AIDS pandemic has not only changed the roles of older persons to being provider of care, it has also traumatized them causing psychological trauma. As a consequence, most of the household members depend on the Older Person financially. Older persons are now forced to cope with changing environments to be able to cope with raising children. In addition, older persons have to use their old age grant to care for themselves as well as the orphaned grandchildren and sick children. Those who have retired are also challenged by the fact that they do not qualify for the full old age grant due to the means test as outlined in the Social Assistance Act although the means test will be phased out soon. This in itself has a negative impact on the very grandchildren that older persons care for as they become vulnerable and remain to live in poverty. The fact that the roles have changed drastically in families will have a negative impact on the economy especially due to the ageing population. Moreover, the burden of the HIV/AIDS pandemic has not only changed the roles of older persons to being provider of care, it has also traumatized them causing psychological trauma. As a consequence, most of the household members depend on the Older Person financially.

In response to the challenges faced by older persons, the Department of Social development has developed a legislation, the Older Persons Act (Act 13 Of 2006) to protect and empower older persons. The Act and its Regulations came into effect on the 1st of April, 2010 and calls for a developmental approach in dealing with ageing issues. The objective of the Act is to deal effectively with the plight of older persons by establishing a framework aimed at the empowerment and protection of older persons and at the promotion and maintenance of their status, rights, well-being, safety and security; and to provide for matters connected therewith. The aim of the Older Persons Act is to move services from institutional care to community based care and support services. This is the transformation process in service provision. This process ensures the provision of affordable, accessible, effective and efficient services to all older persons in partnership with all those committed to building a caring society. It also promotes that older persons should remain in communities for as long as possible.

Importance of the evaluation

Since the implementation of the Older Persons Act, there has never been an evaluation conducted to assess the extent to which act is following

a developmental social welfare approach that it aims achieve in order to care and protect the elderly. The DSD is in the process of amending the Act and the findings of the evaluation will therefore strengthen the implementation of the amended Act.

Purpose of the evaluation

To assess to what extent the Older Persons Act 13 of 2006 is being implemented as specified, why and how it can be strengthened.

Key questions to be addressed

1. To what extent has the Act been implemented, and how it can be strengthened?
2. What are the barriers or challenges experienced during the implementation?
3. What are the successes and best practice models that can be replicated nationally?
4. Has the Act been delivered as planned to the target beneficiaries?
5. Who are the target beneficiaries? Is there evidence that the correct beneficiaries are being reached by the programme activities?
6. How can the Act be more responsive to gender, disability and geographic location
7. To what extent do the institutional arrangements support the performance of the Act, with specific reference to coordination, administration and management arrangements?
8. To what extent is there a shared understanding of roles and responsibilities by different role-players (government and non-government) in implementing the Act?
9. Test assumptions on Resources (infrastructure, personnel, budget)
10. Are the assumptions around the capacity of the government and non-government service providers to effectively deliver the programme plausible?
11. Are the service providers able to implement the Act as intended given the training provided by DSD?
12. How can the existing M&E system be strengthened so as to address the management and performance monitoring needs of DSD?

Principal audience Department of Health, Department of Justice & Constitutional Development, South African Police Services, Department of Sports and Recreation South Africa, Civil Society and Chapter 9 institutions.

Type of evaluation: Implementation Evaluation

Management strategy: The evaluation comes at the time in which the DSD is in the process of reviewing the Older Persons Act 13 of 2006. The findings of this evaluation will be pertinent in informing the process of amending the Act.

Cost estimate: R1.5 million funded by both DPME and DSD.

Time and duration: The evaluation will be undertaken between April 2016 and March 2017.

4.6 Evaluation of the TVET Colleges Expansion and Capacity Development Programme

Implementing Department: Department of Higher Education and Training

Background to the evaluation

A key priority of the Department of Higher Education (DHET) is to strengthen and expand the Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) College system and transform Colleges into attractive institutions of choice for school leavers. Although student enrolment in TVET Colleges more than doubled over the past four years (from 345 000 in 2010 to over 795 000 in 2013), it is unlikely that the Department will be able to meet the TVET enrolment targets set by the White Paper for Post-School Education and Training, the National Development Plan (NDP) and the National Skills Development Strategy (NSDS III). TVET Colleges still enrol fewer students than Universities. This is not ideal for the development of a skilled and educated population or for meeting the needs of an economy which suffers a serious shortage of mid-level skills, particularly artisanal skills.

The public TVET College system is central to the government's programme of skilling and re-skilling youth and adults. Its transformation is therefore key to the integration of education and training and to ensure that TVET Colleges respond to skills needs in South Africa. The White Paper points out that the current mix of Programme and Qualifications (PQM) in TVET Colleges is complex to administer, difficult for learners and parents to understand, and often poorly quality-assured. In addition, many lecturers lack work-place experience, thereby reducing their ability to deliver good quality vocational programmes. There is also a lack of capacity to develop the curriculum and materials required to meet the needs of the economy across diverse sectors. Although it remains the role of government to fund public education institutions, Sector Education and Training Authorities (SETAs) and the National Skill Fund (NSF) can play an important role in funding skills development capacity and steer funding for programmes that meet the needs of society and the economy.

The NSF was established in 1999 in terms of the Skills Development Act, 1998 (as amended), to support the implementation of the NSDS. In October 2011, the Minister of Higher Education and Training requested the NSF to release a portion of the surplus (uncommitted) funds from the Discretionary Projects Programme to support the expansion of student enrolment in TVET Colleges. Following the Minister's request, the NSF set aside a budget of R2.5 billion for the College Expansion Programme. It is expected that approximately 102,000 more students/learners will access learning opportunities at TVET Colleges through the above-mentioned NSF allocation of funding over the 3-year period (2012-2015).

The College Expansion Programme has four main objectives:

- a) to support TVET Colleges to enrol a larger number of students, particularly in artisanal-related programmes and programmes that would support the needs of the economy;
- b) to support TVET Colleges to offer a broader set of programmes through an expanded programme-qualification mix;
- c) to support TVET Colleges to expand student access to workplace-based learning (WBL) through learnerships (including artisanships) and internships; and
- d) to support TVET Colleges to build the capacity of their staff.

Importance of the evaluation

The NDP targets to increase student enrolment in TVET Colleges to 1.25 million by 2030. Enrolment in TVET Colleges (both public and private) stood at 795 000 in 2013, indicating that a substantive increase in enrolment at TVET Colleges is needed between now and 2030 to achieve the NDP target. This programme is one of the initiatives of the DHET to increase enrolment in TVET Colleges to achieve the NDP target.

Purpose of the evaluation: To evaluate whether the TVET College expansion and capacity development programme has achieved its objectives and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of its implementation.

Key questions to be addressed

1. To what extent is the programme design relevant, appropriate and technically sound?
2. To what extent has the programme been effective in achieving its objectives?
3. To what extent has the programme been effectively implemented?
4. To what extent has the programme been efficiently implemented?
5. How was the programme integrated with existing programmes in TVET Colleges, and what implications does this have for programme sustainability?
6. What indications are there of emerging impact of the programme?
7. What key insights, lessons, and recommendations are offered, for possible continuation of the elements of the programme in selected TVET Colleges?

Principal audience

DHET, NSF, TVET Colleges, SETAs, Quality Council for Trades and Occupations (QCTO), UMALUSI, South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA), employer bodies, employers and the South African College Principals Organisation (SACPO).

Type of evaluation: Implementation evaluation

Management strategy

Public TVET Colleges are an important delivery mechanism of education and training envisaged in the White Paper for Post-School Education and Training, as well as the funding made available from the NSF regarding targeted occupational courses to address the specific skills needs. The evaluation will therefore inform the management structures of the DHET and the NSF whether to continue funding similar programmes such as the TVET College Expansion and Capacity Development Programme.

Cost: The evaluation will cost approximately R4 million funded by both the DHET (NSF funding) with R1 million from DPME.

Timeline: The evaluation will be undertaken between April 2016 and March 2017 [161].

4.7 Design and Implementation Evaluation of the City Support Programme (CSP)

Implementing Department: National Treasury (NT)

Background to the evaluation

There is broad consensus that South African cities continue to face significant development challenges, despite the progress that has been made in universalising access to basic services since the end of apartheid. The importance of reversing the economic and socially exclusionary nature of our cities is embedded in the Constitution. The National Development Plan (NDP) recognizes that the sprawling, low density and segregated land use patterns in SA cities are both inefficient and highly inequitable. Moreover, it responds to the critique that public investments since 1994 have largely reinforced the apartheid spatial form and impose significant costs on the fiscus and on poor households. It recommends a new, spatially-focussed approach that encourages integrated investment, led by cities, through a far stronger emphasis on the location of infrastructure and human settlements and the resulting spatial form of cities. The CSP is a key lever in this approach.

The CSP is a change programme that provides support to the eight South African metropolitan municipalities and the broader intergovernmental system through gathering, generating and sharing innovative and appropriate practices to contribute to our cities being well-governed for spatial transformation and our intergovernmental policy, fiscal, regulatory and support system enabling city spatial transformation.

With these in place, our cities can develop in more compact and integrated ways based on transit oriented development (TOD) principles. This in turn allows them to become more productive, inclusive and sustainable which are pre-requisites for urban economic growth and a reduction in poverty and inequality.

Importance of the evaluation

The CSP influences the eight metropolitan municipalities which collectively constitute 40% of citizens (20,4 million people) and 62% of economic activity and 58% of job opportunities. Improving city functioning and spatial development will have a direct influence on our ability as a country to promote inclusive economic growth. The CSP is relevant to Outcomes 4, 6, 8, 9 and 12. It represents an innovative approach in that it operates at the intersection between three spheres of influence – the fiscal and financial framework, the enabling environment and direct city implementation support. Its service delivery model involves utilising both local and international experts (the latter through a service provider agreement with the World Bank.) The CSP is now in its second year of implementation and it is important to understand whether this approach is beginning to yield results or not.

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to review the design and implementation of the CSP in order to strengthen its delivery.

Key questions to be addressed

- 1) What has the CSP delivered to date?
- 2) What evidence is there that changes in city governance have been brought about by the CSP?

- 3) What evidence is there that changes in the intergovernmental environment for city transformation have been brought about by the CSP?
- 4) Are programme functions, structures and systems efficient and appropriate given the agenda of the CSP (inputs and activities)?
- 5) What can be recommended to improve the design and implementation of the CSP?

Principal audience

National Treasury, Departments of Co-operative Governance, Human Settlements, Transport, Environmental Affairs, City Budget Forum, the eight metropolitan municipalities, SALGA and SACN.

Type of evaluation: Design and implementation evaluation

Management strategy

The evaluation will inform the final phase of the implementation of the CSP and provide the groundwork for an impact evaluation which will be undertaken on completion of the programme in 2017/18.

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

Timeline: The evaluation will be undertaken between March 2016 and October 2016

4.7 Evaluation of Government Business Incentives

Implementing Department(s):

Departments offering Business Incentives (Department of Trade and Industry (**the dti**); National Treasury; Tourism; Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; Science and Technology; Cooperative Governance; Economic Development and Small Business Development

Background to the evaluation

Under the National Evaluation Plan a number of evaluations have been conducted of specific incentives schemes – ranging from dti incentives such as Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII), SARS (Tax reform for small businesses), DRDLR - Land Recapitalisation and Development, to microfinance by DAFF (MAFISA). However these have been conducted as separate evaluations without a bigger picture of the incentives environment and how these add together.

This year more than R7 billion will be transferred directly from the fiscus to private companies to support business activity. In addition, the government foregoes at least R25 billion in revenue each year as part of various tax incentives to the private sector. The Ministers' Committee on the Budget has on several occasions pointed to the need for a detailed assessment of the impact of business incentives on economic growth, productivity, empowerment, competitiveness, the balance of trade and employment creation.

Importance of the evaluation

In order to achieve the objectives of the National Development Plan, we need to strengthen economic growth, reduce inequality and reduce unemployment. Inclusive growth is essential, and government has planned for this through Outcome 4 of the MTSF, as well as through the 9 Point Plan. Business incentives play a key part in this, seeking to stimulate potential growth sectors. A wide range of departments play a role including **the dti**; National Treasury; Tourism; DAFF; DST; DCOG; EDD and Small Business Development. These incentives are seen in a range of outcomes as detailed in the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF).

A number of proposals that would have the effect of increasing incentives to the private sector are also being advanced within government. Given the fiscal constraints faced by government over the medium term, budget support for new incentives would entail reallocation from existing incentives.

It is therefore essential to look at the whole ecosystem of business incentives across government and how the system is operating as a whole. There is also a need to evaluate the performance of this system as government considers whether any of its elements should be extended, how the different elements can support each other better, and any duplication avoided. The evaluation should also make recommendations that will help to address the gaps that exist and overcome shortcomings identified to assist the country to be more focused, coordinated and purposeful in attracting investment which stimulates creation of jobs, exports, economic diversification and expands the tax base.

Purpose of the evaluation:

The evaluation aims to develop a broad picture of the system of business incentives across government, how they integrate, the gaps and how the broader system can be strengthened.

This will help to strengthen the contribution of business incentives to the achievement of priorities outlined in the National Development Plan, the MTSF and the 9 Point Plan.

Key questions to be addressed

1. What are the current business incentives that are currently offered by the South African Government (inventory of incentives)?
2. What is the overall Theory of Change (or theories of change) for government business incentives and is it working as planned?
3. How does what we do as a country in relation to incentives compare to best practices internationally?
4. How are these schemes working and do they appear to effective and efficient?
5. Do these incentive programs support each other and what are the gaps?
6. How can the system of business incentives be strengthened and made more cost-effective to achieve enhanced and more inclusive economic growth in the country?

Principal audience

MTEC, Directors-General, Budget Forum on Business Incentives and other departments that have an interest in developing business incentives in their various sectors.

Type of evaluation: Diagnostic/implementation/economic evaluation

Management strategy

The Ministers' Committee on the Budget has requested a detailed assessment of the impact of business incentives on economic growth, productivity, empowerment, competitiveness, the balance of trade and employment creation. Treasury has allocated the budget to DPME to undertake the evaluation. The evaluation will be managed by the DPME in collaboration with National Treasury and involved departments.

Cost: The evaluation will cost approximately R5 million and will be funded by National Treasury (which has allocated the funds to DPME).

Timeline: The evaluation will be undertaken between June 2016 and June 2017

4.8 Evaluation of evaluations

Implementing Department: Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

Background to the evaluation

The Department of Planning, 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 38 evaluations have been completed or are underway and some 8 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 Evaluation Plans. However it needs to expand to 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 by policies/programmes, how the system is working and how it can be strengthened.

Key questions to be addressed

1. How much have programmes changed what they do as a result of evaluations?
2. How has the performance of programmes 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. Is the approach that has been taken working, and how should it change going forward?
6. How is the evaluation system working as a whole and how can it be improved?
7. How are the components of the system working (eg training, guidelines), how helpful are they, and how can they be improved?
8. 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?
9. 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/impact evaluation

Management strategy

Recommendations for improvement in the evaluation Improvement Plan will be used to strengthen the National Evaluation System.

Cost estimate: R2 million, to be provided by the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.

Timing and duration: 12 months starting in February 2016 and should be completed by February 2017.

5 Outline of evaluations proposed for 2017/18

The evaluations proposed for 2017/18 are shown in table 4. These will be reviewed after the call for evaluations in March 2016.

Table 4: Summary of proposed evaluations for 2017/18

Name of Department	Name of intervention	Title of evaluation	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)
Basic Education (DBE)	Kha Ri Gude Programme	Evaluation of Kha Ri Gude Programme	The Kha Ri Gude Mass Literacy Campaign was launched in February 2008, with the intention of enabling 4,7 million adults above the age of 15 years to become literate and numerate in one of the eleven official languages. Achieving this goal will enable South Africa to reach its UN: Education For All commitment made at Dakar in 2000 - that of halving the country's illiteracy rates by 2015. The Campaign makes specific efforts to target vulnerable groups. Currently 80% of the learners are women, 8% are disabled and 25% are youth, and 20% are above the age of 60. The total national and provincial budget for 2014/15 was a total of R484 million.
Department of Public Enterprises	Competitive Supplier Development Programme	Implementation evaluation of the Competitive Supplier Development Programme	In 2007, the CSDP was launched, however at the time, the procurement capability of State Owned Companies was not geared for supplier development. SOC were only focused on short term, transactional procurements which were often crisis driven. There was institutional fragmentation which meant that demand was not aggregated and the focus on a balance sheet perspective further limited the SOC planning horizon. In 2011, the supplier development was integrated into the SOC procurement policy, in particular for Eskom and Transnet. Subsequently, Transnet initiated planning for locomotive fleet procurement while Eskom initiated planning for filter bag procurement based on massive industrial impact. Between 2012 and 2013, the Eskom and Transnet's next generation supplier development plans were assessed and approved. Thereafter, the Supplier Development Plans (SDP) for both Eskom and Transnet were launched. Considerable progress has been made to position the SOC to support customers in emerging industrial sectors. Diagnostic studies were undertaken in both the automotive sectors and for port-related industries.

6 Way forward

Preparation for the 2016/17 evaluations started in September 2015 with a theory of change workshop and a 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. The intention is to complete the TORs by January 2016 so that procurement can start in February 2016. 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 2016 break, with work on improvement plans substantially completed by 15 March 2017. This means that the evaluations should in most cases be completed within the 2016/17 financial year.