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Timeline around DPME

2005  Government-wide M&E system document
2007  Framework for Programme Performance Information (Treasury)
2008  System for data quality (StatsSA)
2009  New administration, emphasis on M&E
       Minister of Performance M&E created
       Work starts on developing priority outcomes
April 2010 DPME created in Presidency, as delivery unit
2010  12 outcomes agreed, Minister’s performance agreements, delivery agreements, quarterly reports
2011  Systems for Management Performance Assessment (MPAT) created with assessment of 103/155 national and provincial departments, monitoring of front-line services developed.
June/July Study tour to Mexico/Colombia/US
October First evaluation starts as pilot for the system
November National Evaluation Policy Framework approved by Cabinet
Why evaluate?

Improving policy or programme performance (evaluation for continuous improvement):
this aims to provide feedback to programme managers.

Evaluation for improving accountability:
where is public spending going? Is this spending making a difference?

Improving decision-making:
Should the intervention be continued? Should how it is implemented be changed? Should increased budget be allocated?

Evaluation for generating knowledge (for learning):
increasing knowledge about what works and what does not with regards to a public policy, programme, function or organization.
Scope of the Policy Framework approved Nov 2011

- Outlines the approach for the National Evaluation System
- Obligatory only for evaluations in the national evaluation plan (15 per year in 2013/14), then widen
- Government wide – focus on departmental programmes not public entities
- Focus on policies, plans, implementation programmes, projects (not organisations at this stage as MPAT dealing with this)
- Partnership between departments and DPME
- Gradually developing provincial (2) and departmental evaluation plans (3) as evaluation starts to gets adopted widely across government
- First metro has developed a plan (Tshwane)
Why a National Evaluation Plan

- Rather than tackling the whole system, focus initially on strategic priorities
- Allows the system to emerge, being tried and tested in practice
- Later when we are all clear it is working well, make system wide
Progress with National Evaluation Plan evaluations

  - 2012/13: 7 evaluations (NSNP moved to 2014/15)
  - 2013/14: 15 evaluations (1 agreed by Cabinet to be dropped)
  - 2014/15: 15 evaluations

- **ECD evaluation** completed June last year and on DPME website, 4 others have final reports and gone to Cabinet been in Parliament in April

- **18 other evaluations** underway from 2012/13 and 2013/14 inc 1 not in NEP – 3 completing in a few weeks, 15 underway

- 15 from **2014/15** TORs mostly developed, procurement started with some – aim for most to be underway by April 2014 – cycle now much earlier (we were at this stage only in May or so in 2013, and September in 2012)
Priority interventions to evaluate

• **Large** (eg over R500 million)
  - or covering a large proportion of the population, and have not had a major evaluation for 5 years. This figure can diminish with time;
• **Linked to 12-14 outcomes (particularly top 5)/NDP**
• **Of strategic importance**, and for which it is important that they succeed.
• **Innovative**, from which learnings are needed – in which case an implementation evaluation should be conducted;
• **Of significant public interest** – eg key front-line services.
Implication of evaluation being in National Evaluation Plan

- **Approved by Cabinet** and reports will go to Cabinet (with Improvement Plans)
- **Political support** from Cabinet and DPME, including to resolve problems emerging
- **Co-funding** available from DPME (or if necessary DPME will assist with sourcing donor funding)
- Have to **follow national evaluation system** - guidelines, standards, steering committees, training to support
- All evaluations are **partnerships with DPME** who will sit on Steering Committee, provide technical support and quality assurance, and be involved in improvement plan.
- All evaluations **published on DPME (and dept?) website** unless security concerns
Approach - ensuring evaluations are used

- Key challenge internationally that where evaluations are done, often not used - waste of money
- Key issues to ensure use:
  - Departments must own the evaluation concept and the process and so they must request evaluation (not be imposed on them)
  - There must be a learning focus rather than punitive otherwise departments will just game the system – so punish people not because they make mistakes, but if they don’t learn from their mistakes
  - Broad government ownership – so selection by cross-government Evaluation Technical Working Group – based on importance (either by scale or because strategic or innovative)
  - Evaluations must be believed - seen as credible
  - There must be follow-up (so improvement plans)
Approach – credibility and transparency

To ensure credibility:

- **Ensure independence:**
  - Independent external service providers undertake the evaluation, reporting to the Steering Committee
  - Evaluations implemented as partnership between department(s) and DPME
  - Steering Committee makes decisions on evaluation not department

- **Ensure quality:**
  - Design clinic with top national and international evaluators (giving time free)
  - Peer reviewers (normally 2) per evaluation
  - DPME evaluation director part of whole process
  - Have to follow system - evaluation panel, standards, guidelines, training etc
  - Quality assessment once completed – must score >3/5. (actuals so far 4.14, 4.45, 3.67, 4.1 3.71)

To ensure transparency:

- All evaluation reports go to Cabinet
- Then evaluations made public unless security concerns – media briefing, DPME website, Parliament, publication, communication
- When complete quality assess and go into Evaluation Repository
### Timeline around evaluations

#### 2012/13 Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2013/14 Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aug</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nov</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td><strong>Jan</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2014/15 Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEP approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORs Start</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation process – 2014/15

- **Call for evaluations for 2014/15**
  - 1 April 2013
- **Depts submit concepts for evals – 30 June 2013**
- **Selection by Eval Tech Working Group**
  - July 2013
- **Work starts on refining concept**
  - Aug/Sept 2013
- **Plan submitted into Cluster/Cab system**
  - Sept 2013
- **Cabinet approves Plan**
  - Nov/Dec 2013
- **Finalising TORs, procurement**
  - Jan-May 2014
- **Evaluation commissioned**
  - Feb-May 2014
- **Evaluation completed**
  - Oct 2014 to March 2015
- **Results to Cluster and Cabinet**
  - 1-2 months after
- **Management Response/Quality Assessment**
  - 1 month after completion
- **Improvement Plan drafted**
  - <4 months from approval
- **Communication of results**
- **Report public – to Parliament and Website**
  - Immediate
- **Improvement Plan**

The Presidency: Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation
# Request for management response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ECD EVALUATION STEERING GROUP</th>
<th>RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT</th>
<th>REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A country strategy for ECD should be developed based on a National Integrated Regulatory framework for ECD, from which each department (DBE, DSD, DoH and if relevant other departments) should develop an implementation programme for their component. A Task Team should be established to produce the Strategy – with clear roles and responsibilities of key players and government departments. The country strategy should be submitted to Cabinet for approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The national strategy should include a common definition of ECD; agreed provisioning based on age, stage of development, socio-economic circumstance and needs (including delivery services to reach poor and vulnerable children, and promoting universal access);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Management response on ECD Diagnostic Review: RESPONSE FROM DWCPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ECD EVALUATION STEERING GROUP</th>
<th>RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT</th>
<th>REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGISLATION AND POLICY FRAMEWORK (INCLUDING STRATEGIES)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A country strategy for ECD should be developed based on a National Integrated Regulatory framework for ECD, from which each department (DBE, DSD, DoH and if relevant other departments) should develop an implementation programme for their component. A Task Team should be established to produce the Strategy – with clear roles and responsibilities of key players and government departments. The country strategy should be submitted to Cabinet for approval including the cost benefit analysis.</td>
<td>AGREED SUBJECT TO THE INCLUSION OF THE ROLE OF DWCPD ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF THE ROLE OF COG TA</td>
<td>NOTE: THE MANDATE OF THE DWCPD IS TO PROMOTE COORDINATE AND MONITOR THE REALISATION OF CHILDREN'S RIGHTS. This is particularly important for ECD. One of the primary reasons for slow progress as diagnosed was lack of coordination and monitoring of the Integrated ECD Plan – not the absence of the Plan. The ECD Plan will be included in the National Plan of Action for Children (NPAC), coordinated by the DWCPD. The role of municipalities in relation to ECD to be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The national strategy should include a common definition of ECD; agreed provisioning based on age, stage of development, socio-economic circumstance and needs (including delivery services to reach poor and vulnerable children, including a full scope of coverage for children with disabilities, and promoting universal access); multidisciplinary and inter-sectoral teams with funding streams &amp; mechanisms in line with a clear set of</td>
<td>AGREED</td>
<td>NOTE ROLE OF DWCPD ABOVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Improvement plan

### Recommendation 1

A country strategy for ECD should be developed from which each department (DBE, DSD, DoH, DWCPD, DPW, DCOG, and if relevant other departments) should develop an implementation programme for their component.

### Recommendation 2

The national strategy should include a common definition of ECD; agreed provisioning based on age, stage of development, socio-economic circumstance and needs (including delivery services to reach poor and vulnerable children, and promoting universal access); multidisciplinary and inter-sectoral teams with funding streams & mechanisms in line with outcomes and results; specific institutional arrangements of interdepartmental and inter-sectoral cooperation with clear protocols; mechanisms for information sharing.

A Task Team should be established to produce the Strategy – with clear roles and responsibilities of key players and government departments. The country strategy should be submitted to Cabinet for approval.

### Improvement Objective 1

A country strategy for ECD is developed to submit to Cabinet and the Children’s Act is revised. The strategy should include a common definition of ECD; agreed provisioning based on age, stage of development, socio-economic circumstance and needs (including delivery services to reach poor and vulnerable children, and promoting universal access); multidisciplinary and inter-sectoral teams with funding streams & mechanisms in line with outcomes and results; specific institutional arrangements of interdepartmental and inter-sectoral cooperation with clear protocols; mechanisms for information sharing.

### Outputs to achieve the objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs to achieve the objective</th>
<th>Priority L/M/H</th>
<th>Activity to achieve output</th>
<th>By who? (Person responsible in bold)</th>
<th>By when? (Deadline)</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Embedded where</th>
<th>Current situation/Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. An ECD policy framework developed</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.1.1 Establish inter-departmental task team as successor to evaluation steering committee, chaired by DSD.</td>
<td>DGs of DBE, DSD, DoH and DWCPD and DPME led by DSD</td>
<td>30 November 2013</td>
<td>Interdepartmental mechanism for coordination of ECD operational by 30 November 2013</td>
<td>APP of DBE, DSD, DoH, WCPD, DPME</td>
<td>NIDECD committee/Interdepartmental steering committee for the ECD review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Develop project plan for ECD policy development namely White Paper for ECD</td>
<td>DSD, DBE, DoH DWCPD</td>
<td>28 February 2013</td>
<td>White Paper on ECD published including norms and standards for differentiated services, provisioning and funding</td>
<td>APP of DBE, DSD, DoH, WCPD, DPME</td>
<td>Segregated policies targeting young children such as White Paper of Social Welfare, Education, Maternal and Child Health policies White Paper 5 for ECD NIPECD Guidelines for ECD Draft Policy Framework (NIPECD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluations coming through

- Total of 37 evaluations under National Evaluation System completed, underway or starting (plus 1 other not in NES)
  - 5 evaluations completed
  - 3 will finish in the next few weeks, 15 underway, 15 TORs being developed and calls going out.

- Departments are using evaluation results to inform planning, policy-making and budgeting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Title of evaluation</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSD/DBE/DoH</td>
<td>Diagnostic Review of Early Childhood Development</td>
<td>Completed June 2012 Improvement Plan being implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Industry</td>
<td>Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme</td>
<td>Final report approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation of Grade R</td>
<td>Final report approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Development</td>
<td>Implementation Evaluation of the Recapitalisation and Development Programme</td>
<td>Final report approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Development</td>
<td>Implementation Evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme</td>
<td>Final report approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Interventions addressing under 5s</td>
<td>Complete in February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Settlements</td>
<td>Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant</td>
<td>SP appointed. Complete May 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NEP 2013/14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Title of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidency</td>
<td>Implementation Evaluation of Government’s Coordination Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dti</td>
<td>Evaluation of Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive programme (EMIAI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dti</td>
<td>Evaluation of Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dti</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Veterans</td>
<td>Evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DST</td>
<td>Evaluation of National Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation on Tax Compliance Cost of small businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COGTA</strong></td>
<td>Impact evaluation of the Community Works Programme (CWP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRDLR</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Land Restitution Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation CASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF</td>
<td>Implementation Evaluation of MAFISA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Baseline for informal settlements targeted for upgrading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHS</strong></td>
<td>Evaluating interventions by DHS to facilitate access to the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Diagnostic of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPME</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation of the Outcomes Approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statuses:**
- Completing by March
- Underway
- About to start
- Delays!
### 2014/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Environmental Governance in the Mining Sector (EEGM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHET</td>
<td>Design Evaluation of the Policy on Community Education and Training Colleges (PCETC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation of the Social Housing Programme (SHP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DST</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Indigenous Knowledge Systems Policy (IKSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td>Diagnostic Evaluation/Programme Audit for Violence Against Women and Children (AVAWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSD</td>
<td>Diagnostic Review of Coordination of the Social Sector Expanded Public Works Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPS</td>
<td>Economic Evaluation of the incremental investment into the SAPS Forensic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF/DRDLR</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation of the Ilima Letsema Programme and Irrigation Schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF</td>
<td>Impact evaluation of MAFISA (quantitative) – through 3ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF/DRDLR</td>
<td>Policy Evaluation of Small Farmer Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Evaluation of the Funza-Lushaka Bursary Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBE</td>
<td>Impact evaluation of National School Nutrition Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRDLR</td>
<td>Impact evaluation of Land Restitution Programme – through 3ie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPME</td>
<td>Impact/implementation evaluation of the MPAT system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPME</td>
<td>Implementation evaluation of the dept strategic planning and APP system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Procurement started**
- **TORs developed**
- **No TORs yet**
- **Delays!**
Some delays

- Some straightforward
- Others taking longer than planned:
  - We procure most and procure within 2 months - some departments taking over 12 months to procure
  - Challenges with lack of data
  - Departments wanting to really take on board the evaluation and delaying it getting to cluster and Cabinet
  - Internal challenges to departments
- Despite this 38 evaluations in process
Current use by portfolio committees

- Basic Education PC had presentation on ECD evaluation by DSD/DBE
- Mineral Resources PC had presentation on evaluation system and suggested dept propose 3 evaluations (they didn’t)
- Criminal Justice PC asked Dept of Justice to propose evaluation on Integrated Justice System – agreed for 2015/16
Use of evaluations by Parliament

- **Repository** provides 70 evaluations which can be a source of evidence now.

- Stage evaluations will be presented at Portfolio Committees:
  - Once final report approved departments given one month to provide a *management response* to findings and recommendations.
  - Once management response received depts develop *improvement plans*.
  - After Cabinet considers a **letter sent from DPME to relevant Portfolio Committee** with copy of evaluation suggesting relevant department is asked to come and present to the Committee.

- Opportunity for committees to **interrogate** what depts are doing, ask deep questions as to whether programmes having an impact, are effective, efficient, relevant, sustainable.

- Next evaluations to portfolio committees March/April 2014.

- Meanwhile Committees could request departments to **brief them on progress** with evaluations, their results, and the development and implementation of improvement plans based on the results.

- Committees could make suggestions to departments regarding **priority areas for evaluation**. Call will go out in March 2014 for proposals for evaluations for 2015/16 to 2017/18 – Portfolio Committees could be asking departments to evaluate specific policies or programmes (but closing date for submissions 30 June).
Other support for Parliament

- Briefing of Committee of Chairs on evaluation (twice)
- Briefing of Committee Researchers on evaluation
- Invitation to SCOA to SAMEA Conference on Evaluation
- Organised two study tours for SCOA to US/Canada and Kenya/Uganda
- Discussing possibility of African Parliamentary Forum on M&E (and invitation to AFREA March 2014)
- Involving SCOA Chair in South-South Roundtable on Evidence-Based Policy Making and Implementation November 2013 (unfortunately not given permission)
Progress with the system (1)

- **>12 Guidelines and templates** - ranging from TORs to Improvement Plans plus 6 draft ones being finalised February

- Very significant ones on Planning Implementation Programmes and Design Evaluation – major focus on improving **programme design**

- **Standards for evaluations** and competences, and standards have guided the quality assessment tool

- 4 courses developed, over 600 government staff trained so far
  - 1 more courses being developed and piloted by March
  - Includes course for DGs/DDGs in use of evidence

- **Study tours** organised for SCOA to Canada/US, Kenya/Uganda, unfortunately SCOA Chair not able to come to South-South Roundtable

- **Evaluation panel** developed with 42 organisations which simplifies procurement - major focus on ensuring universities bid. W Cape now using the panel – may become Government-wide Panel

- **Creation of Evaluation Repository** - 70 evaluations quality assessed and on the Evaluation Repository on DPME website.
Progress with the system (2)

- Gauteng, W Cape provinces have **developed provincial evaluation plans**.
  - DPME working with other provinces – Limpopo, NW, Free State

- **Departmental evaluation plans** for dti, DST, DRDLR

- **Municipal evaluation plans** – Tshwane developed but not focus at present
Conclusions

- In two years the whole system is now established and \textbf{38 evaluations} are completed, underway, or about to start
- \textbf{Interest is growing} – more departments getting involved, more provinces, first metro, and more types of evaluation
- Work on \textit{programme planning} and \textit{design evaluation} will potentially have very big impact – will build capacity in departments to undertake
- \textbf{Challenges} emerging as the evaluation reports start being finalised and the focus shifts to improvement plans
  - Some gaming by departments as they see critical findings
  - Need close monitoring of development and implementation of improvement plans to ensure that departments do implement the recommendations
- Importance of Parliament’s \textbf{oversight role} – committees could request departments to present the evaluation results to them, request departments to present improvement plans to them, and request departments to present progress reports against the improvement plans to them
- Important for Committees to consider \textbf{requesting evaluations for 2015/16 cycle} – start discussing now
Thank you

Outcomes Manager: OME, DPME
Nokuthulaz@po-dpme.gov.za
Director: ERU,DPME
Antonio.Hercules@po-dpme.gov.za
www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za