







National Evaluation Plan 2013-14 to 2015-16

21 November 2012

THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Foreword

In the 2012/13 National Evaluation Plan I said “Evaluation provides us with an opportunity to learn about what is working and what is not working and what we need to do to improve our performance. We must take this opportunity, all of us who are in the public service, to see how we can improve the impacts of the money we spend on our citizens”. I would like to repeat this message.

We are progressing with establishing the National Evaluation System. The first evaluation undertaken as part of the system, on Early Childhood Development, is completed. The National Evaluation Plan for 2012/13 was approved on 13 June 2012, and these evaluations are now underway.

I am pleased to hear that the number of departments submitting evaluations has increased, so there is greater understanding of the role evaluations can play. I also understand that departments mainly submitted for 2013/14 and not later years. We need to get to the point where departments are planning ahead, particularly where they want impact evaluations, which tend to be complex. As the 8 evaluations for 2012/13 are completed, and we get these 15 for 2013/14, all of them government priorities, we have an opportunity to significantly improve the performance of these programmes, plans, or policies. Cabinet will want to hear about that improvement. We also need to make sure that the largest programmes are being covered.

Many thanks to the development partners who are assisting us with developing the system, including the EU-funded Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy Development (PSPPD), the International Centre for Learning on Evaluation and Results (CLEAR), DFID, GIZ, UNICEF and the World Bank. We are also very happy to have peers around the world that we are working with and sharing experience around evaluation, including 3ie, CONEVAL in Mexico, SINERGIA in Colombia, as well as Uganda and Benin, and individual international experts who are giving of the their time to comment on our systems.

I wish you well in implementing these evaluations and look forward to hearing the results.



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





Contents

Glossary iii

Executive summary iv

1 Introduction 1

1.1 The Framework 1
1.2 Purpose of the National Evaluation Plan (NEP) 2
1.3 Criteria and process used for selection 2

2 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system in 2011/12 and underway in 2012/13 2

2.1 Guidelines 2
2.2 Evaluation standards and competences 2
2.3 Training 3
2.4 Audit of evaluations 3

3 Evaluations undertaken in 2011/12 and 2012/13 to date 3

3.1 Evaluations from 2011/12 completed in 2012/13 3
3.2 Evaluations underway from the 2012/13 National Evaluation Plan 4

4 Summary of approved evaluations for 2013/14 6

5 Concepts for evaluations for 2013/14 10

5.1 Evaluation of the quality of the National Senior Certificate 10
5.2 Evaluation of Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme (EMIA) 11
5.3 Evaluation of Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII) 12
5.4 Impact Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP) 13
5.5 Evaluation of National Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (AMTS) 13
5.6 Evaluation of the cost of tax compliance for small businesses 15
5.7 Diagnostic evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme 16
5.8 Impact evaluation of the Community Work Programme (CWP) 17
5.9 Evaluation of the Land Restitution Programme 19
5.10 Impact evaluation of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) 19
5.11 Setting a baseline for future impact evaluations for the informal settlements targeted for upgrading 20
5.12 Evaluating interventions by the Department of Human Settlements to facilitate access to the city 22
5.13 A diagnostic evaluation of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities 23
5.14 Impact evaluation of the Outcomes Approach 25
5.15 Impact/Implementation evaluation of Government's coordination systems 26

6 Outline of evaluations proposed for 2014/15 and 2015/16 28

7 Key implementation issues 30

7.1 Reporting on the Plan, and reviewing the Plan 30
7.2 Funding of the evaluations in the Plan 30
7.3 Next steps 30

Glossary

3ie	International Initiative for Impact Evaluation
AMTS	Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (of DST)
CASP	Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme
CRDP	Comprehensive Rural Development Programme
CWP	Community Work Programme
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
DBE	Department of Basic Education
DCOG	Department of Co-operative Governance
DOH	Department of Health
DFID	Department for International Development
DHS	Department of Human Settlements
DMV	Department of Military Veterans
DPME	Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation
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
DWCPD	Department of Women, Children and People with Disabilities
ECCE	Early Child Care and Education
ECD	Early Childhood Development
EMIA	Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme
ERU	Evaluation and Research Unit, DPME
FDI	Foreign direct investment
IDC	Industrial Development Corporation
IRDP	Integrated Residential Development Programme
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NACI	National Advisory Council on Innovation
NARYSEC	National Rural Youth Service Corps
NEP	National Evaluation Plan
NEPF	National Evaluation Policy Framework
NRDS	National Research and Development Strategy (of DST)
NRF	National Research Foundation
NSC	National Senior Certificate (matric)
NSNP	National School Nutrition Programme
PSPPD	Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy Development (a partnership between the Presidency and the European Union)
RCT	Randomised controlled trial
SEP	Socio-Economic Partnerships Programme (of DST)
SMMEs	Small, micro and medium sized enterprises
SPII	Support Programme for Industrial Innovation
THRIP	Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme
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** - providingfeedback 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. The first National Evaluation Plan developed for 2012/13 covered eight evaluations and those evaluations are underway.

2 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system in 2011/12 and underway in 2012/13

Six guidelines have been developed with at least four more planned in 2012/13. Draft evaluation standards and competencies for programme managers, M&E specialists and evaluators are out for public consultation. Three training courses are planned, of which one has been designed and piloted and is being rolled out in 2012/13, the second will be designed in 2012/13 and rolled out in 2013/14. The third will be designed in 2013/14 following development of guidelines on the different evaluation types. DPME has undertaken an audit of evaluations commissioned since 2006 in the social and economic sectors with over 100 evaluations obtained. An exercise is being funded to assess these evaluations for quality, identify issues emerging which need follow-up, and they will be made available on the DPME website.

3 Evaluations undertaken in 2011/12 and 2012/13 to date

The first evaluation undertaken supported by DPME has been a Diagnostic Review of the Early Childhood Development (ECD) Sector, with partners the Department of Basic Education (DBE), Department of Social Development (DSD), Department of Health (DoH), Department of Women, Children and People with Disability (DWCPD). The findings have been tabled at a national ECD conference in March 2012, and are being used to rethink the future development of the sector. Key findings include that the definition of ECD in the Children's Act is too limited and should be widened beyond care outside of the home to include care in the home. This will expand the health aspects of ECD and strengthen the focus on the first 1000 days from conception. Many elements of comprehensive support and services for children are already in place and some are performing well. However, important gaps remain. These include support for parenting, prevention of stunting among young children, safe and affordable child care for very young children and other families needing assistance, and planned rapid expansion and provision of ECCE services to the most at-need families, including children with disabilities. ECD services require strong and coordinated inter-sectoral vision, commitment and action. High-level authorization and legitimacy of a well-resourced central agency or mechanism is needed to drive forward key strategies for ECD.

The Improvement Objectives in the Improvement Plan focus on developing a country strategy for ECD, amending the Children's Act to include the first 1000 days from conception, creating an effective interdepartmental coordination mechanism, delivery of a comprehensive package of services, focusing in particular on access by vulnerable households, and reviewing funding models that would enable this.

The evaluations underway from the 2012/13 plan are:

Name of Department	Title of evaluation
Department of Basic Education	Impact Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP)
Department of Basic Education	Impact Evaluation of Grade R
Department of Health (with Social Development, DAFF, DRDLR, DWCPD)	Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing Children Under 5
Departmentof Rural Development and Land Reform	Implementation Evaluation of the Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme
Departmentof Rural Development and Land Reform	Implementation Evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)
Department of Trade and Industry	Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme (BPS)
Department of Human Settlements	Implementation Evaluation of the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)
Department of Human Settlements	Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)





4/5 Evaluations for 2013/14

While evaluations were only received from five national departments for the 2012/13 plan, this time proposals were received from 12 national departments, reflecting an increasing awareness and interest in the evaluation system. The evaluations that will be conducted during the 2012/13 financial year are shown in the table below:

Name of Department	Title of evaluation
Department of Basic Education	Evaluation of the quality of the National Senior Certificate (NSC)
Department of Trade and Industry	Evaluation of Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive programme (EMIAI)
Department of Trade and Industry	Evaluation of Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII)
Department of Trade and Industry	Impact Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)
Department of Military Veterans	Evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme.
Department of Science and Technology	Evaluation of National Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (AMTS)
South African Revenue Services	Evaluation on tax compliance cost for small businesses
Department of Co-operative Governance	Impact evaluation of the Community Work Programme (CWP)
Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Evaluation of the Land Restitution Programme
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Impact Evaluation of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP)
Department of Human Settlements	Setting a baseline for future impact evaluations for the informal settlements targeted for upgrading
Department of Human Settlements	Evaluating interventions by the Department of Human Settlements to facilitate access to the city.
Department of Human Settlements	Diagnostic evaluation of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities
Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	Impact evaluation of the Outcomes Approach
Presidency	Implementation Evaluation of Government's Coordination Systems

5 Evaluations for 2014/15 and 2015/16

The evaluations proposed for the following 2 years are shown in the table below:

Name of Department	Title of evaluation
2014/15	
Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Cost benefit analysis of revitalization of existing irrigation schemes
Department of Basic Education	Evaluation of Funza-Lusaka Bursary Scheme
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Impact evaluation of Ilima-Letsema Programme
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Implementation Evaluation of MAFISA
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries / Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Policy evaluation of small farmer support
2015/16	
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Impact evaluation of Land Care
Department of Rural Development and land Reform	Diagnostic evaluation of the National Rural Youth Service Corps (NARYSEC)
Department of Basic Education	Evaluation of curriculum implementation
Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	Implementation evaluation of the national evaluation policy and system

7 Key implementation issues

Annual reports will be provided to Cabinet on progress with implementation of the Plan, highlighting key lessons, as well as emerging findings, and progress with implementation of improvement plans around each evaluation. In terms of funding, this Plan has been developed to link with the budget process for 2013/14 to 2015/16. Some departments have resources available to fund the evaluations in their entirety, whereas in others the funding comes from DPME or donors. Preparation for the 2013/14 evaluations will start in January 2013 (in some cases even earlier), so that the initial phases of getting the relevant stakeholders together, developing terms of reference, and the procurement process can be completed prior to 31 March 2012.





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 these are being tested out as part of the process of implementing the 2012/13 National Evaluation Plan, the first ever National Evaluation Plan in South Africa.

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

- DPME will be a full partner in these evaluations, helping to assure technical quality;
- DPME will have up to R500 000 on average to part-fund these (and in some cases is assistingin finding donor funding);
- The approval by Cabinet will give political focuson 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 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.

DPME has collaborated with a range of organisations in developing the system: national departments involved in the Evaluation Technical Working Group, departments involved in evaluations which fall under the National Evaluation System, provincial governments piloting a provincial evaluation plan, and international organisations including CLEAR, 3ie, DFID, GIZ, UNICEF, World Bank, AusAid.

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 2013/14 to 2015/16, 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 puts the priority for evaluation of existing interventions that:

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

Additional features to be considered include those interventions that:

2. Are innovative and where learning is important;
3. Are from an area where there is a lot of public interest;
4. Have a theory of change/logical framework. At this stage there are no minimum standards for implementation programmes so evaluations are not excluded if this is not the case;
5. Have not been evaluated recently;
6. Are at a critical stage where decisions are to be taken for which an evaluation is needed, and so it is important that it is evaluated now?
7. Ideally have monitoring data that can be used including background and previous documented performance, current programme situation;
8. Have a potential budget for evaluation from the department, DPME or donors. This is particularly important for 2012/13 where the Evaluation Plan has been developed late for the budget cycle. In future it will be developed at the same time.

The call for proposals was issued at the end of May 2012 with letters sent to all national Directors-General. 26 proposals were received in total and selection of the successful 15 for 2013/14 was undertaken by a cross-government Evaluation Technical Working Group on 11 September 2012. In addition five were proposed for 2014/15 and four for 2015/16. The Plan was approved by Cabinet on 21 November 2012.

As the Plan is drafted midway through the year, it reports on progress to date in 2012/13, but also on evaluations conducted in 2011/12, part of which could not be reported in the previous plan.

2 Work undertaken on the national evaluation system in 2011/12 and underway in 2012/13

2.1 Guidelines

Priority has been placed on guidelines that are needed at early stages for taking evaluations forward. The following guidelines and templates have been produced, all available on the DPME website:

1. Guideline for Drafting Terms of Reference;
2. Template for Terms of Reference for Evaluation Steering Committees;
3. Template for an Evaluation Project Plan;
4. Guideline for Peer Reviews;
5. Draft template for departmental evaluation plan;
6. Guideline for inception phase of evaluations (draft being tested).

Work is underway on guidelines for implementation programmes, improvement plans, and communicating evaluation findings.

By March 2013 the plan is also to have guidelines on three of the six types of evaluation.

2.2 Evaluation standards and competences

Draft evaluation standards have been produced, based on the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) standards. Version 1 is now out for public consultation.





Draft evaluation competences have been produced for programme managers commissioning evaluations, government M&E advisors and evaluators. These are also out for public consultation, but are already being used to draft job descriptions,

2.3 Training

The work on competences suggests a need for three training courses, one on managing evaluations, the second on deepening evaluations and a third on evaluation methodologies. For the first two courses the target group is both programme managers commissioning evaluations and government M&E advisors. The first course has been piloted in September 2012 and five further courses are being rolled out from November 2012, including in Gauteng and Western Cape Provinces.

2.4 Audit of evaluations

DPME has undertaken an audit of evaluations undertaken since 2006 in the social and economic sectors. This was supported by the Programme for Support to Pro-Poor Policy Development (PSPPD), a partnership between the Presidency and the EU. Over 100 evaluations have been identified in this process. This list will be made available on the DPME website with contact people, and unless the evaluations are confidential, the actual evaluation reports will also be made available on the DPME website. This will greatly help in ensuring that existing work is used, and the results of evaluations are available for future planning, budgeting and evaluative processes. An assignment is being funded to assess the quality of these and draw out issues that should be followed up in more detail.

3 Evaluations undertaken in 2011/12 and 2012/13 to date

3.1 Evaluations from 2011/12 completed in 2012/13

3.1.1 Early Childhood Development (ECD) Diagnostic Review

The first evaluation undertaken supported by DPME has been a Diagnostic Review of the ECD Sector. The partners have been the departments of Basic Education (DBE), Social Development (DSD), Health (DOH), and Women, Children and People with Disability (DWCPD). The key findings were presented at an ECD Conference at the end of March 2012. The evaluation has been a diagnostic, assessing the issues overall in the sector. There is much existing work done, and so this has not been primary research, but based on 112 existing studies. Key questions were around the overall paradigm being used, the types of services offered, cost-effectiveness, and institutional issues.

Key findings are:

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

- Achieving these goals also depends on new funding and resourcing strategies, especially for ECCE.

The management response from the departments has endorsed the findings and the improvement plan has been produced.

3.2 Evaluations underway from the 2012/13 National Evaluation Plan

Table 1 summarises the evaluations underway in 2012/13.

Table 1: Progress with approved evaluations for 2012/13

Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Purpose	Year of implementation			Progress as at 31 October 2012
			2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	
Department of Basic Education	Impact evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP)	To assess whether the NSNP is being implemented in a way that is likely to result in significant health and educational benefits to recipients.	X	X		The terms of reference have been finalised and the call for proposals went out on 29 Oct 2012.
Department of Basic Education	Impact evaluation of Grade R	The study aims to investigate the impact of Grade R on key dimensions of education effectiveness and efficiency. The main purpose is to assess whether Grade R is leading to both short-term and sustained impacts on learning outcomes. The study will also review the initial impact evaluation undertaken internally by the DBE. A final focus of the study is to consider the observed benefits relative to the costs of the grade R Programme.	X	X		The terms of reference have been finalised and the call for proposals went out on 29 Oct 2012.
Department of Health (Social Development, DAFF, DRDLR, DWCPF)	Implementation evaluation of Nutrition Programmes addressing Children Under 5.	To identify the critical system and implementation issues inhibiting or enabling people's access to nutrition-related interventions targeting children from conception to below the age of five, how these should be addressed and scaled up where appropriate.	X	X		The service provider has been selected and started work.
Department of Rural Development and Land reform	Implementation evaluation of the Land Reform Recapitalisation and Development Programme (RADP)	To provide strategic information on the implementation of the RADP since its inception in 2010, stakeholders' effectiveness during the implementation of the Programme; guide how to improve the implementation of this Programme.	X			The service provider is being selected.
Department of Rural Development and Land reform	Implementation evaluation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)	To assess whether the CRDP is achieving its policy goals and how the Programme can be strengthened and up-scaled.	X			The service provider is being selected.



Name of Department	Title of evaluation	Purpose	Years of implementation			Progress as at 31 October 2012
			2012/ 13	2013/ 14	2014/ 15	
Department of Trade and Industry	Implementation/ design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme (BPS)	To provide strategic information on whether the BPS is achieving its policy goals; operational information on where, how and why its implementation achieves the best results, and show how its performance can be improved.	X			The assignment is underway.
Department of Human Settlements	Implementation evaluation of the Integrated Residential Development Programme (IRDP)	To draw out lessons in order to assess the strength of the Programme and how best to improve it to achieve the desired outcome.	X			The terms of reference have been finalised . The call for proposals will be out in due course.
Department of Human Settlements	Implementation evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG)	To analyse the theory of change, inner logic and consistency of the Programme. In addition, the evaluation will assess the quality of indicators, programme assumptions and whether the Programme is implemented as designed.	X			The terms of reference have been finalised. The call for proposals will be out in due course.

4 Summary of approved evaluations for 2013/14

A call was issued at the end of May 2012 for proposals for evaluations to be included in the National Evaluation Plan for 2013/14 to 2015/16. 18 departments participated in briefings. The response has been very positive for 2013/14 and while evaluations were only received from 5 national departments for the 2012/13 plan (plus 2 provinces), this time proposals were received from 12 national departments, reflecting an increasing awareness and interest in the evaluation system. However only eight of a possible 40 evaluations have been proposed for the following years, showing that departments are not yet grasping that they need to plan and budget ahead for major evaluations, particularly impact evaluations, and more emphasis will be placed on this next year. Table 2 summarises the evaluations that will be conducted during the 2013/14 financial year.

Table 2: Summary of approved evaluations for 2013/14

Name of Department	Name of intervention	Title of evaluation	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (egg budget, beneficiaries)
Department of Basic Education	National Senior Certificate (matric)	Evaluation of the quality of the National Senior Certificate	The quality of the senior certificate is a key aspect for Outcome 1: "Improved quality of basic education", and future education and economic outcomes, both for the children concerned and the country as a whole. The estimated budget for 2013/14 (provincial level only), is approximately R2 billion. There are about 600 000 learners who are affected by this intervention.
Department of Trade and Industry	Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive programme (EMIA)	Evaluation of Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme	This Programme is linked to outcome 4: "Decent employment through inclusive growth" in terms of increased export sales and job creation. The estimated budget of the Programme for 2013/14 is R189 million. The number of people affected by the intervention from the period when the first applications were captured in 2001/02 to 31 March 2012 is 8 169 with a total incentive value of approximately R471 million.
Department of Trade and Industry	Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII)	Evaluation of Support Programme for Industrial Innovation	This Programme is linked to outcome 4. SPII provides financial assistance to SMMEs and large companies for them to develop commercially viable innovative products and processes. Currently the budget is R52.7 million and R339.4 million from 2007/8 to 2011/12. From 2007/8 to date SPII has benefited 269 companies and created 5 012 shop-floor jobs.
Department of Trade and Industry	Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)	Impact evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)	THRIP is linked to outcome 4 and outcome 5 in terms of a "Skilled and capable workforce". It supports more labour absorbing growth to support an inclusive growth path. It has a budget of R157 million for 2012/13 and its budget in the medium term strategic plan rises to R184 million for 2015/16. The THRIP beneficiaries are 205SMMEs, with 322 projects and 780 students.



Name of Department	Name of intervention	Title of evaluation	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (egg budget, beneficiaries)
Department of Military Veterans	Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and skills Transferability and Recognition Programme	Diagnostic evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and skills Transferability and Recognition Programme	The plight of military veterans was so dire that a Department of Military Veterans was established to cater for their needs as well as to ensure that the country honours and appreciates their contribution to bringing about freedom and democracy. Given that the focus on the military veterans' mandate is emerging, it is thus important to position the intervention programmes that deal with issues that will fast-track the improvement of their lives, hence this proposed diagnostic evaluation. The evaluation will assess how military veterans should be re-integrated in civilian life. It will also provide strategic information that will inform the development of the Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme.
Department of Science and Technology	Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (AMTS)	Evaluation of National Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy	This intervention is linked to outcome 4 (Employment). While not a large programme it is strategic and innovative and addresses making South African manufacturing more competitive. The budget is R43 million in 2012/13 rising to R48 million in 2014/15.
South African Revenue Services	Tax compliance cost of small businesses	Impact evaluation on Tax Compliance Cost of small businesses	Key to successful job creation (outcome 4) is the success of small businesses. SARS wishes to undertake a regular evaluation of the cost of tax compliance for small businesses, so informing the streamlining of the tax system. Approximately 800 000 small businesses are affected by this system.
Department of Co-operative Governance	Community Work Programme (CWP)	Impact evaluation of the Community Work Programme	This intervention is linked to outcome 4 and is creating a guaranteed level of basic employment of 100 days per year as a safety net. Participants undertake a range of services such as home-based care, developing agricultural projects etc. The budget is R1.4 billion in 2012/13 rising to R2.7 billion in 2014/15. As at March 2012, CWP had 105 218 participants. Other beneficiaries include those who benefit from the services provided by CWP participants, but the extent of the benefits are not known. The evaluation will help to decide whether the benefits justify scaling up.
Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Land Restitution Programme	Evaluation of the Land Restitution Programme	Restitution is directly linked to outcome 7 (Rural Development). The Restitution Programme also contributes to other outcomes including Outcome 4 and Outcome 10: "Sustainable natural resources management". The Programme is politically sensitive and an important part of the reparations from apartheid. The estimated budget for the current financial year is R3 billion benefitting 1.6 million people.

Name of Department	Name of intervention	Title of evaluation	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (egg budget, beneficiaries)
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP)	Impact evaluation of Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme	The six pillars of CASP are providing support provided to farmers, as planned for in outcome 7: “Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities with food security for all”, and also impacts on outcome 4. In 2012/13 the budget for CASP is R1.5 billion and around R1.6 billion for the next two years. 36 505 beneficiaries were supported by CASP in 2011/12, creating 10 062 jobs. There is a wider importance in that finding a successful way to provide support for small farmers is key for successful rural development.
Department of Human Settlements	Upgrading of informal settlements	Setting a baseline for future impact evaluations for the informal settlements targeted for upgrading	The upgrading of informal settlements responds to Outcome 8 “Sustainable human settlements and improved quality of household life”. Sub-output 1 addresses the upgrading of households in informal settlements with access to secure tenure rights and basic services. There is no estimated budget and the evaluation will establish the number of poor households that are targeted for the upgrading.
Department of Human Settlements	Access to the City	Evaluating interventions by the Department of Human Settlements to facilitate access to the city	The White Paper on Housing of 1995 (A New Housing Policy and Strategy for South Africa) acknowledged the increasingly urban nature of South Africa’s landscape and the fact that even those who reside in rural areas will at some time in their life spend time in a town or city. The question of whether or not the housing programmes of the Department have increased access to the urban space addresses indirectly the issues reflected in Outcome 8, including access to land, the property market, informal settlement upgrading and the acceleration of access to housing. There is no specific budget allocated to efforts of providing access to the city. Thus far over 15 million people have benefitted from the housing programme
Department of Human settlements	Provision of state-subsidised housing	Diagnostic of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities	The 1995 White Paper on Housing highlighted the importance of creating assets that households can leverage to improve their lives and that of their children. The building of integrated human settlements (outcome 8) deals with an improved property market through the creation of assets. Over 15 million people have benefitted from the government housing programme.



Name of Department	Name of intervention	Title of evaluation	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (egg budget, beneficiaries)
Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	Outcomes Approach	Impact evaluation of the Outcomes Approach	This evaluation is based on the lessons from implementation of the Outcomes Approach, which has sought to take forward government's key election priorities. The Outcomes Approach affects services covering all of the population and it is important tolearn the lessons prior to completion of the first 5 year mandate.
Presidency	Government's coordination systems	Implementation evaluation of Government's Coordination Systems	For much of government's work to be effective requires coordination horizontally within national and provincial spheres, as well as vertically across spheres. Challenges are being experienced in coordination both vertically and horizontally which is negatively affecting implementation. Particular systems to be looked at include the cluster system, outcome Implementation Forums, MinMECs which bring together national and provincial departments in a sector, and interdepartmental coordination mechanisms, such as for Early Childhood Development. These coordination mechanisms affect all government actions, and so indirectly impacts on the whole population of the country.

5 Concepts for evaluations for 2013/14

5.1 Evaluation of the quality of the National Senior Certificate

Implementing department: The Department of Basic Education

Background to the evaluation
The National Senior Certificate (NSC) is the school-leaving certificate in South Africa issued to learners upon completion of Grade 12, and is commonly known as the matriculation (matric) certificate. The NSC was introduced in Grade 12 in 2008, at which time it replaced the then existing Senior Certificate. The NSC is generally acknowledged as being the most suitable indicator of the performance of the schooling system. It is based on a high stakes examination and serves as an important filter for admission into Higher Education Institutions. In addition, completion of the NSC is a key gateway for learners to get employment. The NSC provides the education system with valuable diagnostic information that should provide feedback on teaching and learning. The NSC serves as a measure of whether learners have the requisite knowledge, skills and competencies to play their role in society; a filter for entrance into Higher Education Institutions (HEIs); a predictor of employability and a measure of the quality of the performance of the schooling system.

Importance of the evaluation
The NSC is linked to Outcome 1: Improved quality of basic education. The intervention underwent an important policy shift in 2008 and it is important to evaluate whether the intervention is serving its purpose. The estimated programme budget for 2013/14 (provincial level only), is approximately R2 billion. About 600 000 learners write the NSC each year. There is much public pressure to review the pass mark requirements for certain subjects. Furthermore, the purpose of the NSC may need to undergo a review. Issues in relation to the matric examinations are often in the media and usually get front page coverage. Academics, the business community, and parents all have an interest in ensuring that the NSC is a good indicator of the performance of the education system. The NSC commenced in 2008 and has never been evaluated.

Purpose of the evaluation
The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality of the NSC. As mentioned above the intervention underwent an important policy shift in 2008 and it is important to evaluate whether the intervention is serving its purpose.

The key evaluative questions are:

1 What does existing research say about the quality of the NSC exam papers?
2 How do stakeholders (academic community, business community, Umalusi, parents, etc.) understand the purpose of the NSC exam and how does this understanding compare against the policy expectations of the NSC.
3 How has the shift from a three-level grading system (lower grade, standard grade and higher grade) to a single grading system affected the quality and standard of the NSC?
4 Is the 30% pass mark for certain subjects too low? What are the possible effects of increasing the pass mark to 30% to 35% or 40%?

Principal audience National and provincial policy makers, FET stakeholders
Type of evaluation Diagnostic/design/implementation

Management strategy
The project is a partnership between the Department of Basic Education and the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.

Cost estimate
This evaluation will cost approximately R1 million, funded by DBE and DPME.

Time and duration
The evaluation will be undertaken between April 2013 and December 2014.





5.2 Evaluation of Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme

Implementing Department: The Department of Trade and Industry (the dti)

Background to the evaluation
The Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive Programme (EMIA), was established in 1997 within the Department of Trade and Industry (the dti), with the primary objective to develop export markets for South African products and services and to attract new foreign direct investment (FDI) into the country. The key aims of EMIA are to: provide marketing assistance to develop new exporters and grow existing export markets; assist companies to increase their competitiveness by supporting patent registrations, quality and product marks; assist with the facilitation to grow FDI through missions and FDI research; and increase the contribution of black-owned businesses and small, micro and medium enterprises (SMMEs) to the South Africa's economy.

This Programme is intended to partially compensate exporters for costs incurred in respect of activities performed in developing export markets for South African products and services, and to attract new foreign direct investment into South Africa. EMIA supports the export community by offering financial assistance through various offerings such as participation in National Pavilion exhibitions, individual exhibitions, and group trade missions, to actively promote South African products in foreign markets.

Importance of the evaluation
The period between 2001 and 2012 saw EMIA assisting more than 900 entities with their export marketing activities, as well as their recruitment of FDI for this reporting period. The cost of this financial assistance amounted to more than R84 million. EMIA also paid up to 1 274 claims to a total value of R379 million, in the meantime creating 834 permanent and 1 335 temporary jobs. The estimated budget for 2013/14 Financial Year is R189 million.

The Programme is linked to Outcome 4: Decent employment through inclusive economic growth. In view of the fact that a substantial amount of public money is spent supporting enterprises through EMIA, an evaluation is needed to assess how these resources are utilised. Although the dti undertakes small-scale evaluations of this Programme annually, an in-depth and broader evaluation is needed to assess its effectiveness in supporting South African manufacturers and exporters.

Purpose of the evaluation
This evaluation will provide strategic information (on whether the incentive programme is achieving its policy goals); operational information (on where, how and why its implementation achieves the best results). Lessons from the evaluation will be used to improve programme performance.

Key questions to be addressed

1 To what extent are the policy objectives of this Programme being achieved?
2 Is the Programme reaching the intended target groups?
3 How are they benefitting from the Programme? Is it changing their way of doing businesses?
4 How cost-effective has the Programme been and how can it be improved?
5 What are the costs in relation to the benefits?

Principal audience Policy makers and government officials
Type of evaluation Implementation/economic evaluation.

Management strategy
The evaluation will be managed jointly by the Department of Trade and Industry and DPME.

Cost estimate
The evaluation will cost approximately R1 million. DPME has allocated R500 000 for this evaluation.

Timing and Duration
The duration of the evaluation will be 12 months. It will start by April 2013 and should be completed by March 2014.

5.3 Evaluation of Support Programme for Industrial Innovation(SPII)

Implementing Department: The Department of Trade and Industry (the dti)

Background to the evaluation
The Support Programme for Industrial Innovation (SPII) was introduced 23 years ago as a programme to support innovation and technology. The Programme offers grants to Small, Micro and Medium Enterprises (SMMEs) and large enterprises. The aim is to promote the development of commercially viable, innovative products and or processes and to facilitate commercialization of such technologies. The focus of the financial support is specifically on the development phase, which begins at the conclusion of basic research and ends at the point when a pre-production prototype has been produced. The programme is administered by the Industrial Development Corporation (IDC).

Importance of the evaluation
The SPII is directly linked to Outcome 4: Decent employment through inclusive growth. Since the 2007/8 Financial Year, the Programme has disbursed R339.9 million to 269 companies, resulting in the creation of 5 012 shop-floor jobs. SMME development has been identified by government as a key contributor to job creation. As such, addressing the challenges that have been identified about the SPII is crucial. The key challenge that has been identified is an increase of administrative costs over the years. If this challenge is not addressed swiftly, the viability of the Programme may be negatively impacted. It is envisaged that the evaluation will recommend interventions to address this challenge, so that the bulk of programme funds are channelled towards research and product development. Another challenge that has been identified is the need to support the commercialization of the prototypes produced. As mentioned above, the SPII financial support does not go beyond the prototype produced. The evaluation will look at how enterprises can be assisted to access other financial incentives offered by the dti, such that the new products find their way into the market. The SPII was last reviewed in 2006. It is anticipated that evaluation of the Programme will provide insight on the effectiveness and efficiency of the current implementation model. This will assist in improving the contribution of the Programme towards SMME development and job creation.

Purpose of the evaluation
The evaluation aims to find a cost-effective model of implementing SPII. It will also inform management decision on whether to integrate the SPII back into the dti or not.

Key questions to be addressed

1. What are the drivers of the increasing administrative costs of the Programme?
2. What are the costs and benefits of the external administration of the Programme?
3. What would be the costs and benefits of administering the Programme internally, i.e. within the dti?
4. How can SPII beneficiaries be assisted to access other dti incentives?

Principal audience the dti, IDC, policy makers and government officials
Type of evaluation Implementation/economic evaluation

Management strategy
The evaluation will be managed by dti in collaboration with DPME.

Cost estimate
The evaluation will cost up to R1 million. DPME will contribute R500 000.

Timing and Duration
The duration of the evaluation will be 12 months. It will start in April 2013 and should be completed by March 2014.





5.4 Impact Evaluation of Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)

Implementing Department: The Department of Trade and Industry (the dti)

Background to the evaluation
The Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP) was introduced in 1992 to respond to the challenges of skills development in science, engineering and technology. It is funded by the dti and managed by the National Research Foundation (NRF). THRIP strives to improve the competitiveness of South African industry by supporting research and technology development and enhancing the quality and quantity of appropriately skilled people. The planned outputs of the Programme include increasing the number of black female students pursuing careers in science, engineering and technology; promoting technological know-how within the SMME sector; and facilitating and supporting multi-firm projects in which firms (including BEE initiatives) collaborate and share in project outcomes.

THRIP is evaluated bi-annually (every two years). The last impact evaluation report was published in the 2009/10 financial year. A follow-up evaluation is needed to assess how the impacts of the Programme can be strengthened.

Importance of the evaluation
According to the 2009/10 Impact Report, THRIP has invested R524 million in 565 projects. THRIP's current budget (2012/13FY) is R157 million and the programme is supporting 205 SMMEs, 322 firms, 327 projects and 780 students. THRIP is linked to Outcome 4, output 4.2 "More labour absorbing growth" and Outcome 5 Output 5.3 "Increase access to occupationally-directed programmes in needed areas and thereby expand the availability of intermediate level skills".

Purpose of the evaluation
The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of THRIP and to determine how the impacts can be strengthened.

Key questions to be addressed

1. What impact does THRIP make to SMME development through technology partnerships?
2. Do SMME partners realise a significant Return on Investment (ROI) from THRIP? After how long is the ROI realised?
3. What is the impact of THRIP on skills development in Science, Engineering and Technology?
4. What is the rate of job creation by firms which took up THRIP's incentive? Why are jobs being created at this rate – how could this be speeded up?
5. What is the absorption capacity of students supported by industry?
6. How can the impact of THRIP be strengthened?

Principal audience Policy makers and government officials
Type of evaluation Impact evaluation

Management strategy
The evaluation will be managed jointly by the Department of Trade and Industry and DPME.

Cost estimate
At this stage the cost implications are not clear. The budget will depend on the methodology to be used, which in turn will depend on the recommendations of a scoping exercise. DPME will contribute 50% of the total cost of the evaluation.

Timing and Duration
The duration of the evaluation will be 12 months. It will start by April 2013 and should be completed by March 2014.

5.5 Evaluation of National Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy

Implementing Department: Department of Science and Technology

Background to the evaluation
The Advanced Manufacturing Technology Strategy (AMTS) was initiated by the National Advisory Council on Innovation (NACI) in being identified as a priority technology mission in the Department of Science and Technology's (DST's) National Research and Development Strategy.

The primary intended outcome of the AMTS is to assist in improving the competitiveness of the manufacturing sector in South Africa. This is to be achieved through activities and resulting outputs focused on innovation and advanced technology development within the manufacturing sector by addressing innovation gaps and by investing in manufacturing technology programmes.

The AMTS identifies several industry sectors (e.g. aerospace, automotive, chemicals) and technology focus areas (e.g. advanced materials, production technologies, cleaner production technologies) which conceptually create cross-cutting areas for intervention. Three flagship programmes were initiated (viz. light-weight materials, advanced electronics and digital manufacturing technologies), supported by a number of special human resource development programmes and instruments.

Importance of the evaluation

The AMTS supports Outcome 4, namely "decent employment through inclusive economic growth". The primary outcome of the AMTS is also aligned with one of the strategic objectives of the DST's Socio-Economic Partnerships (SEP) Programme, specifically to grow and sustain a portfolio of niche high-potential research and development capabilities that support the competitiveness of existing and emerging economic sectors and the development of new targeted industries with growth potential in advanced manufacturing, chemicals, advanced metals and information and communication technologies (ICTs).

The DST has invested approximately half a billion Rand in the AMTS since its inception. Even though the current set of outcomes (and the internal strategic objectives of the Programme) were formulated well after the AMTS came into being, the evaluation of the AMTS is nevertheless important in order to determine to what extent the AMTS has supported the relevant DST SEP strategic objective and Outcome 4. A review of the AMTS was conducted in 2006, hence the intended evaluation will focus primarily on the fiscal period from 2006/7 to 2012/13.

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the efficiency of the implementation of the AMTS and also assess its effectiveness in improving the competitiveness of the local manufacturing sector. It will also assess whether the intended outcomes of the strategy have been achieved.

The findings of the evaluation will be used to improve the performance of the Programme and will also aid future medium - to long-term planning of appropriate interventions to make more of an impact.

Key questions to be addressed

Outcomes:

- To what extent has the AMTS improved the competitiveness of South Africa's manufacturing sector? Have there been any observed changes attributable to the AMTS?
- In terms of co-investment by industry and securing additional public funds, to what extent have AMTS investments unlocked or leveraged additional resources?
- What number of new technologies were developed that are now integrated into industry processes, products and/or services. What was the nature of the impact of these (e.g. incremental, radical changes)?
- To what extent has the AMTS led to the establishment of new innovation networks or partnerships (local and overseas)?

Implementation:

- To what extent have the recommendations made in the 2006 AMTS implementation review been implemented?
- What are the barriers to up-scaling the AMTS?
- What interventions need to be put in place to improve the AMTS' contribution to local manufacturing competitiveness? Specifically, what are the appropriate levels of human resources and financial investments required for sustainability and growth of the AMTS to improve the initiative's impact?
- How can the implementation of the AMTS be strengthened to improve the initiative's impact?

Principal audience: Politicians, policy-makers, government officials, researchers, medium-to high-tech manufacturers

Type of evaluation: Implementation and outcomes evaluation

Management strategy

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





Cost estimate
The evaluation is estimated to cost R2 million. The costs shall be shared equally by the DST and the DPME.

Timing and duration
The evaluation will start in July 2013 and should be completed by March 2014.

5.6 Evaluation of the cost of tax compliance for small businesses

Implementing Institution: South African Revenue Service (SARS)

Background to the evaluation
Governments globally are under pressure to rationalise administrative burdens and to create an enabling regulatory environment that fosters economic and social advancements at a time when businesses, individuals and governments are forced to do much more with much less.

Reducing administrative burdens for many governments has become a key priority to achieve accountable, transparent and efficient service delivery. Within government, tax authorities in many countries have introduced burden reduction programmes that aim to simplify and reduce compliance obligations to enable taxpayers to interact with the revenue authority in an efficient and cost effective manner. Taxpayers need to feel that they are paying a sizeable portion of their income to a government that they support and a tax system that is perceived to be fair.

The basic administrative goals of tax policy is that it should be easy to understand and to comply and that it should be administered in a competent and fair manner. However, various complexities resulting in increased administrative burdens and compliance costs for taxpayers, in particular for small businesses, reduce profits and retards growth. To stimulate an environment that enables social and economic development and at the same time increase the compliance levels of small businesses it is imperative that the costs incurred by small businesses in fulfilling their tax obligations are understood and the benefits of cost saving initiatives are passed to them.

While there are talks in Government to put an infrastructure for small businesses in order to boost the economy of the country, SARS would like to work with government in helping to monitor the tax compliance costs for small businesses, through face to face surveys over a period of time. This is also to address the concern raised by the Parliamentary Committee in their fourth session report where they indicated that the cost of compliance for Small Medium and Micro Enterprises (SMME) is high and could burden the poor in starting their own small businesses.

Importance of the evaluation
This survey will make possible a comprehensive system that will regularly assess and account for taxation compliance costs for small businesses in South Africa because the impact of burden alleviation measures aimed at reducing taxation compliance costs is a continuous process. A baseline study was conducted in 2011, which needs to be continuously updated and used to evaluate initiatives embarked on by SARS. The tax system and legislation change continuously as different programs are initiated and surveys of this nature will detect issues that impact on the tax system and retard business development. SARS can use the findings of the survey as acknowledgement of its commitment to assist small businesses in their compliance obligations and to promote new reforms, and/or improve existing reforms. A quantification of compliance and administrative costs will enable SARS to understand the costs; prioritise cost reduction programs, set targets, monitor performance and track improvement over time, since tax compliance costs are one of the regulatory costs that have a huge impact on small businesses. This has been proved in many countries including most OECD countries.

Purpose of the evaluation
The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the gross tax compliance costs incurred by small businesses to meet their tax obligations.

This evaluation will allow management to have a better understanding of the cost of compliance of small businesses and also to evaluate whether any specific legislation (such as Turnover Tax) should be amended or enhanced to further assist this segment of the SARS tax base.

Key questions to be addressed
The key evaluation questions that will be addressed are:

1. To what extent are small businesses complying with the tax legislation?
2. What are reasons for non-compliance with the tax legislation?

3. What are the total costs and related benefits of the following services:
    - External accounting services used by small businesses?
    - External tax services used by small businesses?
    - External payroll related services used by small businesses?
4. What are the costs that small businesses can afford to pay for external accounting services and external payroll related services?
5 What are the benefits in relation to these costs?
6. What is the time and costs involved for the following for each tax?
    - recording information needed for tax;
    - calculating tax, completing tax return and paying tax;
    - dealing with SARS (phone calls, email, visits);
    - tax planning and tax advice;
    - dealing with external tax advisors, including time taken to provide information to them.
7. Does SARS have an effective communication strategy on tax compliance for small businesses? Have small businesses been made aware of the SB tax concessions and the extent of their use?

Management strategy
The evaluation will be managed jointly by the South African Revenue Service (SARS) and DPME.

Cost estimate
The evaluation is estimated to cost R1 million, which will be covered by the DPME.

Timing and duration
The duration of the evaluation will be 12 months. It will start in April 2013 and should be completed by March 2014.

5.7 Diagnostic evaluation of Military Veterans Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme

Implementing Department: Department of Military Veterans (DMV)

Background to the evaluation
The mission of the Department of Military Veterans is to facilitate delivery and co-ordinate all activities that recognise and entrench the restoration of dignity and appreciation of the contribution of military veterans to our freedom and nation building. One of the vehicles to meet this vision and mission is the Empowerment Programme, which aims to provide skills development, employment creation as well as services to honour contributions made by military veterans. Military veterans have acquired significant skills over years. These skills are however not recognized and/or easily transferable to the civilian setting. This Programme aims to develop instruments and/or tools to recognize the learning that military veterans have acquired in a military setting and translate them to a civilian setting, and allow for quantification and recognition of that experience to facilitate access to employment opportunities.

Importance of the evaluation
There is a high rate of unemployment amongst military veterans which is compounded by poor transferability of military skills, which, in turn, limits their opportunities to access employment opportunities. By providing them with market-related skills, it is hoped that this will result in more military veterans securing employment (including self-employment). This will in turn result in empowered military veterans.

The plight of military veterans was so dire that a Department of Military Veterans was established to cater for their needs as well as to ensure that the country honours and appreciates their contribution to bring about freedom and democracy. Given that the focus on the military veterans' mandate is emerging, it is thus important to position the intervention programmes that deal with issues that will fast-track the improvement of their lives, hence this proposed diagnostic evaluation.





Purpose of the evaluation
The evaluation will undertake a diagnostic to assess how military veterans should be re-integrated into civilian life which will inform the development of an Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme.

Key questions to be addressed

1. What are the current skills and competencies of military veterans?
2. How many military veterans have obtained portable skills? Have they received any career counseling? If so, how many have received this counseling?
3. How many military veterans are in secure employment? How many are self-employed/ established successful enterprises?
4. Is the current policy for military veterans adequately addressing their needs? Are there challenges experienced in implementing this policy? If there are challenges, how can it be improved?
5. What should be the strategy for recognising prior learning and transferability of skills for military veterans?
6. What should be the strategy for increasing the employability of military veterans?
7. What are the implications for the theory of change and logic model that should inform the Military Veterans' Economic Empowerment and Skills Transferability and Recognition Programme?

Principal audience Policy makers and government officials
Type of evaluation Diagnostic evaluation, mainly using secondary data.

Management strategy
The evaluation will be managed jointly by the Department of Military Veterans and DPME.

Cost estimate
The evaluation will cost approximately R500 000, which will be covered by the DPME.

Timing and Duration
The duration of the evaluation will be 6 months. It will start in March 2013 and should be completed by September 2013.

5.8 Impact evaluation of the Community Work Programme (CWP)

Implementing department: Department of Co-operative Governance (DCOG)

Background to the evaluation
The CWP was included as a new component of EPWP in Phase Two and has a number of features that differentiate it from other components of EPWP. In particular:

- The implementation model was kept simple, and it has a mandatory labour intensity of 65%, to optimise the resources that reach the hands of poor people;
- It is an area-based programme, not a sectoral programme. This allows it to target the most marginal areas;
- It offers regular part-time work to participants, typically two days a week. This provides an on-going income floor, rather than a short-term periodof work;
- It is a government programme, but it is implemented by non-profit agencies. The work performed is decided in consultation with communities.

The objective is to create access to a minimum level of regular and predictable work opportunities for those who need it, targeting areas of high unemployment. The planned outcomes are:

- Participants from poor households are employed on a regular, part-time basis;
- Participants earn regular incomes;
- Work performed creates socially useful assets and services;
- Community capacity to participate in and contribute to development is strengthened;
- New forms of partnership in development are enabled.

Importance of the evaluation

The Community Works Programme contributes to priority outcome 4 "Decent employment through inclusive growth", through sub-output 7: "agreement with social partners to promote the goal of decent work through inclusive growth and strengthened implementation of the Framework Response to the International Economic Crisis". It introduces a new model for delivery of public employment, intended to enable greater scale, to strengthen the poverty impacts of public employment, to build greater community participation in the development process, and to strengthen partnerships between government, civil society and communities as a result of its implementation model. At the July Cabinet Lekgotla 2011, a proposal was approved to scale up the CWP to 1 million participants by 2013/14. However, in the current MTEF, CWP is funded to scale up to 332,500 participants over this period. In his budget speech, the Minister of Finance made the point that this could be adjusted upwards based on CWP's performance.

Purpose of the evaluation

CWP is a complex programme, and different dimensions of its impact need to be evaluated. The proposed focus of this evaluation is, however, on the qualitative dimensions of the Programme, particularly in relation to the last two outcomes identified:

- Community capacity to participate in and contribute to development is strengthened;
- New forms of partnership in development are enabled.

These aspects of the Programme have been highlighted inter alia at the Cabinet Lekgotla of July 2011, where they formed part of the rationale for scaling the CWP up to a million participants; as well as by the National Planning Commission as part of its rationale for supporting the model.

Key questions to be addressed

1. Is community capacity to participate in and contribute to development being strengthened through the CWP?
   a. If so, in what ways is this taking place, with what lessons, with what best practices, with what strengths and weaknesses, and with what impacts on social cohesion and local development? If not, why not? What are the constraints, what are the lessons?
2. The 'new form of partnership' envisaged in CWP is between government, (as the programme holder), civil society organisations, (as implementing agencies), and communities, (as participants in identifying priorities for 'useful work' at local level). In this context, is the CWP enabling new forms of partnership at local level?

Principal audience	CWP stakeholders, including the responsible department, Implementing Agents, the CWP Steering Committee (made up of DPME, DCOG, DSD, NT, EDD and DPW), and the Inter Ministerial Committee on Short Term Strategies for Job Creation and Anti-Poverty.
Type of evaluation	Outcomes/Impact

Management strategy

The evaluation complements a proposed study using a randomised controlled trial (RCT) which has been submitted to 3ie to determine the extent to which the CWP improves livelihoods and economic agency of its participants in marginalised rural communities. Funding under the National Evaluation Plan will be used either (a) to enhance the qualitative dimensions of the RCT, or (b) to extend the scope of the RCT. The evaluation will be managed by DPME and DCOG, in their capacities as co-chairs of the CWP Steering Committee, on whose behalf the evaluation will be conducted, and to whom it will be reported. This ensures that the outcomes influence the CWP Steering Committee in relation to its function of strategic oversight of the CWP; if relevant they will be reported to the IMC as well.

Cost estimate

The proposed budget under the NEP is R500 000. If possible this should be used as co-funding to leverage additional support for a wider qualitative study from other donors.

Time and duration

The CWP is currently undergoing an institutional review, to ensure that institutional arrangements for the Programme are optimal for it to achieve its objectives. This evaluation should take place once agreement has been reached on any changes that might be required at this level, to ensure that the evaluation supports on-going assessment rather than reflecting on weaknesses already evident. Depending on the outcome of the application to 3ie, the evaluation may undertake baseline studies at new sites, and return after six months and one year to assess outcomes and impacts in the areas as defined.





5.9 Evaluation of the Land Restitution Programme

Implementing Department: Department of Rural Development and Land Reform

Background to the evaluation
As one of three legs of Land Reform, the Land Restitution Programme is a rights-based programme where all those who lost their land under the repressive land legislation of the past could lodge their land claims before 31 December 1998 as per the Restitution Act of 1994 as amended. The Programme is geared towards redressing the injustices of the past, as well as contributing towards nation building, either through either land restoration or equitable redress.

The Department provides settlement support to restitution beneficiaries, supports mentorship (skills development) and much needed functional agricultural infrastructure, all of which are geared towards ensuring productivity and food security. This contributes towards the achievement of the departmental strategic goal: Increased access to and productive use of land by 2014.

Importance of the evaluation
The issue of land ownership is a national priority which serves as a rural development intervention linked to the five top government priorities namely, health, education, crime, rural development, job creation. Through restoration of rights to land, the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform serves as catalyst and a facilitator to ensure that rural development takes place at the required depth and scope. Since the inception of the programme the Commission has spent more than R22.9 billion on land restoration and financial compensation.

Purpose of the evaluation
The evaluation will focus on the impact on the lives of the people contributed by the Restitution Programme in collaboration with the CRDP. This will entail the assessment of the social and economic change as a result of the Restitution Programme since inception.

Key questions to be addressed
- Are the set objectives/outcomes of the Restitution Programme being achieved?
- Is the Programme reaching its targeted beneficiaries and what are the intended and unintended impacts on them?
- What other results have been achieved by the Restitution Programme?
- Is the intervention more effective for some beneficiaries than for others?
- Are the results of the Programme sustainable?
- Is the Restitution Programme implemented efficiently, effectively and is it value for money?

Principal audience Politicians, policy makers, government officials, researchers and academia
Type of evaluation Impact

Management strategy
The project is a partnership between the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.

Cost estimate
This evaluation is estimated to cost R1.5 million, which will be covered by the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights.

Timing and Duration
The evaluation will start in March 2013 and will be complete by the end of 2013.

5.10 Impact evaluation of the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP)

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

Background to the evaluation
The Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) is a schedule 4 grant that aims to provide post-settlement support to targeted beneficiaries of land redistribution and reform and other producers who have acquired land through private means and are for example, engaged in value-adding enterprises domestically, or involved in export.

Importance of the evaluation
The six pillars of CASP are defining the support provided to farmers categories targeted by outcome 7: "vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all". It is therefore critical for a number of outputs under outcome 7. In terms of agrarian reform, the number of smallholder farmers should be increased by 50 000. However, only 11 000 new smallholders have been established since 2009. Although support has been provided to both new and long-established farmers through programmes such as the CASP, only a marginal number of 5 381 smallholders are involved in agri-business and a mere 3 910 are linked to markets.

In view of the current economic circumstances, National Treasury is insisting that support programmes be assessed to determine value for money. Other support programmes for smallholders such as Ilima-Letsema, LandCare, Mafisa, and the AgriBEE Fund also need to be evaluated as it appears that there is no convincing overall support package in place yet. A number of departments have developed rural strategies and there is a need for improved integration and coordination of these strategies at the local level. This entails that the evaluation will have to involve all departments that have programmes to develop rural areas.

Purpose of the evaluation
An impact evaluation of CASP to determine the impact on food production, livelihoods of rural communities and how the Programme can be strengthened.

Key questions to be addressed

1. Has CASP had any effect on food production in the country or would the results have happened anyway?
2. What impact has CASP made on business processes of the Department?
3. Are the objectives and activities of other related programmes aligned with the intended outcomes of CASP?
4. Are CASP's objectives and implementation approaches fully understood at implementation stages by beneficiaries and stakeholders?
5. How can the Programme be strengthened?

Principal audience Policy makers and staff of DAFF, DRDLR and COGTA
Type of evaluation Impact

Management strategy
The evaluation is a partnership between the Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries and DPME. The evaluation will also have to involve other departments that have related programmes to develop rural areas.

Cost estimate
Still to be determined. DAFF and DPME will each contribute R500k to this study. Additional resources may need to be sought.

Time and duration
This evaluation will take place during the 2013/14 financial year.

5.11 Setting a baseline for future impact evaluations for the informal settlements targeted for upgrading

Implementing Department: Department of Human Settlements

Background to the evaluation
South Africa is facing a major challenge of informal settlement growth, which impacts on poverty, health, community safety, and the effective functioning of urban areas. Since 1994 the number of households living in informal settlements has risen in both absolute terms and as a share of the total number of households in the country. According to Stats SA (2007 Community Survey), there are still between 1.1 million and 1.4 million households of the total population of 49 million living in slum-like conditions in South Africa. Due to continually changing socio political and spatial configurations in these settlements, appropriately defined data collected on a more frequent basis is necessary so as to provide for more appropriate interventions and support to the population living there and thus contributing for effective urban economies

The Department of Human Settlements Informal Settlements Upgrading Programme takes two forms, in-situ upgrading of informal settlements, and the relocation of informal settlements dwellers into safe habitable settlements. The key objective of the in–situ upgrading of the informal settlements is to facilitate the structured upgrading of informal settlements without relocation, to minimise disruption to social networks, and facilitate integration into the workings of the urban realm. Overall the Programme is designed to achieve the following policy objectives: stabilise the lives of people living in informal settlements by improving shelter





and living conditions; provide tenure security; establish processes towards housing consolidation empowering targeted communities and to integrate the settlements into neighbourhood and city wide development initiatives. In the last year, a new programme was developed for the 6 largest metropolitan governments called the Urban Settlements Support Grant, which has as a programme objective supplementary planning and infrastructure support for informal settlement upgrading by municipalities.

During the 2009/10 financial year, the Department with the technical assistance of the World Bank conducted a limited series of Impact Assessment Studies to assess the effects of the Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme (UISP) interventions in selected housing projects. The studies measured the impact of providing subsidised housing (through the UISP) by comparing beneficiaries of UISP to a comparable group of individuals who did not benefit from the programme. The results of the study show strong impacts in relation to change in household demographics, asset accumulation, social interactions, satisfaction levels, household upgrading, crime rates, health and unemployment. Although impacts have been noted in the 2009/10 studies, the scope of coverage was limited, and these studies took place without a previously established baseline, which implies that the results of these studies cannot be generalised across the country. In order to address the concerns raised in the previous studies, this study aims at mapping and profiling informal settlements across the country that are targeted for upgrading. The collected data will then be used as a baseline to conduct future impact assessment studies based on the range of support programmes (UISP and the USDG) and interventions made regarding the upgrading of the settlements and their inhabitants, either in situ and or through relocations, and given that the programme is crafted into stages, at the respective stage of intervention.

Importance of the evaluation

The Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme responds to Output 1 of Outcome 8, to accelerate the delivery of housing opportunities through the upgrading of 400 000 households in informal settlements with access to secure tenure rights and basic services. This survey will enable the Department to accurately scope the number of informal settlements targeted for upgrading in the country, and to monitor and report on progress. Collected data will then be used as baseline information against which future impact will be measured.

It is also envisaged that the survey will provide better understanding of the current complexities of the informal settlements and provide updated information which will indicate how the provinces and municipalities are/will make choices in terms of interim services, categorisation of settlements for types of upgrading, development plans both local and sub-regional, prioritisation and nature of intervention plans, institutional arrangements including community involvement, how these areas are to be fully developed and integrated into the wider neighbourhood development plans and importantly how communities have been impacted upon by these choices. Through this survey and the measurement of progress based on the stage of programme intervention, the Department will also ascertain whether the Programme outcomes are being achieved or not, if not, whether there is a need to review the entire UIS Programme to address the evolving needs on the ground. The survey and subsequent impact evaluations will further reveal the unintended outcomes (positive or negative) resulting from the Programme which will in turn help the Department and other implementing and management agencies to adjust the Programme.

The measurement of impact of many government programmes is often compromised by the fact that in many instances baseline data is not collected prior to programme delivery. This often leads to inability to objectively quantify improvements and measure the effectiveness of the intervention. This study will close this gap by providing status quo information on informal settlements targeted for upgrading using a variety of measures that will later on be used as a basis to quantify and qualify impact. The baseline study will therefore be a significant step needed to avoid underestimation of impact.

Purpose of the baseline survey

The purpose of the survey will be to collate existing locality maps and plans, obtain an understanding of geophysical conditions, service availability, get an understanding of community dynamics and demographics which includes health and safety, employment, consumption and productive activities and a state of social capital of local communities in the informal settlements targeted for upgrading.

Key questions to be addressed

The study will respond to the following broad questions:

a. Is the theory of change that informs the UIS Programme in responding

to the informal settlements valid and appropriate for the South African context?

b. Where are and what is the state of the informal settlements targeted for upgrading?
c. What is the number and composition of households living in the informal settlements targeted for upgrading?
d. What is the classification of informal settlements per province and per district municipality targeted for upgrading, according to the checklist of descriptive factors of informal settlements and their mode for upgrading?
e. What is the demographic profile of the targeted informal settlements?
f. What are the dynamic of the settlements in relationship to the sub economy including factors of health and safety, employment, consumption and productive activities, the state of social capital and activities aimed at the empowering of local communities?
g. How have community dynamics been factored into plans being prepared by the officials responsible for carrying out the upgrading and integration of the settlements into wider neighbourhood and city development plans?

Principal audience Politicians, national departments (policy makers), provincial departments (policy implementers), municipalities (planners), government officials, researchers and academia

Type of evaluation Baseline study for impact evaluation

Management strategy
The project is a partnership between the Department of Human Settlements (DHS), and DPME.

Cost of the evaluation
It is estimated that the evaluation will cost approximately R5 million and will be funded by the national Department of Human Settlements.

Timing and duration
The evaluation is likely to start in 2012/13 and should be completed by the end of 2013/14 financial year.

5.12 Evaluating interventions by the Department of Human Settlements to facilitate access to the city

Implementing Department: Department of Human Settlements

Background
The White Paper on Housing of 1994 highlighted the increasingly urban nature of South Africa's landscape and the fact that even those who reside in rural areas will at some point in their lives spend time in a town or city. For those trying to access opportunities and resources in urban centres, informal housing in informal settlements remained the only option available. Since 1995 a large amount of work has been done by the Department of Human Settlements to address the shelter challenges and improve access of all to the urban spaces within South Africa. In particular, the interventions sought to ensure that in addition to improving access to decent shelter, those living in the cities also had improved access to the various other opportunities that present themselves in centres of economic activity. A number of evaluations of specific programmes are being undertaken in 2012/13 (Urban Settlements Development Grant, Integrated Residential Development Programme) and in 2013/14 (A Diagnostic of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities; Setting the Baseline of the informal settlements targeted for upgrading).This evaluation will provide a picture of the wider policy intent, how far this has been achieved and the implications for the future.

Importance of the evaluation
The White Paper on Housing of 1994 acknowledged the increasingly urban nature of South Africa's landscape and the fact that even those who reside in rural areas will at some time in their life spend time in a town or city. The question of whether or not the housing programmes of the Department have increased access to the urban spaces indirectly addresses the issues reflected in Outcome 8, including access to land, the property market, informal settlement upgrading and the acceleration of access to housing. This evaluation is thus important and innovative as it uses the urban space as a lens through which to assess the impact of the housing programme. It is very likely that this evaluation will inform the development of a Green Paper on Human Settlements, to be undertaken by the Department.





Government evaluations tend to focus on evaluating a particular programme or policy and very few evaluate the appropriateness and achievement of the overall intentions of government interventions. This study does not aim to evaluate a specific policy, plan or programme but aims to determine whether the overall interventions of the Department of Human Settlements since 1994 have over time enabled poor households to access the city and the opportunities it presents.

Purpose of the evaluation
The evaluation will determine how the South African government, and particularly the Department of Human Settlements, have been able to facilitate access to the city for previously marginalised individuals. The study will assist the Department of Human Settlements to strengthen current human settlement programmes and the lessons learned will be incorporated in new programmes aimed at responding to shelter and settlements concerns.

Key questions to be addressed

1. What interventions were put in place by the Department of Human Settlements between 1994 and 2011 to enhance access to the city by previously marginalised groups?
2. Have the various interventions of the Department of Human Settlements succeeded in facilitating access to the city for the previously marginalised post 1994?
3. Where there has been no 'obvious' investment by the Department of Human Settlements, how have people managed to facilitate access on their own? Do they have sufficient flexibility to negotiate their own access?
4. What is the impact of the economic, legal and policy imperatives in South Africa on the current urban context? What have been their contributions towards increasing access to the city for all?
5. Based on the above, is the theory of change that informs the various housing programme in responding to access to the city valid and appropriate?
6. What are the implications of this for future policy and programme interventions?

Principal audience	Politicians, policy-makers, government officials, researchers in academia and civil society, community based organisations
Type of evaluation	Outcome/impact evaluation

Management strategy
The project is a partnership between the Department of Human Settlements (DHS), and DPME.

Cost of the evaluation
It is estimated that the evaluation will cost approximately R500 000 and will be funded by the national Department of Human Settlements.

Timing and duration
The evaluation is likely to start in January 2013 and should be completed by December 2013.

5.13 A diagnostic evaluation of whether the provision of state-subsidised housing has addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities

Implementing Department: Department of Human Settlements

Background
From an economic perspective, the housing programme that was introduced in 1994 had the aim of redistributing wealth through home ownership in order to ensure the participation of the poor in the mainstream economy and to drive economic development. While this was one of the primary intentions of the housing programme, for the most part the first ten years of housing delivery focused predominantly on shelter provision, security of tenure and poverty alleviation. To a large extent, the South African Government succeeded in achieving the goal of providing shelter and security of tenure to millions of impoverished South Africans. However, whether or not these houses have developed into economic, financial and social assets for beneficiaries of the housing programme, as well as their dependants, requires further investigation and understanding.

Importance of the evaluation

Outcome 8 is about sustainable human settlements and improved household lives; the evaluation relates to the extent to which the lives of beneficiaries have improved through home ownership and whether they have been able to use the home/shelter to improve their lives.The area of assets is of public interest as shown in the many debates in Parliament, the latest being the Human Settlements 2012/13 budget vote. In addition, this evaluation will determine whether the Programme has enabled municipalities to increase their tax base (i.e. assets for municipalities as well as for households). This evaluation is particularly important because the Programme has not yet been evaluated in this manner. While the DHS has previously completed studies focusing on the impact of government programmes on households the extent to which the Programme impacts on municipalities has not been fully assessed.

Along with the evaluation on Access to the City, it is very likely that this evaluation will inform the development of a Green Paper on Human Settlements, to be undertaken by the Department. In addition the study will provide valuable guidance for future interventions.

Purpose of the evaluation

This study aims to determine whether the overall interventions of the Department of Human Settlements since 1994 have over time been able to encourage the creation of social, economic and financial assets for marginalised households and communities as well as assets for municipalities.

The main research question is: Has the provision of state subsidised housing addressed asset poverty for households and local municipalities? This study should therefore respond to a range of issues related to asset creation for individual households, the creation of assets for municipalities and the challenges and opportunities within the broader context that influence these.

Key questions to be addressed

1. To what extent has the intended outcome of reducing poverty through provision of housing been achieved?
2. To what extent have these assets assisted beneficiaries to participate in the formal property market and to move up the ladder in the property market as intended?
3. To what extent have these assets been used as collateral for funding and how have they been used as leverage to access other economic opportunities?
4. Have housing development programmes created assets for municipalities?
   - What has been the impact of the housing programme on municipalities?
   - What are the opportunities missed by municipalities to capitalise on housing programmes?
5. Are there any contextual factors at play that have enhanced or diminished the impact on assets of the various programmes of the Department of Housing over time?
6. What are the conditions that have facilitated or constrained the creation of government subsidised housing as assets and how can these conditions be improved?
7. Are the objectives of the various government housing programmes realistic in addressing asset poverty?
8. Is the theory of change that informs the housing programmes in responding to asset poverty valid and appropriate for South African context and if necessary how should this theory of change be revised, with what implications for the mix of programmes?

Principal audience Politicians, policy-makers, government officials, researchers in academic and civil society, community-based organisations

Type of evaluation Outcome/impact evaluation

Management strategy

The project is a partnership between the Department of Human Settlements (DHS) and DPME.

Cost estimate

As the evaluation will use existing secondary data, it is estimated that the evaluation will cost approximately R500 000 and will be funded by the national Department of Human Settlements.

Timing and duration

The evaluation is likely to start in January 2013 and should be completed by December 2013.





5.14 Impact evaluation of the Outcomes Approach

Implementing department: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation

Background to the evaluation

The Outcomes Approach represents a specific innovative orientation to building and establishing a results-oriented approach in government. The purpose was to ensure an outcomes (rather than simply outputs or activities) orientation within government, to focus on a limited number of key strategic priorities of government, and to promote a coordinated whole-of-government approach to achieve these outcomes, going beyond the silos. In total, 12 cross government and cross sphere outcomes were adopted by government in 2009. Delivery agreements (outcome plans) were signed in 2010 for each outcome, developed from intensive engagements between the DPME and departments involved in the outcomes. Each outcome is coordinated by one department, using a structure called an Implementation Forum which involves the departments involved from the relevant spheres. The delivery agreements have a log-frame type structure that includes outcomes, outputs, sub-outputs and activities, based on a more-or-less explicit theory of change. Actual monitoring and coordination is achieved through the departments reporting to implementation forums using a system of quarterly reports. Outcome facilitators were appointed in DPME to support the planning and monitoring of the outcomes.

Importance of the evaluation

The Outcomes Approach was introduced to ensure that government focused on achieving the expected real improvements in the lives of citizens rather than just carrying out functions and delivering outputs (Guide to the Outcomes Approach Version 27, May 10 2010, page 9). However, several challenges have been experienced since the introduction of the Outcomes Approach. Amongst others, questions have emerged about the following:

- The breadth and depth of delivery agreements across government;
- The functionality and effectiveness of Implementation Forums;
- The role of outcome facilitators;
- Data quality;
- The data system (Programme of Action);
- Inter-linkages between the DPME and Treasury systems;
- Alignment between delivery agreements and departmental strategic plans and annual performance plans;
- Reporting requirements by centre of government departments.

An evaluation is therefore needed to devise solutions to the above challenges and to track progress of what is working and what is not working. This will assist management to make an informed decision on how to continue with this approach.

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the outcomes approach in terms of increased strategic focus of government, improved coordination on cross government priorities, and improved monitoring and focus on addressing problems emerging in implementation. It will also guide how implementation of the approach can be strengthened.

Key in this regard is whether whole-of government planning, linked to outcomes has been introduced and implemented; and whether an effective outcome monitoring system has been institutionalised, resulting in improved use of results to drive and improve government performance.

Key questions to be addressed

1. To what degree have the delivery agreements actually been implemented?
2. What impact have the quarterly monitoring reports had in terms of identifying areas to improve, decisions taken by departments or Cabinet?
3. What impacts has the implementation of the Outcomes Approach had on the following:
    - On the achievements in the outcome areas?
    - On the way departments approach the content around the outcome (eg quality of their plans)?
    - On coordination between departments around the outcome?
    - On an outcomes as opposed to activity/output focus of government?
    - Are there unintended and/or negative impacts?
4. Has the investment in the outcomes approach within DPME, and by departments been cost-effective? Has the strategic focus of government improved?

5. If the Approach has had positive impacts, how could it be strengthened?

Principal audience The President, policy makers, government officials, and civil society

Type of evaluation Impact/implementation

Management strategy

The evaluation of the Outcomes Approach will be discussed with the Presidency and G&A Cluster, as part of reviewing operations of the current term of office and reflecting what may be useful going into the next term of office.

Cost estimate

Estimated budget for the evaluation is R1 million, which will be covered by the DPME.

Timing and Duration

The evaluation will start by February 2013 and be completed by October 2013.

5.15 Impact/Implementation evaluation of Government's coordination systems

Implementing department: Presidency/DPME

Background to the evaluation

Coordination across government departments is often very problematic. Some of the approaches being used include:

- Within national government, the cluster system, which has been operating for over 10 years and has developed some institutional stability;
- Across spheres, MinMECs established to deal with concurrent functions;
- Implementation Forums established in 2010 to coordinate outcomes (which use the MinMECs or clusters);
- Interdepartmental mechanisms such as those for Early Childhood Development;
- Structures proposed by the Intergovernmental Relations Act.

Despite these systems, coordination is not as strong as is needed.

Importance of the evaluation

Weaknesses of the current cluster system were raised as early as 2005, in the Cabinet Discussion Document on the Capacity and Organisation of the State (the Presidency, 2005). This stated that " officials' inter-departmental project teams exist only in name, and relate to one another only when updates have to be provided". An evaluation of the cluster system was carried out in 2008 by the Technical Assistance Unit (TAU) in National Treasury which indicated that many Directors-General do not see attending cluster meetings as a good use of their time. There are also many programmatic areas where coordination is critical and failing. Classic examples are around the gap between Rural Development and Land Reform, leading on land reform, and DAFF, leading on agricultural extension and post settlement support. Another is in ECD where the recently completed Diagnostic Review states that "ECD services require strong and coordinated inter-sectoral vision, commitment and action. The current coordination structures are not working adequately. High-level authorization and legitimacy of a well-resourced central agency or mechanism is needed to drive forward key strategies for ECD." The operation of MinMECs and the Implementation Forums for the 12 outcomes is also patchy and limiting the effectiveness of implementation across government. This evaluation will provide an opportunity for Cabinet to reflect on how these systems could be strengthened which should have a big impact on cross-government programmes and policies.

Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the performance of coordination systems in government and to see how to strengthen their effectiveness.

Key questions to be addressed

1 To what extent are these systems improving coordination in government in general?

2 What needs to be done to improve the coordination mechanisms?

- 2.1 Are the mandates, roles and responsibilities clear, appropriate and being fulfilled?
- 2.2 Do the systems have the institutional capacity to do what is expected of them? If not, what should be done in this regard?
- 2.3 How could the operation of these systems be improved?





Principal audience Ministers, Directors General
Type of evaluation Implementation

Management strategy
The client of the evaluation is the Director General in the Presidency, who oversees the performance of government, chairing the Forum of South Africa's Directors General (FOSAD). The results will be tabled at FOSAD and considered in some detail by Cabinet as part of considering how to improve the effectiveness of implementation.

Cost estimate
A budget of R1.5 million has been allocated.

Timing and Duration
The evaluation will start as soon as approval has been obtained from Cabinet, and will aim to complete by June 2013.

6 Outline of evaluations proposed for 2014/15 and 2015/16

The evaluations proposed for 2014/15 and 2015/16 are shown in tables 3 and 4. These are not definite, as they will be reviewed when the Plan is rolled in mid 2013.

Table 3: Summary of proposed evaluations for 2014/15

Name of Department	Name of intervention	Title of evaluation	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (egg budget, beneficiaries)
Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	Revitalization of irrigation schemes	Cost benefit analysis of revitalization of existing irrigation schemes	The ultimate objective of the revitalisation of irrigation schemesis directly linked to outcome 7," Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security". Over and above that the irrigation schemes contribute to the achievement of other outcomes namely Outcome 4: Decent employment through economic growth. Irrigation is one of the main mechanisms for permitting high productivity production and for providing significant numbers of smallholder farmers with a decent living. Many of the irrigation schemes were established in the former homelands and are not working effectively.
Department of Basic Education	Funza-Lusaka Bursary Scheme	Evaluation of Funza-Lusaka Bursary Scheme	The intervention is linked to Outcome 1: Improved quality of basic education and Sub-output 1: Improve teacher capacity and practices. The budget is R672 million for 2012/13 with 11 650 bursaries awarded for 2012/13. Given the shortage of teachers in key subjects such as maths, physical science and accounting, as well as in the Foundation Phase, it is important to assess the extent to which the Funza Lusaka Bursary Scheme addresses this problem.
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Ilima Letsema Programme	Impact Evaluation of Ilima-Letsema Programme	Ilima Letsema is responding to outcome 7 in terms of the establishment and support provided to farmers at large, as well as support for domestic food production. Currently the budget is R415.7 million, rising to R460 million in 2014/15. 54 740 beneficiaries were targeted, but 99 245 have been reached.
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	MAFISA	Implementation evaluation of MAFISA	MAFISA was set up to provide funding through provisionally accredited DFIs to on-lend to targeted HDI agricultural micro-businesses, covering irrigation, livestock, equipment and production inputs. The scheme was first piloted in 2005 and was set up to complement larger scale finance provided by the Land Bank. Credit is an important part of the technical package of support needed by small scale farmers, and is part of output 7.1 on agrarian reform of outcome 7 on rural development.
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries / Department of Rural Develop-ment and Land Reform	Small farmer support	Policy evaluation of small farmer support	Support for small farmers is a key component of outcome 7 on rural development, where the target is to increase the number of smallholder farmers from 200 000 to 250 000. A number of programmes are being proposed for evaluation in 2013/14 and 2014/15 which relate to small farmer support. It is proposed to then do an overarching review of policy for small farmer support, drawing from these various evaluations (CRDP, Land Recapitalisation and Development, CASP, Ilima-Letsema, Land Restitution, support for irrigation schemes, MAFISA) to review in an integrated way policy for small farmer support.





Table 4: Summary of proposed evaluations for 2015/16

Name of Department	Name of intervention	Title of evaluation	Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (egg budget, beneficiaries)
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Land Care	Impact Evaluation on Land Care	The Land Care Programme is about the sustainable use of land and so is linked to outcomes 7 (rural development) and 10 (Environment). Land care projects are implemented mostly in communal lands and the Programme employs community members to implement activities. The Programme benefited 15 867 beneficiaries in 2011/12 and it is envisaged to benefit 28 500 people in the 2012/13 financial year. The estimated budget for 2012/13 is R115 661 000 and R108 million for 2013/14. It is not a large programme but is innovative in seeking to achieve environmental, production and economic objectives simultaneously.
Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	National Rural Youth Service	Diagnostic Evaluation of the National Rural Youth Service Corps (NARYSEC)	Half of all 18 to 24 year olds are unemployed, accounting for about 30 per cent of total unemployment and National Treasury estimates that the average probability of an 18 to 24 year old of finding a job is just 25 per cent. Overall unemployment is worse in rural areas. The National Rural Youth Service attempts to deal with issues of youth unemployment and rural development, supporting rural youths who lack skills and enabling them to develop skills and take forward productive activities. As such it is linked to outcomes 7 (rural development) 5 (skills) and 4 (employment). The Programme targets unskilled and unemployed rural youths from ages of 18-35 who have a minimum of Grade 10 certificate. (Outcome 4 Delivery Agreement)
Department of Basic Education	New School Curriculum	Evaluation of curriculum implementation	A key initiative of government has been in changing the school curriculum, affecting 12 million learners. This is a key activity in Outcome 1: Improved quality of basic education. Sub-output 1: Improve teacher capacity and practices and Sub-output 2: Increase access to high quality learning materials. An evaluation in 2013/14 is looking at the school certificate more generally. This evaluation will look more particularly at the issue of the school curriculum.
Department of Performance Monitoring & Evaluation	Evaluation of the impact of evaluations	Implementation evaluation of the national evaluation policy and system	The national evaluation system has been created since adoption of the National Evaluation Policy Framework by Cabinet in November 2011. Evaluations are selected specifically because they are national priorities and linked to the 12 outcomes. Implementing the evaluation system requires investment in time and money. This evaluation will seek to establish whether this system is adding value, and how it can be strengthened to maximise the impact on performance and decision-making, as well as accountability and knowledge sharing.

7 Key implementation issues

7.1 Reporting on the Plan, and reviewing the Plan

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

The Plan will be reviewed annually, with an additional year added as the first year drops away. This links to the budget process so that departments are budgeting for evaluations at the same time as they are submitting them to be considered for the multiannual plan.

7.2 Funding of the evaluations in the Plan

This Plan has been developed to link with the budget process for 2013/14 to 2015/16. Some departments have resources available to fund the evaluations in their entirety, whereas in others the funding comes from DPME or donors. Indicative budgets are indicated in section 5. These may vary, as the methodology for the evaluations has not yet been defined.

7.3 Next steps

Preparation for the 2013/14 evaluations will start in January 2013 (in some cases even earlier), so that the initial phases of getting the relevant stakeholders together, developing terms of reference, and the procurement process can be completed prior to 31 March 2013. 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 2013 break, with work on improvement plans substantially completed by 15 March 2014. This means that from next financial year the evaluations have up to 15 months to ensure they are completed within the 2013/14 financial year.





Contact: Dr Ian Goldman, DPME

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

Tel: +27 12 308 1918

Email: nkamang@po.org.za

Web: www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za

THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION