



# How to develop a Provincial Evaluation Plan

Created: March 2013  
Revised: November 2020

<b>Addressed to</b>	Provincial offices of the Premier, M&E units of provincial departments, Municipalities and Provincial Public Entities
<b>Purpose</b>	To give practical guidance on how to develop and manage a Provincial Evaluation Plan
<b>Reference documents</b>	National Evaluation Policy Framework, 2019 Concept for National Evaluation Plan
<b>Contact person for this guideline</b>	Evaluations Unit, DPME E-mail: Evaluations@dpme.gov.za Tel: 012 312 0162

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) focuses on evaluations of strategic policies, programmes and projects, which are identified as part of a National Evaluation Plan. Similarly, Offices of the Premiers (OTPs) are also required to develop Provincial Evaluation Plans (PEPs). A Provincial Evaluation Plan (PEP) is a plan that consists of evaluations identified by the Offices of the Premier (OTPs) through a process of consultation with provincial oversight structures and respective sectors. The purpose of this guideline is to give a practical guidance for developing and managing Provincial Evaluation Plans.

The purpose of this guideline is to give practical guidance for developing and managing provincial evaluation plans. This is a guideline and it is not meant to be prescriptive. It should be read along with the (NEPF, 2019). A template is attached for a possible structure of a PEP, but OTPs want to adapt it. OTPs may also want to include both their evaluation and research agenda.

## 2. PURPOSE OF THE PROVINCIAL EVALUATION PLAN

The purpose of a Provincial Evaluation Plan, is to provide details of evaluations approved by the Provincial EXCO/ Cabinet as priority evaluations to be undertaken over a five-year period, which are linked to the strategic plan and the MTSF. The evaluations are linked with the planning, provincial priorities, budgeting processes, implementation, monitoring and reporting of the OTPs.

## 3. LINKAGE WITH THE NATIONAL EVALUATION SYSTEM

- 3.1 As part of the National Evaluation System (NES), a National Evaluation Policy Framework has been developed to guide evaluations. The NEPF further proposes a set of standardised types and approaches to evaluation. In supporting the implementation of the NEPF, various evaluation guidelines, competencies for government staff and evaluators, workshops, training to support the evaluation system etc. have been developed.
- 3.2 The 2019 - 2024 NEPF reinforces South African government's commitment to the principles of inclusiveness and the cross-implementation of different evaluation approaches and methodologies in ways that promote this inclusivity. The 2011 NEPF inevitably excluded state-owned entities (SOEs) and local government from the national evaluation system, as efforts in the early years were concentrated towards advocating for the up-take of the policy by national and provincial departments. The current policy achieves this objective by incorporating different strategies including the following elements: integrating SOEs into the NES; ensuring that the policy takes into account gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) priorities relating to women, the development needs of youth and the concerns of persons with disabilities as well as other vulnerable groups in society when undertaking evaluation projects; and devolving an all-encompassing evaluation capacity development approach which aims to empower the State in the effective implementation of evaluations.
- 3.3 It is suggested that provinces formally adopt the National Evaluation Policy Framework, and then use these systems and processes, for which a lot of work has been undertaken drawing on international good practice to develop their Provincial Evaluation Systems.
- 3.4 A key focus in the approach in the NEPF is ensuring utilisation, and this means that departments, provincial municipalities and public entities must own the evaluations they are undertaking.

## **4. LINKAGES WITH PROGRAMME PLANNING, STRATEGIC PLANNING, ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN (APP) AND M&E FRAMEWORK**

### **4.1 Programme Planning**

Evaluation is a critical element in the programme planning process. Embedding the practice of evaluation in the programme cycle will ensure that evaluations inform planning and budgeting. This will assist in improving performance throughout the programme cycle.

### **4.2 Strategic Planning**

Evaluations form an integral part of the strategic management processes of the department. Therefore, the PEP must be developed as part of the strategic planning process and must be informed by the priorities of the department as outlined in the strategic plan.

### **4.3 Annual Performance Plans (APPs)**

The development and review of the APPs should also consider the development and implementation of PEPs. The Framework for Strategic and Annual Plans (FSAPPs) requires departments to indicate how evaluation results are incorporated into their APPs. The implementation of the PEPs should also be linked to the budget process of the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF).

### **4.4 M&E Framework**

The development of the PEP should also reflect the priorities that have been identified in the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework of the respective department(s). This will ensure that commitments that are in the framework also inform the content of the PEP. The monitoring data from the M&E framework should form the basis of the evaluations of the interventions that are in the PEP. The baseline data to be collected through reports from the framework should provide data that will be essential for the execution of evaluations that will be in the PEP.

### **4.5 Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing (GRPBMEA) Framework**

The mainstreaming of gender equality and women's empowerment considerations into all the component of the PEP is essential. The PEP should ensure that evaluations are gender-responsive with an explicit focus on women's rights or women's empowerment, or which particularly targets women. However, gender-responsive evaluations can also be employed in any kind of project or programme that seeks to contribute to social impact, irrespective of whether or not they specify gender-sensitive objectives.

## 5. MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION OF PROVINCIAL EVALUATION PLAN

The Office of the Premier is the custodian of the provincial M&E system, and should lead on the provincial evaluation system. A Provincial Evaluation Technical Working Group (PETWG) must/ should be formed, bringing together skills and capacities available in the province to support the system. This may also include higher learning institutions in the province. PETWG should include relevant officials such as policy/planning unit, programme managers, Gender Unit, CFO, Internal Audit, M&E staff. A sample Terms of Reference is attached in Annex 1.

**The offices OTP in collaboration with PETWG will:**

- Initiate the decision by EXCO as to whether the province wishes to take forward a provincial evaluation system;
- Request support from DPME in establishing the system;
- Develop and update on an on-going basis the systems for the provincial evaluation system, starting with the Concept;
- Carry out an audit of existing evaluations undertaken in the province, and maintain the inventory on an on-going basis;
- Manage the process for developing and undertaking evaluations, including developing and monitoring Improvement Plans arising from evaluations;
- Quality control all evaluations undertaken for the Provincial Evaluation Plan;
- Ensure that EXCO and senior management provincially and within departments is fully aware of the system;
- Ensure that part of implementation programme budgets are being allocated to regular evaluations;
- Ensure that the learnings from evaluation findings are implemented in Improvement Plans and are used for planning, budget and other decision-making;
- Decide on modalities for dissemination of evaluation results;
- Disseminate evaluation results upon completion of provincial evaluations.

## 6. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF EVALUATIONS

The NEPF sets the following generic criteria for identifying evaluations to be included in Evaluation Plans across the different spheres of Government:

Alignment to the key Provincial priorities	Impact of the intervention within provinces
Alignment with the Provincial planning cycle	Performance of the intervention
Achieving gender equity through the intervention	Inclusion of issues related to vulnerable/ marginalised groups
Periodicity of evaluations	Projected time for completing an evaluation
Budget availability to undertake evaluations	Public interest and/or media attention

- 6.1 According to the NEPF, priority evaluations are identified by an oversight structure that is the custodian of M&E System i.e. Provincial Evaluation Technical Working Group (PETWG) which is made up of representatives from the: CFO, Audit Office, Gender Focal Point, M&E, Strategic Planning and Policy Units.
- 6.2 Additionally, in times of possible national disasters such as pandemics which may result in budget cuts (both operational and compensation of employees) and necessitating a change in the way evaluations are undertaken, an additional criterion is proposed in order to prioritise evaluations in the midst of the disaster and government departments may be faced with capacity (financial and human) constraints. See the table below:

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
Practicality	Evaluation subject and questions can be successfully investigated under the current environment of the national disaster Availability and accessibility of data and information to enable rapid evaluation
Stakeholder commitment	There is demand for evidence at Cluster or Cabinet level There is clearly defined intended use of the evaluation results by custodian department
Estimated cost	Evaluation study will cost less than R300,000
Availability of external resources	External funding guaranteed or can be made available before the commencement of the evaluation

## 7. PROCESS/CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING A PROVINCIAL EVALUATION PLAN

Once the Concept has been approved, the Provincial Evaluation Technical Working Group (PETWG) should meet, identify and select evaluations for a five-year period. The suggested set of steps and timing for this to link with the budget process is:

Table 1: Action plan for developing a Five-Year Provincial Evaluation Plan

	Action	Responsible	When
Development and submission of concepts	1. Identify evaluation topics through research and consultations (Annual Provincial Review, performance information, SOPA, MTSF, Provincial Priorities etc.)	OTP	April
	2. Consultation with key centre/ institutions (Provincial Treasury, AGSA, StatsSA, Public Commissions etc.) of government including branches and units	OTP	April
	3. Half day briefing workshops with departments to deepen understanding on the National Evaluation Policy Framework, the Concept for the Provincial Evaluation Plan	OTP/Depts/ SOEs	April/May
	4. Tentative agreement in departments about priority evaluations and allocations of funds in the MTEF	Depts	June
	5. Deadline for departments to include evaluations in their 5 year budgets	Depts	June
	6. Workshopping of draft concept notes for evaluations with departments	OTP/Depts	July
	7. 8 Provincial Evaluation Technical Working Group discusses draft concept notes with departments	PETWG/Depts	July
	8. 9 Deadline for concept notes to be submitted	Depts	July

Selection and refining	9. Proposals reviewed by PETWG and recommendations made for X evaluations.	PETWG	Early August
	10. Scoping workshops for each evaluation where wider stakeholders help to guide the appropriate focus and scope of the evaluation	Depts/OTP	Aug/Sept
	11. Training of programme manager/M&E staff for each evaluation recommended for the financial year and draft TORs produced for evaluations.	DPME/OTP/Depts	September
	12. Design clinic with evaluation experts to review theory of change, evaluation purpose, questions and methodology and refine TORs	OTP/Depts	October
	13.1. Provincial Evaluation Plan (PEP) drafted	OTP	November
	14. PEP submitted to provincial EXCO/Cabinet for approval	OTP	Late November
Start up	15. TORs finalised for evaluations and Steering Committees established	Depts/DPME	Jan
	16. Procurement undertaken	DPME/Depts	Feb
	17. Contracts awarded and inception meetings	DPME/Depts	March
	18. PEP submitted to DPME	OTP	March/April

## 8. FORMAT OF A PROVINCIAL EVALUATION PLAN

a. There is no prescribed format for a Provincial Evaluation Plan. However, it should incorporate at least the following elements:

- Brief highlight of challenges of the Provincial Evaluation System
- An introduction to the process followed to develop the Plan including the criteria for selection;
- An outline of the approved evaluations, indicating a background to the intervention being evaluated, what the evaluation will focus on, and what methodology is likely to be used.

b. The National Evaluation Plan, and approved Provincial Evaluation Plans provide models which can be drawn from to develop a localised version. The Provincial Evaluation Plan should incorporate at least the following elements:

- Background
- Update on the Implementation of previous Provincial Evaluation Plans
- Challenges on Implementation of the previous Provincial Evaluation Plans
- Legislative Framework
- Public Finance Management Act
- Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework
- National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) 2019-2024
- The purpose of the PEP 2020-2025
- A summary/ progress update of evaluations undertaken in the past 5 years and status on the use of the evaluation recommendation
- Prioritising Evaluations for the Provincial Evaluation Plan
- Summary of proposed evaluations for 2020/21

## 9. ROLE OF DPME IN SUPPORTING PROVINCIAL EVALUATION SYSTEMS

9.1 DPME will continue to provide support in institutionalising evaluations across provinces and ensure that evaluations are undertaken systematically across government to improve performance and accountability.

9.2 As such DPME will assist provinces in the development of provincial evaluation systems. This support can include:

- Presentations to EXCO or senior management around the national evaluation system;
- Supporting provinces in developing their Concept for a Provincial Evaluation Plan, and in taking forward the identification and selection for evaluations.
- Making available all the guidelines and systems developed as part of the national evaluation system;
- Making available the evaluations conducted already or planned to be conducted;
- Ensuring that all systems, including software, can be customised for use by Offices of the Premier;
- Providing initial training to Offices of the Premier and departments. Rolling out the training further will be the responsibility of the OTPs;
- Potentially there could be shared services provided by DPME for all provinces, such as quality assessment of evaluations. Annex 2 is a Responsibility Matrix for provincial evaluation systems.

## 10. SHARING LEARNINGS AROUND IMPLEMENTING PROVINCIAL EVALUATION SYSTEMS

10.1 The OTPs should provide on-going feedback to DPME on learnings emerging from the rollout of the system in the province, to refine the national evaluation system, and to ensure that learnings are shared with other provinces. They should invite DPME and other provinces to participate in key activities.

10.2 The Provincial M&E Forum will be used to share learnings, potentially with special sittings to enable in-depth sharing.

- 10.3 In addition provincial representatives sit on the National Evaluation Technical Working Group and so participate in the development and rollout of the national system. Conversely, representatives from DPME can serve on the Provincial Technical Working Group.

Signed



---

**Mr Robert Nkuna**

Director-General

Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

Date: 03/11/2020

## **ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROVINCIAL EVALUATION TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP**

### **1. Background**

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) was adopted by Cabinet on November 2019. The NEPF envisaged the development of a government-wide evaluation system, led by DPME nationally, and Offices of the Premier in provinces. Evaluation Technical Working Groups are envisaged at national and provincial levels so that the system is owned by government as a whole, and draws on the range of expertise available across government. This is important to ensure that the evaluation system is high quality and is likely to lead to use.

### **2. Objective**

To support the establishment, operation and effectiveness of a provincial evaluation system.

### **3. Specific tasks**

- 3.1 Develop/review plans for rollout of the evaluation system.
- 3.2 Develop/review specific methodological inputs for the evaluation system, e.g. Concept for a Provincial Evaluation Plan, competencies, standards, guidelines.
- 3.3 Select evaluations for the three year and annual evaluation plans based on inputs from departments.
- 3.4 Review the technical quality of evaluations conducted under the provincial evaluation plan, ensuring the overall system is working well.
- 3.5 Members act as the evaluation champions within their respective organisations, and are likely to be involved in steering committees of individual evaluations relevant to their departments.
- 3.6 In time specific task teams may emerge on specific issues, e.g. impact evaluations, and these may involve other people.



## 4. Members

Consistent members are needed, not delegates. These should cover:

- OTP – key staff involved with evaluation
- Centre of government departments – Provincial Treasury, provincial COGTA
- Evaluation specialists from departments. These members may change on an annual/two yearly basis to ensure that there is broad involvement across government
- External evaluation experts/partners – universities, other.

## 5. Roles

- Chair and secretariat: Office of Premier.

## 6. Meetings

- Will meet as needed, based on key milestones in the system, but likely to be a day a month for the first 6 months, then every two months

# ANNEX 2: RESPONSIBILITY MATRIX FOR PROVINCIAL EVALUATION SYSTEMS

The objective of the matrix is to clarify the roles played by different stakeholders and structures in the provincial evaluation system.

Stakeholder or structure	Key role	Members	Further information
Office of Premier	<p>Champion for evaluation system in the province.</p> <p>Support the system</p> <p>Develop the provincial evaluation plan and take to HoD forum and EXCO</p> <p>Support training in evaluation for provincial staff</p> <p>Part-fund evaluations</p> <p>Secretariat for evaluation steering committees</p> <p>Issue request for</p> <p>Participate in development of the national system</p> <p>Assist provincial departments to prepare departmental evaluation plans</p>	M&E Unit, strategy or research unit (should be at least one person as an evaluation specialist)	Section 7 of Guideline on PEPs
Provincial HoD meeting	<p>Approve the concept note for the evaluation system</p> <p>Act as champions for evaluation across the province and within their depts.</p> <p>Recommend the PEP prior to submission to EXCO</p>	Provincial HoDs	

Stakeholder or structure	Key role	Members	Further information
EXCO	Provide political oversight and support for evaluation. Approve the Provincial Evaluation Plan Consider evaluation reports Ensure that blockages identified by evaluations are addressed		
Provincial Evaluation Technical Working Group	Support the evaluation system in the province Agree systems for the province Select evaluations for the provincial plan	M&E/research staff from departments with skills or an interest in the evaluation system	Annex 1 of PEP Guideline
Panel of evaluation service providers	Group to which calls for proposals are sent (so a restricted tender)	Group of organisations (universities, research institutions, consultants) selected through a tender process as having evaluation expertise. Could be an agreement between provincial DG and DG DPME to use the DPME panel	
Evaluation Steering Committee (for each evaluation)	Oversight of the specific evaluation process, including approving TORs, selecting service provider (as bid adjudication committee), reviewing instruments, approving reports.	Custodian dept (chair) OTP (secretary) Other departments involved in the specific programme being evaluated	
		Potentially external experts or stakeholders	
Custodian department	Propose evaluations (developing evaluation concept notes) for consideration for the PEP "owner" of the specific policy/programme being evaluated Chair Steering Committee (see above) Consider findings in management structures Provide Management Response to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation Lead on the improvement plan to address the findings (with other stakeholders needed)		Guideline on management response Guideline on Improvement Plan
Provincial Treasury	Participate in provincial PETWG Participate in evaluation steering committees (at least in development of TORs and reading final reports) Ensure funds available from programme budgets for evaluation		
DPME	National custodian of the government-wide evaluation system Development of standards, guidelines, training Support for national evaluations Support provinces to develop the provincial evaluation system Quality assessment of some provincial evaluations		Section 6 of Guideline on PEPs
National Evaluation Technical Working Group	Support development of government-wide evaluation system	M&E/research staff from national departments with skills or an interest in the evaluation system Representatives from provinces with PEPs	TORs for PETWG

# ANNEX 3: VERSION OF CONCEPT NOTE TEMPLATE FOR MOTIVATING FOR AN EVALUATION IN THE PROVINCIAL EVALUATION PLAN

This concept motivates why a particular intervention is a priority for evaluation under the Provincial Evaluation Plan. It is not a plan for the evaluation which will be done later.

## Part A: Contact details

Name of proposed evaluation		Year proposed to be implemented	202_ - 202_
Branch proposing Evaluation	<i>Could be suggested by a strategic section but custodian will normally be an implementation branch, or possibly a strategic unit if cross-department.</i>		
Branch that is Custodian (and will implement the Improvement Plan arising from the evaluation)	<i>Should not be exclusively the responsibility of a state-owned enterprise, if several branches/departments, then list these here, and suggest who would coordinate</i>		
Programme Manager		Title	
Telephone		E-mail	
M&E person		Title	
Telephone		E-mail	
Other key departments/ agencies involved in the intervention			

## Part B: Background of the intervention

Note this section is not about the evaluation, but the policy/plan/programme/system that the evaluation proposes to focus on.

Specific unit of analysis of the evaluation (should be a policy, plan, programme, project or system)	E.g. ECD Policy, X programme, Y project etc.		
Departmental situational analysis prior to the intervention being introduced			
<b>Give some background to the intervention</b>			
Summary description of the intervention			
The problem or opportunity the intervention focuses on	<i>For example, the National School Nutrition Programme focuses on disadvantaged learners coming to school without having eaten which undermines their ability to learn</i>		
Objective or outcomes of the intervention (specify which)	<i>These should not be general but should be taken from the original programme plan, policy or strategy document etc.</i>		
Key components of the intervention (e.g. outputs in a log frame or programme plan)	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
Is there a log frame? (Yes or No)	<i>If yes please attach</i>		

Programme document	<i>Please attach the key programme document describing the specific programme, policy, plan or strategy to be evaluated, along with its indicators, and theory of change.</i>		
Duration and timing of the intervention	Started (or proposed to start)		Ends

## Part C: Motivating for the evaluation of the intervention to be considered in the National Evaluation Plan

Why is this evaluation a priority for the National Evaluation Plan? Note: the evaluation does not have to score high on all of these.

<b>Criteria</b>
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>
<b>National Priority:</b> why this is a national priority in terms of the following 4 criteria. Note it does not have to satisfy all criteria.
<b>1.1 Aligned to the National Priorities (7 government priorities) and linked to the MTSF, departmental strategic plan as well</b> Directly linked to two or more of the 7 priorities Directly linked to one of the 7 priorities Addresses a small part of one of the 7 priorities Is not part of the 7 priorities but otherwise a priority of government Is not part of the 7 priorities Comment
<b>1.2 Impact of the intervention:</b> Is the intervention having intended contribution to the intervention's programme life cycle? Intervention contribute to the programme life cycle Intervention does not contribute to the programme life cycle Comment
<b>1.3 Public Interest and / or media attention:</b> (where possible drawn from analysis of the Presidential Hotline) Continuously in the media or many complaints in hotline Regularly in the media and significant number of complaints in hotline Not very much in the public eye Comment
<b>1.4 Inclusion of issues related to vulnerable / marginalised groups:</b> Does the identified evaluation consider how programme intervention target the needs of vulnerable groups (either intentionally or unintentionally) to provide an indication of how issues relating to identified groups were planned for or how such groups have benefited from the programme or policy being evaluated?
<b>1.5 Achieving gender equity through interventions:</b> Is the evaluation engendered to ensure that gender equality considerations are addressed across the evaluation and that the differential impact of interventions on women and men are appropriately measured and assessed? Yes
No
<b>1.6 Performance of the intervention:</b> Is this a weak performing or best performing intervention to improve and promote learning and future implementation? Weak performing interventions Best performing interventions score
<b>If a provincial department, how is this linked to the, Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDS) and Departmental Strategic Plan</b>
<i>Be specific of how this links to specific sections and recommendations in the PGDS or Departmental Strategic Plan (please also refer to relevant page number).</i>

How large is the intervention?			
Budget for intervention (not for the evaluation) for financial year	R	Estimated total budget for the intervention (over 5-year MTEF period)	R Period
Number of people directly affected or enrolled (e.g. service users, beneficiaries...)	<i>If this does not directly serve citizens, then it should be a measure of coverage, e.g. if the proposed evaluation is of whether to lease buildings or to own, then this could be the number of buildings covered.</i>		

## Part D: Details on the evaluation proposed

In this section you are requested to give some idea on the type of evaluation being proposed, not the intervention that the evaluation is focusing on.

**Note:** We want to understand what you are trying to get out of the evaluation, but are not expecting you to know what methodology is needed.

<b>Key focus of the evaluation</b>	<i>For example, the evaluation may only focus on part of a programme/ policy, plan or project</i>
<b>Evaluation Approach (rapid/ traditional)</b>	
<b>Type of evaluation</b>	<i>e.g. Diagnostic/Implementation/Cost Effective, Outcome, Impact, Synthesis or Sectoral Reviews</i>  <i>Note: Write here one or more of the options below. (Some evaluations can combine these). Refer to Guidelines on the different evaluation types available on the DPME Website:</i>
<b>Diagnostic</b>	Analyses the situation, brings out root causes, considers options. Used prior to design or re-planning an intervention
<b>Implementation</b>	Used during implementation to understand how the intervention is working and how it can be strengthened
<b>Cost effectiveness</b>	To understand how cost effective the intervention is – often combined with implementation or impact
<b>Outcome</b>	To measure the degree to which the program is having an effect on the target population's wellbeing and/or behaviours. Outcome evaluations help determine whether or not the intended benefits of a programme are actually achieved (i.e. whether or not the programme is able to meet its intended purpose)
<b>Impact</b>	To understand what impact the intervention has had and why. Note this often needs either existing data or to collect data (expensive) on what are the impacts of people impacted by the intervention, and similar people not impacted by the programme. Do you have this data?
<b>Synthesis</b>	Rather than undertaking primary data collection this synthesises data from across a range of existing evaluations.
<b>Sectorial Reviews</b>	A mechanism through which support to public expenditure programmes can be better coordinated; a means of improving aid effectiveness by improving the efficiency and effectiveness with which all resources are used, and accounted for, in the sector.
<b>Suggested purpose of the evaluation</b>	<i>Refer to the DPME Guideline on TORs for how to define the purpose – available on the DPME Website</i>
<b>What are the main evaluative questions you will be asking (maximum 5) (Use the Guideline on TORs to help you think these through, or the guidelines on specific evaluation types).</b>	

1
2
3
4
5

**Availability of scientific evidence (e.g. monitoring data, researches, case studies, systematic review, experts' opinions etc)**

Is there sufficient evidence to undertake an evaluation, especially if an impact evaluation is requested?

Key evidence is needed and available  
 Key evidence is needed but will have to be collected  
 Key data is needed but difficult to obtain  
 comment

*If you want to do an impact evaluation do you have data on impact, including existing external databases (StatsSA, NIDS, etc.). You should not invest in primary data collection on variables which government is already collecting data on through other means. If little evidence exists, then an impact evaluation will be difficult and you may need to undertake an implementation evaluation initially. Alternatively, you are likely then to have to collect the data, which may be expensive.*

*Make some General Comments here:*

Please complete fill in the table below:

Do you have any data on?	Data available	Source/s	Custodian of data	Contact person and email or telephone	Quality/reliability/verifiability of data as well as limitations in terms of data availability, readiness, relevance, timeliness and access pertaining to this evaluation
Impacts on the target population					
Outcomes (e.g. changes in behaviour or systems)					

Do you have any data on?	Data available	Source/s	Custodian of data	Contact person and email or telephone	Quality/reliability/verifiability of data as well as limitations in terms of data availability, readiness, relevance, timeliness and access pertaining to this evaluation
Outputs (the things you deliver, e.g. people trained, groups with community gardens with fencing and water)					

Likely duration (months)	<i>Indicate when the evaluation needs to start and when to end</i>
How recently was this intervention evaluated – if not for a long time then it is a higher priority	<i>Date and type of evaluation and what it focused on (attach copy to this submission)</i>
Do you have an <b>estimate</b> for what the evaluation may cost?	<i>If you are not sure discuss with DPME around likely cost.</i>
What <b>budget</b> for the evaluation has been allocated by the department or donors – <i>note: this must come from existing budgets</i>	<i>You are expected to at least contribute 75% of the budget for the evaluation. If in the NEP then DPME will part fund.</i>

#### Part E: Approval by sponsoring Department

Name of relevant Deputy Director General (DDG) of custodian branch:	
Signature:	
Name of DG or relevant DDG of Custodian department:	
Signature:	

## ANNEX 4: EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EAC) SCORE SHEET

*Purpose: To be used for assessing Evaluation Proposals for the National Evaluation Plan (Provinces/Department to adapt)*

Name of branch	
Evaluation title	
Evaluation type	Diagnostic, design, implementation, impact, economic, synthesis (Please circle – can be more than one)
Year evaluation requested	

## 1. Is the intervention a national priority and we need to focus on it?

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
<b>National Priority:</b> <i>why this is a national priority in terms of the following 4 criteria. Note it does not have to satisfy all criteria.</i>		
<b>1.1 Aligned to the National Priorities (7 government priorities) and linked to the MTSF, departmental strategic plan as well</b> Directly linked to two or more of the 7 priorities = 15 Directly linked to one of the 7 priorities=10 Addresses a small part of one of the 7 priorities = 7 Is not part of the 7 priorities but otherwise a priority of government =5 Is not part of the 7 priorities = 0 Comment	15	
<b>1.2 Impact of the intervention:</b> Is the intervention having intended contribution to the intervention's programme life cycle? Intervention contribute to the programme life cycle = 10 Intervention does not contribute to the programme life cycle = 0 Comment	10	
<b>1.3 Public Interest and / or media attention:</b> (where possible drawn from analysis of the Presidential Hotline) Continuously in the media or many complaints in hotline=5 Regularly in the media and significant number of complaints in hotline=3 Not very much in the public eye=0 Comment	5	
<b>1.4 Inclusion of issues related to vulnerable / marginalised groups:</b> Does the identified evaluation consider how programme intervention target the needs of vulnerable groups (either intentionally or unintentionally) to provide an indication of how issues relating to identified groups were planned for or how such groups have benefited from the programme or policy being evaluated?	10	
<b>1.5 Achieving gender equity through interventions:</b> Is the evaluation engendered to ensure that gender equality considerations are addressed across the evaluation and that the differential impact of interventions on women and men are appropriately measured and assessed? Yes = 10 No = 0	10	
<b>1.6 Performance of the intervention:</b> Is this a weak performing or best performing intervention to improve and promote learning and future implementation? Weak performing interventions = 10 Best performing interventions score = 0	10	
<b>Overall comment</b>		
<b>Category total score</b>	<b>60</b>	



## 2. Is it important that it is evaluated in the next financial year or the next four financial years?

Criteria <i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>	Max Score	Score
<b>National Priority:</b> why this is a national priority in terms of the following 4 criteria. Note it does not have to satisfy all criteria.	10	
<b>2.1 Is the intervention at a critical stage where decisions need to be taken or where solutions are required immediately?</b> Critical stage/decision reached by end of the next financial year (2022/23) where key decisions needed=10 Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2023/24 where key decisions needed= 5 Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2024/25 where key decisions needed=3 Not critical decision point=0 Comment	5	
<b>2.2 Previous evaluations (if any) - How recently was this intervention evaluated? If &gt;5 years, score 5, if less than 2 years score zero (unless the evaluation proposed is very different). Periodicity of evaluations: the interventions have not had a major evaluation for the past 3 years.</b> Comment		
<b>Overall comment</b>	15	
<b>Category total score</b>		

## 3. How feasible will it be to evaluate this year?

Note these questions are not killers, and may just mean that the evaluation will take more work

Criteria <i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>	Max Score	Score
<b>3.1 Focus of evaluation - Is the object of evaluation clear (policy, programme, plan or project), and are the evaluative questions clear?</b> The evaluation is clear with strong evaluative questions=5 The evaluation has a reasonable focus but could be clarified=3 The evaluation is unclear=0 Comment	5	
<b>3.2 Evaluability of the Programme</b> Is there an evaluability assessment for the programme? Evaluability analysis undertaken = 5 Evaluability analysis not undertaken? = 0 Comment	5	
<b>3.3 Availability of scientific evidence (e.g. monitoring data, researches, case studies, systematic review, experts' opinions etc)</b> Is there sufficient evidence to undertake an evaluation, especially if an impact evaluation is requested? Key evidence is needed and available=5 Key evidence is needed but will have to be collected=3 Key data is needed but difficult to obtain=0 Comment	5	
<b>3.4 Availability of budget - How assured are we that there is a budget for the evaluation from the department or donors?</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full budget available from department/donor = 10</li> <li>• Budget likely or partially available from department, and supplemented by DPME/province = 5</li> <li>• Only budget available is from DPME/province = 0</li> </ul> Comment	10	
<b>Overall comment</b>		
<b>Category total score</b>	25	

AGGREGATE/ OVERALL SCORE	Max score	Score	%
Importance of the intervention	60		
Important that it is done in the 5 years	15		
Feasibility of doing evaluation this year	25		
<b>Total (maximum 100)</b>			
Recommendation by assessors (please put cross)	Appropriate for NEP	Not appropriate for NEP	Needs rethinking

**Assessors**

<b>Signed</b> <i>Name</i> <b>Member: EAC</b> <b>Date:</b>	<b>Signed</b> <i>Name</i> <b>Member: EAC</b> <b>Date:</b>	<b>Signed</b> <i>Name</i> <b>Member: EAC</b> <b>Date:</b>
<b>Signed</b> <i>Name</i> <b>Member: EAC</b> <b>Date:</b>	<b>Signed</b> <i>Name</i> <b>Member: EAC</b> <b>Date:</b>	<b>Signed</b> <i>Name</i> <b>Member: EAC</b> <b>Date:</b>

**FINAL DECISION AND FEEDBACK TO THE PROGRAMME BY THE EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EAC)**

(To be completed after the assessment based on overall decisions of the EAC)

No.	DECISION AND FEEDBACK	Please tick (X)
1	Yes, evaluation should be considered for the plan for the year requested (- for a four year circle the year requested). <i>Reasons:</i>	
2	Not recommended for the 2022/23 National Evaluation Plan but a good idea, and could be considered for National Evaluation Plan 2023/24 or 2024/25 (recommend which by circling the year - will not need to be resubmitted). <i>Reasons:</i>	
3	Not included in the plan and the department needs to strengthen certain aspects (either to implement itself, or to resubmit next year). <i>Reasons and aspects to be strengthened:</i>	
4	Rethink and we suggest these areas need to be revisited (to be indicated) <i>Reasons and areas to be revisited:</i>	

Signed on behalf of EAC:	<hr/> <b>Signed</b> <b>X</b> <b>Head: Evaluation, Evidence and Knowledge Systems</b> <b>Date:</b>
--------------------------	--