



agriculture, land reform
& rural development

Department:
agriculture, land reform & rural development
NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (PMER) Framework for 2018/19-2019/20

NORTHERN CAPE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, LAND REFORM AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT:

PERFORMANCE MONITORING , EVALUATION AND REPORTING FRAMEWORK

	PERSON	SIGNATURE	DATE
Compiled by:	Ms M Malgas		21/08/18
Head Responsible for Planning and Reporting	Mr RL Banda		21/08/2018
Head of Department	Mr WVD Mothibi		22/08/2018

Acronyms

AGSA	Auditor General South Africa
APP	Annual Performance Plan
CBM	Citizen-based monitoring
DAFF	Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries
DALR&RD	Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development
DEC	Departmental Executive Committee
DEP	Departmental Evaluation plan
DPME	Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation
DPSA	Department of Public Service and Administration
FMPPI	Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information
GWME	Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation
HOD	Head of Department
IA	Internal Audit
IDPs	Integrated Development plans
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEC	Member of Executive council
MER	Monitoring, Evaluation Reporting
MoV	Means of Verification
MPAT	Management Performance Assessment Tool
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
MTSF	Medium-Term Strategic Framework
NDP	National Development Plan
NES	National Evaluation system
OPSC	Office of Public Service Commission
OTP:	Office of the Premier
PAA	Public Audit Act
PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
PE	Portfolio of Evidence
PM&E	Performance Monitoring and Evaluation
PPME	Planning Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation
SDIP	Service Delivery Improvement Plan
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time bound
SASQAF	South African Statistics Quality Assurance Framework
SDF	Service Delivery Forum

TID

Technical indicator Description

Contents

- Acronyms3
- SECTION A: BACKGROUND 7**
- 1. Introduction7
- 1.1. The importance of measuring performance in the public sector8
- 1.2 Purpose of the PMER Framework.....9
- 2. Policy Imperatives 2015-20209
- 3. Legislative and Policy Context.....10
- 4. Definition of Concepts.....14
- SECTION B: INSTITUTIONALISING M&E IN THE DEPARTMENT..... 15**
- 5. Institutional Arrangement for PM&E15
- 5.1. Functions of PPME15
- 5.2 Other Departmental PM&E Institutions.....16
- SECTION C: BUSINESS PROCESS..... 19**
- 6. Business process for performance information.....19
- 6.1. Strategic Plan19
- 6.2. Annual Performance Plan.....19
- 6.3. Quarterly Reports.....20
- 6.4 Annual Reports.....21
- 6.5 Service Delivery Improvement Plan (SDIP) reports21
- 6.6 Mid-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and End- Term Performance Reports ..21
- 6.7. Departmental Evaluation reports.....22
- 7. Data Management.....22
- 7.1 Means of Verification22
- 7.2 Collecting, Collating and Storing of Performance Information22
- 7.3 Verification of Performance23
- 7.4 Performance Review23
- 7.5 Data quality23
- 8. Dissemination of Performance Information24
- 9. Conclusion24

Tables

Table 1: Monitoring and evaluation principles	7
Table 2: Summary of Roles and Responsibilities	18
Table 3: Data Quality Dimensions	23

SECTION A: BACKGROUND

1. Introduction

The public sector reforms of the democratic dispensation in South Africa, particularly pertaining to management of public finances have highlighted the need to focus on the management of performance information. In South Africa, the Constitution of 1996 and the PFMA of 1999 all place emphasis on accountability and the need for an efficient, effective and transparent management of performance of government. The Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (PMER) Framework 2018/19 responds to these legislative and policy requirements.

However, it must be stated with great emphasis that although the PMER Framework 2018/19 seeks to respond to the legislative and policy requirements on management of performance information, it is not merely a compliance document. It is a living document that seeks to assist the department to manage performance more effectively and improve service delivery. At the same time, it is meant to enable stakeholders to hold it accountable. Through this document the process to be followed in carrying out Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting functions in the department and the responsibilities of role players is outlined.

The PMER Framework is underpinned by principles of monitoring and evaluation as espoused in the Policy Framework for Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System of 2005.

Table 1: Monitoring and evaluation principles

Principle	Rationale
PME should contribute to improved governance	This can be done by ensuring that all findings are publicly available, the use of resources are open to public scrutiny and traditionally excluded interest are represented through the monitoring and reporting processes
PME should be rights based	A rights based culture should be promoted and entrenched by its inclusion in the value base for all monitoring and evaluation processes
PME should be development-oriented, nationally, organisationally and locally	Poverty's causes, effects and dynamics should be highlighted and the interests of the poor people to be prioritised. Variances reflecting organisational performance and service delivery should be analysed and reviewed. Links should be identified and responsive strategies formulated.
PME should be undertaken ethically and with integrity	Knowledge and an appetite for learning should be nurtured and skills required to deliver monitoring and evaluation should be fostered and retained. The possible impacts of monitoring and evaluation interventions should be

Principle	Rationale
	considered and reflected upon in plans and their actual outcomes should be tracked and analysed systematically and consistently
PME should be utilisation oriented	Monitoring and evaluation product should meet knowledge and strategic needs. A record of recommendations should be maintained and their implementation followed up. An accessible central repository of evaluation reports and indicators should be maintained
PME should be methodologically sound	Common indicators and data collection methods should be used to improve data quality and allow trend analysis. Findings should be based on systematic evidence and analysis. The methodology used should match the questions being asked. Multiple sources of data/information should be used to build credible findings.
PME should be operationally effective	The scale of monitoring and evaluation application within a Government organisation should reflect its purpose, level of risk and available resources. Continuous management of the function should lead to sustained timeous delivery of excellence. The benefits of monitoring and evaluation should be clear and its scale of application should be appropriate given resource availability. Robust systems should be built up to ensure that effective and efficient monitoring and evaluation is not dependent on individuals or chance.

1.1. The importance of measuring performance in the public sector

The service delivery challenges facing the state after about 24 years of democracy in South Africa have highlighted the need for government to use reasonable methods to monitor and evaluate performance of public institutions and bodies. It is clear from the policy documents that the importance of the measuring performance is generic for the public sector. Amongst others, measuring performance is important because:

- It indicates how well an organisation is doing in meeting its aims and objectives, and which policies and processes are working;
- It facilitates accountability by focusing the attention of the public and oversight bodies on whether public institutions are delivering value for money;
- It can inform and enhance the budget allocation process by highlighting programmes that are not doing well and those that are meeting the set objectives; and
- Through measuring performance service delivery can be improved but enabling managers to pursue results based management systems.

1.2 Purpose of the PMER Framework

The purpose of the PMER Framework is to:

- Integrate and align monitoring, evaluation and reporting activities in the department by specifying the roles and responsibilities for managing performance information;
- Outline the procedures to be followed in the process of documenting and recording and reporting performance information;
- Promote accountability and transparency by providing stakeholders including the Executing Authority, the Provincial Legislature, Office of the Premier, National Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, and the public with timely, accessible and accurate performance information; and
- Provide for the process in identifying, collecting, collating and verifying performance information.

2. Policy Imperatives 2015-2020

The Medium Term Strategic Framework 2015-2020 espouses five priority of government adopted from the electoral mandate. In 2010 government translated these priority areas into a set of 14 outcomes and a few crucial outputs whose achievement will place the country on a new developmental path. These outcomes reflect the desired development impact that government seeks to achieve.

Significantly, the adoption of the *Outcomes Approach* in 2010 has ensured that public institutions pay more attention to systematic monitoring and evaluation of whether their programmes or intervention are successful. The *Outcomes Approach* was designed to ensure that government focuses on achieving the expected real improvements in the life of South Africans. It is expected that the implementation of this approach will assist government track progress being made in implementation of public programmes, collect evidence about what is or not working, and most importantly improve planning and implementation.

DALR&RD is mandated to coordinate the implementation of Outcome 7: *Comprehensive Rural Development* and Land Reform in the province. This Outcome aims to create *vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all*. The sub-outcomes are as follows:

- Sub-outcome 1: Improved land administration and spatial planning for integrated development in rural areas;
- Sub-outcome 2: Sustainable land reform contributing to agrarian transformation;
- Sub-outcome 3: Improved food security;

- Sub-outcome 4: Smallholder producers' development and support;
- Sub-outcome 5: Increased access to quality infrastructure and functional services; and
- Sub-outcome 3: Growth of sustainable rural enterprises and industries.

The department also contributes to Outcome 4: Decent employment through inclusive economic growth; Outcome 9: Responsive, accountable, effective and efficient local government system; Outcome 10: Protect and enhance our environmental assets and natural resources and Outcome 12: An efficient, effective and development oriented public service and an empowered, fair and inclusive citizenship.

The DALR&RD Strategic Plan 2015/16 – 2019/20 and the Annual Performance Plans seek to give expression to the outlined policy imperatives of government. Managing performance of the department will essentially strive to periodically establish progress on the contribution to the policy priorities and improve design and implementation of programme and projects based on the results of the performance reviews.

3. Legislative and Policy Context

The focus on monitoring and evaluation of performance in the South African public sector has developed significantly over the past years both in legislative and policy positions and in the implementation of the M&E mechanisms. The PMER Framework for 2018/19 is guided and benchmarked against, among others, the following legal and policy documents:

- **Constitutional mandate (section 195 of 1996)**

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa emphasises the need to provide effective, transparent, accountable and coherent government for the entire Republic, while also providing the public with timely, accessible and accurate information.

- **Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (2005)**

The Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System requires that all government institutions adopt an M&E strategy that outlines how the M&E findings inform planning, budget formulation and execution and annual reporting.

- **Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (2007)**

Performance information is essential to focus the attention of the public and oversight bodies on whether public institutions are delivering value for money, by comparing their performance against their budgets and service delivery plans, and to alert Managers to areas where corrective action is required.

- **South African Statistics Quality Assurance (2008)**

This framework places emphasis on data quality of M&E studies satisfying eight quality dimensions, namely: Relevance, accuracy, timeliness, accessibility, interpretability, coherence, methodological soundness and integrity.

- **National Evaluation Policy Framework (2011)**

This policy framework provides the basis for a minimum system of evaluation across government. Its main purpose is to promote quality evaluations which can be used for learning to improve the effectiveness and impact of government, by reflecting on what is working and what is not working and revising interventions accordingly. It seeks to ensure that credible and objective evidence from evaluations is used in planning, budgeting, organisational improvement, policy review, as well as on-going programme and project management and to improve performance. It provides a mutual language for evaluation in the public service.

- **Public Service Act (1994 as amended by Act No.30 of 2007)**

The Act, among others, seeks to achieve:

- Improved governance through direct accountability and decision-making as close as possible to the point of service delivery; and
- Harmonization of administrative and operational arrangements to suit the service delivery environment.

- **Public Audit Act (2004)**

Section 20 (2) (c) of the Public Audit Act requires the report of the Auditor-General on the audit of a public institution to reflect at least an opinion or conclusion on the reported information relating to the performance of the audited programmes against predetermined objectives. It should be noted that the auditing of performance information, that will be applied by the Auditor-General, can be located on a spectrum between assurance on financial information (i.e. whether financial information fairly presents the financial status of an organisation) and

reporting on value-for-money (i.e. whether resources are used efficiently and effectively by public institutions to achieve desired outcomes).

- **Public Finance Management Act (1999)**

The Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) is all about the efficient and effective management of state resources. It emphasises the need for accountability for results by focusing on outputs and responsibility, rather than just on procedural accountability, which ensures that rules have been adhered to. In other words, in terms of budgeting and financial management, the focus is not only on compliance with the relevant appropriation Act, but also on obtaining value-for-money from each department within government for every rand spent. Managers should not only be held accountable for their resources, but also for the efficacy and efficiency in reaching present targets.

- **DPME guideline No3.1.5: Functions of M and E Components in National Government Departments (2014)**

The document differentiates the roles and the responsibilities of monitoring and evaluation components in national and provincial departments. Monitoring and reporting are regarded as a managerial function that should be undertaken by all managers and must form part of the key functions of their performance agreements. The establishment of M&E units does not shift the responsibility of monitoring and reporting from managers.

M&E units on the other hand are expected to develop frameworks for monitoring the sector performance, report against predetermined objectives, develop departmental information management and evaluations systems.

- **Framework for Strengthening Citizen-Government Partnerships for Monitoring Frontline Service Delivery (August 2013):**

It guides monitoring performance from the citizen's perspective and to use this evidence to improve accountability and service delivery. The aim of this framework is to promote citizen-based monitoring as an essential component of monitoring for improved government performance. It sets out principles, essential elements, considers roles and responsibilities, risks, models for piloting, and finally describes a three-year timeline of activities to support the emergence of Citizen Based Monitoring (CBM) as a practice. Other supporting frameworks includes: Frontline Service Delivery Monitoring Assessment Framework (2015)

- **The Green Paper: Improving Government Performance (2009)**

The Green Paper on Improving Government Performance (2009) provides the framework for the activities of the Department of Performance Monitoring and

Evaluation. The Green Paper on Improving Government Performance was developed with the aim of translating Government's electoral mandate into a clear set of outcomes and output measures. It is envisaged that these outcomes and output measures will assist Government in delivering on the 14 outcomes identified as priorities. The Paper complements the Green Paper on National Strategic Planning and together envisages reforms which will facilitate improvements towards achieving a development state.

4. Definition of Concepts

The concepts monitoring and evaluation are often used together as if they mean the same thing yet they refer to different type of activities. It is therefore imperative that this plan outlines what these concepts mean particularly in relation to the department.

Evaluation: Evaluation is the systematic assessment of the operation and/or outcomes of a program or policy, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to the improvement of the program or policy. More practically, evaluation is a time bound exercise carried out periodically that seeks to provide useful and credible information about the usefulness and success of an intervention. There are three types of evaluations that can be carried out:

- **Clarificatory Evaluation:** whether programme goals and objectives are well formulated, whether programme activities and outputs are clearly specified and whether expected outcomes and associated indicators are specified.
- **Process or Implementation Evaluation:** are directed at three key questions: (1) the extent to which a programme is reaching the appropriate target population; (2) whether or not its service delivery is consistent with programme design; and (3) what resources are being expended.
- **Summative Evaluation:** aims to establish whether a programme had delivered on its promises; has it produced value for money.

Monitoring: It refers to the continuous process of examining the delivery of programme outputs to intended beneficiaries, which is carried out during the execution of a programme with the intention of immediately correcting any deviation from operational objectives. The activities pertaining to the collecting performance data, producing the performance reports and performance reviews are the main examples of performance monitoring that is undertaken in the department.

Administrative Monitoring and Evaluation: Basically refers to compliance and adherence to the PMER framework. It therefore focuses on daily management of the delivery of planned interventions, including quality assurance, implementation of corrective actions and reporting as per the guidelines.

SECTION B: INSTITUTIONALISING M&E IN THE DEPARTMENT

5. Institutional Arrangement for PM&E

Although the department has been carrying out performance monitoring activities in the past and all managers are responsible for PM&E in the immediate working environment, it has largely been uncoordinated and not integrated. In 2010 the department decided to establish a Directorate responsible for Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (PPME). PPME is the primary structure that is responsible for overall function and institutionalising monitoring and evaluation in the department.

5.1. Functions of PPME

The key functions of the PPME Directorate are to:

- Coordinate and support the strategic planning processes of the department;
- Monitor and evaluate the performance of the department against policy and mandated directives, report on findings and provide recommendations;
- Develop and institutionalize PMER framework for the department;
- Develop tools and methodologies to support the Monitoring and Evaluation of policies, programs and projects; and
- Conduct impact assessment of departmental policy initiatives and implemented programs.

In to ensure that the department monitors and evaluates performance financial year the PPME will carry out the following activities:

- Review the PMER framework for the financial year which will form the basis upon which PM&E is to be conducted within the Department.
- Create standardised input templates for reporting purposes to ensure that similar data format is captured throughout the Department. This will improve the monitoring process in that similar data will improve the comparison and analysis processes.
- Analyse data for quarterly and annual preparation of performance reports
- Verify all performance reports and collate a portfolio of evidence for all departmental outputs
- Support quality performance reporting by conducting workshops on programme planning and report with all programmes
- Monitor and evaluate selected programmes in the Department.
- Compile PM&E policies, process guides and other information guides to build capacity for monitoring and evaluation within the Department.

- Make recommendations to senior management to all other processes and changes required to improve PM&E functions and operations within the Department.

5.2 Other Departmental PM&E Institutions

The department also has institutional structures that have an inherent role for monitoring and evaluating performance. In particular, the Departmental Executive Committee (DEC) and the Service Delivery Forum (SDF) play an important institutional role in performance management.

- **Departmental Executive Committee:** It comprises of all Senior Managers in the departmental and convenes by-monthly. The mandate of this committee is to determine the strategic direction of the department, approve policy and related departmental wide issues, and review organisational performance. The DEC meetings will monitor the organisational performance through analysis of quarterly reports by the PPME Directorate; make decisions based on the performance analysis and recommendations on corrective actions.
- **Service Delivery Forum:** It comprises of all managers in the Department and convenes at least four times a year. The role of this forum is primarily to review organisational performance and plan for the next financial year. PPME will make presentation to SDF on the analysis of performance; recommend measures to be implemented and support its planning activities.
- **Programme Managers:** are expected to conduct administrative monitoring and evaluation which included includes the management of performance information within their area of operations or function. This includes managing the delivery of planned interventions, ensuring quality assurance, implementation of corrective actions and reporting as per the guidelines.
- **MEC/HOD Planning Meeting:** The HOD will keep the Member of Executive Council (MEC) informed on progress regarding departmental performance on a quarterly basis. High level strategic outputs will be considered, challenges and trends in the monitoring process indicated and

recommendations on corrective steps will be made to the MEC. The MEC will provide guidance on further interventions necessary to improve Organisational performance.

Internal Audit (IA) also audits preliminary performance information on a quarterly to ensure quality management and assurance. The reports from IA are informs the improvements that should be made in the quarterly and annual reports. DAFF (Department Of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries) also assess performance information in line with the legislative prescripts governing the non-financial performance information in government

Table 2: Summary of Roles and Responsibilities

Person/Institution	Responsibility
Member of Executive Council	It is accountable to the Provincial Legislature which has to be provided with full and regular reports regarding matters under the organisation's control. The Executive Authority needs to ensure that the organisation has the appropriate performance information systems in place in order to fulfil his accountability reporting responsibility. She should also oversee such systems to ensure that they are functioning optimally and comply with the Framework on Managing Programme Performance Information and other related standards and guidelines. The Executive Authority's role is prescribed by section 133 of the Constitution and section 5.1 of the National Treasury Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information.
Accounting Officer	Is responsible for establishing and maintaining the systems to manage performance information. The accounting officer must ensure that performance information systems are integrated within existing management processes and systems (i.e. that there is a link between planning, budgeting and performance monitoring and evaluation processes for example). In the integration of performance information systems with management processes and systems
Programme Manager/ Senior Managers	Responsible for overseeing performance in their respective programmes/sub programmes. This will include overseeing that the systems and processes are established and maintained in the collection of performance information and evidence of performance, as well as signing off on progress reports that are sent to PPME, to confirm accuracy (i.e. verification). They are required to analyse and use performance information for improving programme and project management design as well as to act promptly upon monitoring and evaluation findings where corrective action is required.
Line Managers and other Officials	Responsible for establishing and maintaining the performance information systems and processes within their areas of authority. Other officials are responsible for capturing, collating and checking performance data related to their activities. The integrity of the institution's overall performance information depends on how conscientiously these officials fulfil these responsibilities.

SECTION C: BUSINESS PROCESS

6. Business process for performance information

Section 92 of the Constitution states that "members of the Cabinet are accountable collectively and individually to Parliament for the exercise of their powers and the performance of their functions" and those they must "provide Parliament with full and regular reports concerning matters under their Control". These reports *enable Parliament, provincial legislatures, municipal councils and the public to track government performance, and to hold it accountable*. "They provide information on the overall progress made with the implementation of an institution's performance plans, on a quarterly and an annual basis.

The following documents are prepared:

- Quarterly performance reports
- Annual performance reports
- Monitoring Reports
- Service delivery Improvement Plan reports
- Mid-term report
- End term report (5 years)
- Evaluation reports

In order to generate the aforementioned reports, the monitoring of departmental performance will be done through the following processes:

6.1. Strategic Plan

At the beginning of the Medium Term Strategic Framework period 2015-2020 the department development a strategic plan. It takes into consideration the MTSF, the provincial growth and development strategy, IDPs of municipalities, Performance Agreements between the Ministers and MEC as well as Service Delivery Agreements entered into in terms of the broad strategic outcomes and any other relevant long term government plans. The DALR&RD Strategic Plan 2015/16 – 2019/20 lays the foundation for the development of Annual Performance Plans during this period.

6.2. Annual Performance Plan

Before the beginning of the financial year and at a date determined by the Provincial Legislature the department will table an Annual Performance Plan (APP) detailing the priorities, indicators and targets. The APP will espouse the Medium Term Strategic Framework, the 14 outcomes adopted by government in 2014 and

other government priorities. Although there are a number of other planning documents that the department will produce, the APP remains the main document and the basis of performance monitoring and evaluation.

6.3. Quarterly Reports

- Quarterly Performance Reports will be generated in each quarter based on the indicators of performance as entailed in the APP.
- Performance information is generated in the following way:
- In the course of duty, frontline officials collate performance information and Means of Verification (MoV) which must be submitted to District Managers/Supervisors.
- District Managers/Supervisors must verify the generated information against the MoV as well as consolidate them into Unit/District performance reports.
- Consolidated Unit/District performance report are to be send both electronically and in signed hard copies to the relevant Senior Manager.
- The Senior Manager must subject the submitted performance reports and MoV to quality assurance and consolidate it into a Directorate/Sub-programme report after which it must be send to the Programme Manager.
- All Programme Managers/Senior Managers shall assume the role of Information Oversight Officers. Information Oversight Officers refer to officials designated to ensure that information reported on is accurate and supported by evidence. They are accountable for any reported information within their scope of application. They are required to verify the actual performance reported for the quarter, analyze and explain any material deviation and identify corrective action where appropriate. They are also required to validate the evidence in support of the performance reported. They shall ensure that evidence on performance information reported is systematically available, complete and accessible.
- Programme Managers/Senior Managers shall submit their quarterly reports on the date communicated to them by PPME of the first month after the end of the quarter to the PPME Directorate, supported by MoV per indicator and relevant to the progress made on targets.
- The Directorate PPME consolidates all performance reports from Programme Managers on the electronic system and the Departmental Coordinator will therefore check and submit to the Head of the department (HOD) for signing off
- The HOD signs off the system and Microsoft Word departmental quarterly reports and their then submitted to the Executive Authority, Office of the Premier, Portfolio Committee on Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development, and the DAFF.

- PPME conduct analysis and verification of the submitted quarterly performance reports to inform the performance review meetings and prepare for next quarter report.

6.4 Annual Reports

- Four validated quarterly' reports are consolidated into an annual report and submitted to the Auditor-General along with annual financial statements before the end of May each year.
- The fourth quarter actual output is submitted to OTP (Office of the Premier) and DPME together with the pre-audited annual output for, which is submitted to the Auditor General by departments no later than the 31st of May of each year.
- The Accounting Officer submits an Annual Report to the Executive Authority no later than the 31st August of each year.
- The Accounting Officer and Executive Authority shall table the Annual Report to the Portfolio Committee on the dates as per the committee schedule.

6.5 Service Delivery Improvement Plan (SDIP) reports

- SDIP is reviewed every three years or as determined by Department of Public Service Administration (DPSA) Monitoring against the SDIP done on a quarterly
- An annual report will be prepared and submitted to DPSA
- PPME has to facilitate the process of annual SDIP report approval within the department and submission to DPSA according to scheduled time frames

6.6 Mid-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and End- Term Performance Reports

At the end of an MTEF period a mid-term report must be compiled. A Mid-Term Review Report provides a three years review of an institution's performance indicating the extent of progress towards the achievement of the outcomes reflected in a Strategic Plan, and should include recommendations for performance, budgeting and planning improvement for the remaining years of implementation of the Strategic Plan. The department produce an end-term report towards the end of the period covered by its Strategic Plan. The report covers the extent to which the department has succeeded in achieving each of the strategic outcome oriented goals and objectives set at the beginning of the five-year period, as well as on any other evaluations conducted during the period

- Mid-Term Review Reports shall be developed and finalized within **30 days** after the end of the first quarter in the **fourth year** of implementation of the Strategic Plan within a particular planning period.
- End-Term Review Reports must be developed and finalized within 60 days after the tabling of the fifth Annual Report within a particular planning period.

6.7. Departmental Evaluation reports

The department as part of the National Evaluation System (NES) coordinated by DPME will have its own Departmental Evaluation Plan (DEP) developed and implemented over a three-year period i.e. 2018/19 – 2020/21. The DEP provides details of evaluations approved by the department as priority evaluations to undertake over the three-year period. These priority evaluations will be undertaken internally under the guidance of PPME directorate.

The departmental evaluation plan will be rolled out over the three year MTEF cycle, with the timing linked to the budget process to enable budgeting for evaluations. This alignment is also important for the management to timeously consider those evaluations to be submitted for consideration for the DEP.

- PPME will facilitated the evaluations
- Findings of the evaluations conducted within the department will be sent to DPME, to be deposited into the Evaluation Repository, on their website.
- The improvement plan will be included into the department's Strategic Plan and Annual Performance Plan, with regular reporting against the implementation of the improvement plan required.
- The progress reports against the improvement plan will have to be submitted to DPME, who will then submit the reports to Cabinet.

7. Data Management

7.1 Means of Verification

This Framework is developed against the Annual Performance Plan of the Department and reflects all the indicators per Programme. In order to facilitate verification of performance a definition of indicators framework detailing the type of evidence to be used was developed by the Directorate PPME together with Programme Managers.

7.2 Collecting, Collating and Storing of Performance Information

- Central depository of PI across all Quarters and Programmes is created in the office of the Senior Manager: PPME.
- Files opened per Quarter, per Programme, containing the MoV per indicator resulting in a Portfolio of Evidence (PI).
- PPME Directorate has a dedicated official attached to each programme to support collection/consolidation, collating and storing the PI.
- A Peer review moderation between the PPME officials takes place after the official verifying evidence has ended.

7.3 Verification of Performance

The Directorate PPME reviews portfolio of evidence and means of verification quarterly. Primarily, this review must focus on is establish whether evidence of performance is complete, valid and accurate as well as accessible. The evidence received is checked against the Technical Indicator Description (TID), then a verification report is compiled.

7.4 Performance Review

Periodically, the relevant structures in the department will review performance especially once the reports have been finalised. The DEC and SDF are the key management structures that will review departmental performance. However, each quarter all programmes must conduct performance reviews. The purpose of these reviews include to:

- The measure the outcomes and impacts of implemented programmes or projects;
- Establish the cost effectiveness and efficiency of activities;
- Identify shortcomings/gaps in the performance of the programme or department;
- Determine whether a programme or project should be expanded, modified or eliminated; and
- Make recommendations for future strategic objectives.

7.5 Data quality

Data quality refers to the extent to which data adhere to the six dimensions of quality, which Programme Managers need to ensure exist at all times during reporting. M&E data quality assurance process need to verify this and advice on improved ways to enhance the process. The six data quality dimensions are defined in the table below:

Table 3: Data Quality Dimensions

Dimension Of Data Quality	Operational Definition
Accuracy/Validity	The extent to which the data adequately represent the actual performance
Reliability	The data generated by a programme's information system must be based on protocols and procedures that do not change irrespective to who is using them or when and how often they are used
Completeness	Information system from which the results are derived and is appropriately inclusive: It represents the complete list of eligible persons or units and not a fraction of the list

Precision	Data have sufficient details
Timeliness	Data are timely when up-to-date (current) and when the information is available on time. Timeliness is affected by 1) the rate at which the programme's information system is updated; 2) the rate of change of the actual programme activities; and 3) when the information is actually used or required
Integrity	When data generated by the programme's information system are protected from deliberate bias or manipulation for political or personal reasons

8. Dissemination of Performance Information

Apart from the internal use of performance information and its reviews, it is also generated to enable oversight bodies and the public to know how well the department is doing and hold it accountable. Accordingly, once the internal processes are completed and performance reports are finalised such information will be made available through the website of the department and other means to be determined by the Directorate of Communication.

9. Conclusion

The Performance Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Framework 2018/19 of the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Develop, represents the document that outlines how the department will carry out PM&E.