

**PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND
EVALUATION FRAMEWORK 2017/18**

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

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

agriculture, land reform
& rural development



DOCUMENT APPROVAL PAGE

**NORTHERN CAPE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, LAND REFORM AND
RURAL DEVELOPMENT:
PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**



	PERSON	SIGNATURE	DATE
Head of Department	Mr. WVD Mothibi		10/04/2017
Executive Manager: PPME	Mr. RL Banda		03/04/2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section A: Background

1. Introduction

1.1. The importance of monitoring performance in the public sector

1.2. Purpose of the PM&E Framework

2. Policy Imperatives 2015-2020

3. Legislative and Policy Context

4. Definition of Concepts

5. Principles of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Public Sector

Section B: Institutionalising M&E in the Department

6. Institutional Arrangement for PM&E

6.1. Functions of PME

6.2. Other Departmental PM&E Institutions

6.3. Summary of Roles and Responsibilities

Section C: Business Process

7. Business process for performance information

7.1. Strategic Plan 2015-2020

7.2. Annual Performance Plan

7.3. Quarterly Reports

7.4. Annual Report

7.5. Means of Verification

7.6. Collecting, Collating and Storing of Performance Information and MOV

7.7. Verification of Performance

7.8. Performance Review

8. Dissemination of Performance Information

9. Conclusion

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 and Evaluation (PM&E) Framework 2017/18 responds to these legislative and policy requirements.

However, it must be stated with great emphasis that although the PM&E Framework 2017/18 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 which will result in improved service delivery. At the same time it is meant to enable stakeholders to hold it accountable. This PM&E Plan also seeks to consolidate progress made in implementing the Audit Action Plan on performance information. Through this document the process to be followed in carrying out PM&E functions in the department and the responsibilities of role players are outlined.

1.1. The importance of measuring performance in the public sector

The service delivery challenges facing the state after about 20 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 therefore generic for the public sector. Amongst others, measuring performance is important because:

- Performance information 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.

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 interventions 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.

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 12 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.

2. Policy Imperatives 2015-2020

- Integrate and align M&E 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 Executive 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.

The purpose of the PM&E Framework 2017/18 is to:

1.2. Purpose of the PM&E Framework

DAL&RD is mandated to drive and ensure the implementation of outcome 7 in the province. This outcome aims to create vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all. The outputs are as follows:

- Sustainable Agrarian Reform;
- Improved access to affordable and diverse foods;
- Improved Rural service to support livelihoods;
- Rural job creation and promoting economic livelihoods; and
- Enabling institutional environment for sustainable and inclusive growth.

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 DAL&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.

(a) *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996*

A number of sections in the Constitution make reference to monitoring and evaluation of performance in the public sector. Most importantly creates mechanism for holding government accountable. 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 that they must provide Parliament with full and regular reports concerning matters under their control".

(b) The Public Finance Management Act of 1999

Although the PFMA largely deals with reforms and management of public finances it makes significant provisions for the requirement to account on the performance of public institutions.

(c) Policy Framework for the on Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

In 2007 government produced a Policy Framework for the on Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Systems. This framework was essentially the first policy on government wide monitoring and evaluation in South Africa. Its aim was to provide integrated, encompassing framework for M&E principles, practices and standards to be used throughout government, and function as an apex-level information system which draws from the component systems in the framework to deliver useful M&E products for its users.

(d) Framework for Performance Information Management (2007)

National Treasury's 2007 Framework for Management of Programme Performance Information stresses the need for Departments to put in place processes to ensure that performance information is used in planning, budgeting and management in the department. This would include (a) the setting of ex ante performance standards and targets; (b) reviewing progress and taking managerial action and (3) evaluation of programme performance. It also suggests processes to ensure that performance information management responsibilities are included in the performance agreements of line managers.

(e) 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 12 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.

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) Difference between Monitoring and Evaluation

Evaluation differs from monitoring in the sense that while monitoring is aimed at describing progress against set targets, evaluation attempts to find reasons why objectives, programmes, project interventions were effective or unsuccessful. Evaluation is an attempt to systematically and objectively assess a planned, on-going, or completed development intervention. Evaluations assess relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Evaluation encompasses the process of

determining the merits or shortcomings of achieved results by comparing it to a set standard

5. Principles of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Public Sector

To ensure that PM&E will optimally assist Government in its endeavours, the Policy Framework for Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System provides a number of principles that should be applied to ensure sound monitoring and evaluation in the public sector.

These principles include the following:

PRINCIPLE	RATIONALE
PM&E 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
PM&E 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
PM&E 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.
PM&E 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 considered and reflected upon in plans and their actual outcomes should be tracked and analysed systematically and consistently
PM&E 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
PM&E should be methodologically sound	Common indicators and data collection methods should be used to improve data

RATIONALE	PRINCIPLE
<p>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.</p>	<p>PME should be operationally effective</p>
<p>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 timely 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.</p>	

**Section B
Institutionalising M&E in the Department**

6. 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 M&E in the department. In the outer years it will develop a plan for institutionalising M&E in the department.

6.1. 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 Monitoring and Evaluation 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 the 2017/18 financial year the Directorate will carry out the following activities to ensure that the department monitor and evaluate performance.

Review the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation 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.

<p>Compile PM&E policies, process guides and other information guides to build capacity for monitoring and evaluation within the Department.</p>	<p>Make recommendations to senior management to all other processes and changes required to improve PM&E functions and operations within the Department.</p>
--	--

6.2 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 department 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.
- Managing of performance information is the responsibility of each programme within the department, as they have to provide feedback and early indications of progress or lack thereof in the achievement of intended results and the attainment of goals and objectives. Inherent in this task is the responsibility of the programmes to compile progress reports in line with Departmental Annual Performance Plans. The monitoring of programme performance will be conducted quarterly during the Programme Management Meetings.
- 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.

6.3 Summary Roles and Responsibilities

Person/Institution	Responsibility
Member of Executive Council	<p>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 fulfill 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.</p>
Accounting Officer	<p>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</p>
Programme Manager/Senior Managers	<p>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 PPMI, 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.</p>
Line Managers and other Officials	<p>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 fulfill these responsibilities.</p>

7. Business process for performance information

Monitoring of departmental performance will be done through the following processes:

7.1. Strategic Plan 2015-2020

At the beginning of the Medium Term Strategic Framework period 2015-2020 the department developed 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 DALRR&D Strategic Plan 2015/16 – 2019/20 lays the foundation for the development of Annual Performance Plans during this period.

7.2. 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 detailing the priorities, indicators and targets. The APP will espouse the Medium Term Strategic Framework 2015-2020 and the 14 outcomes adopted by government in 2014. Although there are a number of other planning documents that the department will produce, the APP is the main document and the basis of performance monitoring and evaluation.

7.3. 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 processed 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 sent 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, analyse 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 Means of Verification per indicator and relevant to the progress made on targets.
- The Data Capturer in the PPME Directorate PPME will consolidate all performance reports from Programme Managers on the electronic system and the Departmental Coordinator will therefore check and submit to the HOD for sign off of the system.
- The HOD signs off in the system and Microsoft Word departmental quarterly reports and his office submit such to the Executive Authority, Office of the Premier, Portfolio Committee on Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development, and the National Department of Agriculture.
- PPME conduct analysis and verification of the submitted quarterly performance reports to inform the performance review meetings and prepare for next quarter report.

7.4. Annual Reporting

- The Department shall submit a draft Annual Report to the Auditor General's Office no later than the 31st of May of each year.
- The Accounting Officer shall submit 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 date that has been communicated to them.

7.5. 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.

7.6. Collecting, Collating and Storing of Performance Information and Means of Verification

- 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.

7.7. Verification of Performance

The Directorate PPME will develop a methodology and review the portfolio of evidence and means of verification quarterly. Primarily, this review must focus on its establish whether evidence of performance is complete, valid and accurate as well as accessible.

7.8. 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.

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 and Evaluation Framework 2017/18 of the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Develop, represents the document that outlines how the department will carry out PM&E. In the future the framework will be improved to cover other essential areas such as the information management systems, capacity building issues, and how to institutionalise M&E in the department.