

# Final Evaluation Report of the UNDP South Africa Country Programme

CPD 2013-2017

PREPARED BY: DR. BACKSON SIBANDA

Independent Consultant – BACTHA Consultancy 31st July 2017

# **List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**

AU African Union
CO Country Office

CPAP Country Programme Action Plan
CPD Country Programme Document

CPSI Centre for Public Service Innovation

CSO Civil Society Organizations

DIRCO Department of International Relations and Cooperation

DoE Department of Energy

DPME Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation

DPSA Department of Public Service and Administration

DRC Democratic Republic of Congo

Dti Department of Trade & Industry

EU European Union

FPA Fire Protection Association

HDR Human Development Report

HDRO Human Development Report Office

IEC Independent Electoral Commission

GEF Global Environment Facility

HQ Head Quarters

ILO International labour Organization

KZN Kwa Zulu Natal

MDG Millennium Development Goals

MTSF Medium Term Strategic Framework

NDP National Development Plan

NFNV New Faces New Voices

OATF Oliver and Adelaide Tambo Foundation

ODA Official Development Assistance

PFA Partnership Framework Agreement

PFC Partnership Framework for Coordination

PMTC Peace Mission Training Centre

PMU Programme Management Unit

PRAU Policy Research Analysis Unit

PSC Programme Steering Committee

RBM, M&E Results Based Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

RC Resident Coordinator

ROA Regional Office for Africa

RSC Regional Service Centre

S&L Standards & Labels

SADC Southern African Development Cooperation

SADPA South African Development Partnership Agency

SAHRA South African Heritage Resource Agency

SALGA South African Local Government Association

SDGs Sustainable Development Goals

SDP Supplier Development Programme

SGP Small Grants Programme

SMEs Small Medium Enterprises

SMMEs Small Medium and Micro-Sized Enterprises

SSC South-South Cooperation

STAR System for Transparent Allocation of Resources

ToRs Terms of Reference

UN United Nations

UNDP United Nations Development Programme

UNDP-RC United Nations Development Programme Regional Service Centre

UNEG United Nations Evaluation Group

UNFPA United Nations Family Planning Agency

UNPAN United Nations Public Administration Network

UNSCF United Nations Strategic Cooperation Framework

UNCEF United Nations International Children and Education Fund

UNOPS United Nations Office for Project Services

UNV United Nations Volunteers

# **Acknowledgements**

The evaluator would like to thank the Government of the Republic of South Africa and all the officials who provided valuable information and insights into the United Nations Development Programme's ("UNDP's") contribution and support to South Africa. Thanks also go to the UNDP Country Office in South Africa's programme staff and other stakeholders who gave their valuable time and input to the evaluation process despite busy schedules. Thanks go to Mr. Gana Fofang, UNDP Resident Representative and UN Resident Coordinator and his staff for providing planning and administrative support to the whole process of evaluation. Special thanks go to Mr. Walid Badawi, UNDP Country Director, the programme managers for providing leadership and guidance as well as their staff who helped plan the visits to the various Government departments and other stakeholders. Special thanks are due to the UNDP Operations personnel for efficiently arranging local travel and support services during the evaluation process. Thank you to my evaluation team (Ms. Angela Bester and Ms. Susan Kiragu Nottingham) for providing such a friendly and inspiring working atmosphere. Lastly thanks also go to Iris Sibanda of BACTHA Consulting for working with me on editing and cleaning up the evaluation report.

This report is prepared by Dr Backson Sibanda – BACTHA CONSULTING.

# **Table of Contents**

Li	st of A	Acronyms and Abbreviations	i
Α	cknow	vledgements	iii
E۱	valuat	ion Report Executive Summary	v
	Evalu	ation Scope and Objectives	V
		mary of Evaluation Major Findings: Achievements, Challenges, Recommendations and Less ned	
	Sumr	mary of Major Findings and Recommendations	xviii
	Propo	osed Recommendation on Coordination	xxi
	Conc	lusions	.xxii
1	Background		
	1.1	Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation	2
	1.2	Scope of UNDP CPD Evaluation	3
	1.3	Methodology	4
	1.4	Evaluation Criteria	4
	1.5	Limitations and Challenges Impacting the Evaluation	5
	1.6	Opportunities	6
2	2 Analysis and Findings		6
	2.1	CPD Design	7
	2.2	Findings	8
3	Government UNDP Relationships and Oversight		
	3.1	UN and NDP 2030 Priorities	33
	3.2	Traditional Donors Experiences and Views	34
4	UN	IDP Challenges for CPD Implementation	35
5	Ma	ajor Recommendations and Issues for Consideration	36
6	Les	ssons from CPD Implementation	39
7	Co	nclusions	40
8	An	nexes	i
	8.1	Annex 1: CPD/CPAP Mid Term Evaluation Terms of Reference	i
	8.2	Annex 2: UNDP CPD Interview List	xii
	8.3	UNDP CPD Evaluation – List of documents	. xiii

# **Evaluation Report Executive Summary**

#### **Evaluation Purpose**

The evaluation was undertaken to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of the 2013 – 2017 Country Programme Document (CPD) and the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). The evaluation findings, conclusions, good practices, lessons learned and recommendations will be used by UNDP to improve its relevance and work in South Africa.

# **Overview of the Programme Context**

UNDP developed its CPD and CPAP documents guided by South Africa's key national development policy documents including the National Development Plan (NDP), Vision 2030; the Medium Term Strategic Framework 2009 – 2014; and the New Growth Path. These CPD and CPAP documents also responded to the recommendations of the 2008 United Nations Joint Evaluation Report in South Africa. These documents were further informed by the broad consultations with government departments, civil society and non-governmental organizations.

# **Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

The scope of the evaluation included assessing the results of four programme components as outlined in the CPAP.

# **Evaluation Methodology**

The evaluation is anchored on a methodology that uses document review, interviews with key informants including UNDP staff, government stakeholders, non-governmental organizations, beneficiaries as well as on-site field visits to selected provinces to enable data collection and triangulation. Triangulation increases the accuracy and credibility of the findings.

The 2013 – 2017 UNDP CPD focuses on the following:

# (i) Inclusive growth;

Under this programme area, UNDP has been supporting the Government of South Africa in its efforts to address the triple challenge of poverty, inequality and unemployment, especially among youth, women and those living in rural areas. In collaboration with Government, UNDP is implementing four key areas to:

- support policy dialogue on mechanisms to address the challenges highlighted above:
- engage the private sector to enhance supplier development programmes (SDP) and innovative programmes to help match skills including e-skills with employment opportunities, particularly among youth and women;
- build capacity of government officials in implementing rural development and land reform policies, and

• strengthen social protection mechanisms. This evaluation assesses UNDP's contribution to Government's efforts on reducing poverty, inequality and enhancing inclusive growth.

# (ii) Climate Change and Greening South Africa's Economy;

The effects of climate change are posing major threats to the land and marine ecosystems and other natural resources in South Africa, affecting various sectors and areas where the poor and most *vulnerable* often earn their livelihoods (i.e., fishing, agriculture, forestry and biodiversity). As a rapidly industrializing country with a rich endowment of natural resources, South Africa's energy use is derived almost entirely from fossil fuels. UNDP has been supporting the Government to achieve its national priorities to green the economy in two key areas:

- Promoting sustainable energy for all through policy advisory services on climate-resilient development strategies, institutional strengthening, and enhancing access to renewable energy technologies; and
- Enhancing biodiversity management through policy advisory services on protected area management and employment generation opportunities for improved livelihoods, with particular emphasis on women and youth.

These efforts will contribute to stabilizing and reducing carbon emissions, mitigating and adapting to climate change. These contribute to the overall goal of "greening" the South African economy. Under this programme area, various mid and end of programme evaluations were conducted to assess their contribution to Government's efforts of achieving its national priorities to green the economy. UNDP works with other UN agencies as well as national and local government partners and CSOs to achieve these goals.

# (iii) Service Delivery & Democratic Governance;

South Africa's public sector across all spheres of government has been experiencing uneven public service delivery due to insufficient institutional capacities, and increasing corruption. To address this challenge, the government of South Africa has embarked on a comprehensive public sector reform. UNDP has been providing policy advisory services and targeted institutional interventions to strengthen government capacity to expand and improve equitable delivery of public services, promote community participation, enhance oversight and accountability mechanisms of relevant institutions across national, provincial and municipal levels.

# (iv) Support for South Africa's Regional and Global Engagement.

One of South Africa's national development outcomes is to create a better South Africa and contribute to a better Africa and a better world on a host of development issues. The achievement of this outcome was envisaged to contributing South Africa's role in the regional and global arena to advocate for South-South Cooperation, effective development cooperation and raising Africa's voice on development issues through expanding development exchanges, conducting sound analytical and policy work with

a regional and global impact as well as organizing dialogues to inform the Post-2015 process among others as well as implement good practices on sustainable development, development in post-conflict and peace-building, in collaboration with government, respective research institutes, and UNDP Bureaus.

The crosscutting areas within all the above programmes in South Africa are:

- Mainstreaming Gender transformation and HIV and AIDS across all programmes.
- To ensure a multi-sectoral response to HIV and AIDS.

#### The country programme:

- Is clearly aligned to national priorities and development outcomes of the Government of South Africa – UN Strategic Cooperation Framework (SCF) 2013 – 2017;
- Seeks to contribute to South Africa's social and economic transformational aspirations through support to policy innovations and movement from policy to implementation; through pilots and demonstration projects and new partnership arrangements, capacity building and pure learning.
- Brings knowledge of global best practices to South Africa to customise this knowledge, thought leadership and formulate policies, legislation, processes and systems and provides a window to the world to enable South Africa to share experiences, challenges and best practices with the world.
- Mainstreaming gender and HIV across all UNDP programmes

# Summary of Evaluation Major Findings: Achievements, Challenges, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

This executive summary provides a brief resume of the major findings which include achievements, challenges, recommendations and lessons learned from this evaluation. The details and supporting evidence are provided in the body of the report.

#### **Highlights of major achievements**

Given the complexities of the relationships between the UNDP and its partners, which sometimes overshadow what has been done and what has been achieved, this section of the report highlights major CPD implementation achievements by the UNDP. This is aimed to assist in balancing the constraints and challenges that have been experienced in achieving the goals. Further, it should be appreciated that there is not always a common understanding or agreement between UNDP and its partners and hence some achievements are contested or are not viewed in the same way by the partnership. It should, however, be appreciated that some of these achievements are completed activities and outputs and few outcomes. Impacts cannot be measured at this point since these take a long time. The following are some of the achievements as of July 2017:

#### (i) Inclusive Growth:

- Research was commissioned by the UNDP to investigate policy options for extending social protection to informal workers. There has been ongoing national policy dialogue and roundtable discussions facilitated by the UNDP on social protection with the intention of introducing policy changes on social protection so as increase coverage. According to UNDP interventions go beyond research as it provides a neutral platform which helps bridge the divide. The debates and roundtable discussions with selected stakeholders enables them to find suitable and practical interventions on social protection.
- According to UNDP documents the project on Rural Development and Land Reform is one where UNDP has worked well with the Government in developing different policies and legislation relating to land reform and rural development. UNDP has demonstrated its comparative advantage by providing technical support and policy support to the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. Further, UNDP signed a cost sharing agreement and the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform has been funding the project.
- An inequality study was undertaken and the report disseminated to concerned stakeholders.
- Under the UNDP technical support was provided to 520 women owned SMMEs integrated into the value chain in the Passenger Rail Service. Further, Mentorship was provided to women owned SMMEs for young Women Business Cooperatives and Institutions leading to 300 women beneficiaries. Given the time and financial constraints for this evaluation no interviews were carried out with the women to determine how they are benefitting from this support.
- UNDP also commissioned three research papers aimed at revitalising small businesses and industrialisation.
- 20 specialists were trained on *supply development methodology*. Information is not available on how the specialist are using this methodology in their work.
- The Graça Machel Trust's New Faces New Voices (NFNV) was commissioned by UNDP to undertake a study on *finding sources of funding for women entrepreneurs*. NFNV believes that time was lost after the completion of the study and before taking this further as much as the findings were positive. The conclusion and recommendations were that the study would contribute to a deeper understanding of the factors that limit women's access to SMME financing and that the findings could be used for promotion and implementation of inclusive gender equitable financing policies and programming for women entrepreneurs among financiers and key government and private stakeholders. NFNV believes that much as there has been a time lapse the findings are still relevant and recommends that the study has the potential to be beneficial to the entire SADC region. Based on NFNV's conclusions the evaluation recommends that UNDP follow this up and further utilise this information.
- OR Tambo debate series: This project has three components which include a
  policy debating platform, roundtable discussions and a "deep dive" analysis. All
  components are designed to interrogate the constraints and bottlenecks in the
  implementation of the NDP. As the evaluation report concludes, there have

already been policy changes in some of the areas tackled by the project which are influencing the implementation of NDP. The debates played a critical role in raising society awareness on NDP and their role in implementing NDP. One example is that of the debate on the Capable State where the Minister of Public Service and Administration indicated that the Commission was not utilising its constitutional mandated powers to make sure that public servants conduct themselves and perform appropriately. Based on the Minister's remarks the Chairperson of the Public Service Commission initiated a meeting with the NDP project to discuss these issues to seek recommendations on how things can be improved. The second example is on the Education Debate which addressed accountability within the public education system. One of the issues raised during the debate was the role of national assessments in improving accountability. After the roundtable discussions, trade unions and government agreed on an approach to implement national assessments. The third example is the Social Protection Policy Dialogue. One of the issues raised was the extension of social protection to informal workers. It was agreed that a pilot is needed to test the social protection scheme for informal workers. These examples demonstrate how the work of the project is related to the goals of inequality, poverty and unemployment. The impact of policy change will only be measured in the long term. There are clear indications that this project already shows the potential for impact because changes in policy are already being implemented.

# (ii) Climate Change, Greening the Economy and Energy

- The UNDP- GEF (Global Environmental Finance) supported projects in South Africa with the aim of achieving national priorities to green the economy by supporting the promotion of sustainable energy biodiversity management. The evaluation provides a few major achievements as summarised in project evaluations.
  - UNDP is implementing GEF projects in biodiversity management and land degradation and has expanded the conservation estate and protected areas.
  - The CO provided support for climate change mitigation via phase 2 of the South African Wind Energy Programme to ensure expanded access to renewable energy technologies.
  - Further, the CO supported market transformation of households to contribute to the national low carbon agenda whereby purchase decisions of consumers are better informed through the labelling of energy efficient standards on appliances.
  - As part of environmental and biodiversity protection 4,500 Fire Protection Association (FPA) members were trained. These members are now better positioned to implement fire management plans because of the wide sharing of fire information among the FPAs.
- One of the GEF projects is Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildlands Fire Hazards Associated with Climate Change. This UNDP-GEF project seeks to reduce the environmental and socio-economic impacts of wildlands fires that

are expected to accelerate due to climate change in the Fynbos Biome of South Africa. This GEF investment seeks to strengthen the capacity of people and institutions to implement effective and proactive integrated fire management systems to reduce hazards. This project has built technical and institutional capacity of individuals and institutions to manage current levels of wildland fires. The current priority of the project is continued building of capacity to meet future challenges of climate change scenarios. Fire Protection Associations have been capacitated to transition from reactive to proactive management models. While GEF projects have strong technical experts these projects take longer to move through the project cycle than stakeholders expect.

- Market Transformation Through Energy Efficiency Standards and labelling of Appliances in South Africa: The focal area for this project is Climate Change. The project goal is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The project has three outcomes:
  - 1. Policy and regulatory framework for Standards and Labels (S&L) programmes.
  - 2. Define labelling specifications & MEPS thresholds for 12 products considered by DoE and DTI for S&L regulation.
  - 3. Strengthening of capacity of institutions and individuals in the S&L regulations.

There was a slow start due to delays in the "Cash Disbursement Modality". However, there is strong willingness amongst the industrial sector to comply with new EE regulations. As a result, appliances meet the standards. There are highly skilled and enabling stakeholders who support this effort. This project has thus led to strengthened institutional and individual capacities as well as facilitate strategic partners. Notwithstanding, the project continues to be negatively impacted by cash disbursement modality, unclear management arrangements, understaffing at the Project Management Unit (PMU) and the delays in the appointment of the manager.

- National Biodiversity Grasslands Programme: This programme was highly rated by the Terminal Evaluation as an excellent programme because of its achievements in land protection and mainstreaming biodiversity within the sector guidelines, norms and planning mechanisms. The programme has also produced significant organizational and individual capacity mainstreaming processes. It is strong in bringing people and agencies together. Engagement of well selected stakeholders around key activities at field level resulted in lessons being institutionalised in the form of industrywide guidelines, special plans and standards. The major achievement of this programme was that it addressed the gap between policy, implementation and the coordinated nature of the many efforts to manage grasslands biodiversity.
- Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the SA Wild Coast.
  The project was designed as a representative protected estate on communal owned land in the Eastern Cape. The communal area was managed through a management agreement between provincial, local and national authorities. Its main interventions were strengthening the national institutional framework for protected areas, co-management, enhancing management effectiveness and

- developing a functional system in protected areas with active collaboration with local communities. The programme success is participatory land use planning, strengthened capacity and awareness among target communities and effective management under community participation.
- GEF Small Grants Projects: The Small Grants mechanism was started in 2001 and to date has supported 112 projects in South Africa. The maximum grant size is \$50,000. Strategic projects have a maximum budget of \$150,000. Most of the small grants projects are in the biodiversity portfolio. The small grants projects are implemented by UNDP using GEF funds that are manged by the Government of South Africa. The evaluation established that the grantees have been recognised by South Africa's Department of Environmental Affairs and many of these projects have won prizes. It has been demonstrated that small community projects can make a big difference in the environment. It is clear from results thus far that the small grants projects have found traction among the rural people and that they are making a difference to people's lives and the environment. This is an area where UNDP technical support and management of these funds is creating an impact as demonstrated by the documentation of these experiences and the number of lives that are impacted. Among the beneficiaries of these projects are women, youth and men.

#### (iii) Service Delivery and Democratic Governance

According to UNDP in South Africa the South African Government recognised the disparities in public service delivery due to insufficient institutional capacities and increased corruption in the public service. The SA Government then embarked on a comprehensive public-sector reform. UNDP found traction with these Government efforts and engaged government in supporting a number of these initiatives based on its comparative advantage and expertise. The major areas of cooperation and support are in the areas of policy advisory services and targeting institutions where its comparative advantage and expertise could make a difference. A few of these efforts and achievements are captured below.

• Public Service Innovation: UNDP has excellent working relationships and supports the work of the Centre for Public Service Innovation (CPSI). CPSI values UNDP more than any other partner or stakeholder because of the importance and relevance of UNDP's support to the centre. The centre's recognition of innovation as critical to service delivery found traction with UNDP and the partnership is working well. The United Nations Public Administration Network (UNPAN) is a strategic programme that consists of over 30 partner institutions (Online Regional Centres) covering five global centres. The value of the work of CPSI and UNDP's support are well documented and appreciated by South Africa and other (Southern African Development Community) SADC member states. This is certainly an area where UNDP support is making a difference and hence lessons should be learned from this and similar approaches can be replicated.

#### (iv) South Africa's Regional and Global Role

- UNDP is cooperating with the South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA) to support national efforts to build local organisational capacity and enhance South Africa's regional and global role. Progress to date includes:
  - 1. Establishing and signing of the Partnership Framework Agreement (PFA) and implementation mechanism;
  - 2. UNDP and the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO) jointly organising consultations on the Post 2015 Development Agenda, including the African Common Position on the Post-2015 Development Agenda as well as the 2063 African vision;
  - 3. Facilitating consultations among African climate change negotiators and experts and training as a preparation for the COP 21 that was held in Paris in 2015 on key issues to be decided by COP 21

Evidence also shows that the country office has also contributed substantively to the draft Humanitarian Policy Framework of the Government at the invitation of DIRCO's Humanitarian division.

- Peace Mission Training Centre (PMTC): The objective of the Institutional Capacity Enhancement of the Peace Mission Training Centre project is to enhance the institutional capacity of the PMTC to train personnel for South Africa to effectively participate in the United Nations (UN) and African Union (AU) peacekeeping and peace building activities. To date, the Country Office. in partnership with the Government of Japan, has supported the institutional and training capacity of the PMTC by constructing two centres - a multidimensional training and education centre- as well as purchased equipment and vehicles to support the strengthening of the training programme. In 2013 and 2014 respectively, the project supported a two-week training entitled "Peace Relief and Reconstruction". 87 peace personnel from Defence, National Disaster Management, DIRCO and other security structures attended the course. Given South Africa's participation in peace keeping this training has a potential to make a difference especially in Africa. The fact that South Africa has utilised the facilities and sent a number of their peace keeping staff for training is an indication of its potential value.
- Support to Department of Public Service and Administration: UNDP supported the study on the consolidation and repositioning of the South African Public Service. Policy review and reformulation and national policies have been strengthened as a result of this support. Community participation in capacity building resulted in the establishment of 9 provincial repositioning processes.
- KZN Academy: UNDP provided support to the Public Service Training Academy in KwaZulu Natal (KZN). A consultant was commissioned to develop a curriculum and training materials in Results Based Management (RBM) and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in 2015. This was followed by two training workshops in April 2017. Based on a feedback survey the evaluation established that the participants found both the materials and the training relevant and beneficial and recommended that more officials be trained, especially more senior officials who should be prioritised. This would create a

- situation of understanding at senior levels and thus increase chances for adoption and implementation.
- Multi Party Women's Caucus KZN Natal Legislature: UNDP in corporation
  with UN Women helped build capacity of members of the Women caucus in
  KwaZulu Natal Legislature on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)
  through a gender lens.
- Social Protection: UNDP contributed to the development of a chapter on Social Protection in the NDP which is being used to implement social protection (UNDP Report 2016).

#### Assessing Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation also used the criteria to establish if the CPD implementation produced the envisaged outcomes, and to demonstrate the programme's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

- Relevance: Based on the information collected the evaluation concluded that
  the CPD was relevant as it directly responds to NDP and MTSF which directly
  address the needs and priorities of South Africa. The programme was
  responsive to the social, legal and institutional needs and changes of the
  country and the triple challenges of poverty, inequality and unemployment.
- Effectiveness: Many of the CPD projects and interventions were found to be
  effective in addressing the national priorities especially at the national level,
  policy level and in developing capacities of government at the national and
  provincial levels. The evaluation concludes that the CPD was less effective at
  the grassroots level because it did not directly address the needs and priorities
  of ordinary grassroot people.
- Efficiency: The evaluation established that resources were utilised to undertake
  planned activities which led to the achievement of planned outputs and
  outcomes. The annual workplans demonstrate a clear causality between
  resource use and achievement of results.
- Impact: While impact cannot be measured at this stage of the programme there
  are indications that, given some of the policy changes and capacity
  development outcomes, this would lead to impact in those specific areas
  addressed by the CPD.
- Sustainability: Given the capacity development efforts by the programme at the
  individual and institutional levels there is potential technical and managerial
  sustainability from those who have been capacitated. The Government of South
  Africa has also demonstrated that it has the financial capacity to sustain these
  initiatives that have been started with the UNP support.

#### Challenges

- Relocation of the Regional Service Centre (RSC) key staff to Ethiopia caused huge impact on the administrative resources and drained the technical and operation procedure of the GEF portfolio.
- Delays in the implementation of GEF projects were experienced during the current CPD implementation period.
- Time lag in the communication and dialogue with government counterparts and building of pipeline projects.
- Changes in Government focal points for the GEF Projects and international conventions on which projects are normally developed, i.e. in one key ministry changes since 2015.

This section provides an evaluation summary of major issues identified by both the main government partners/stakeholders and UNDP that have impacted delivery. These issues are critical to the relationships of UNDP and the Government of South Africa as they have paralysed some excellent partnerships and projects. Many of the articulated challenges, problems and constraints in the main document emanate from these relationship issues. Unless these are resolved amicably and solutions found UNDP's work in South Africa will continue to be negatively impacted. Indeed, the UN/UNDP's efforts and impacts in South Africa can be severely diluted if these issues are not addressed. The issues relate to undefined or unclear relationships between UNDP and government, confusion over coordination or lack thereof on both sides as well as paralysis created by rigid UNDP and government templates. Some government partners indicated that the lack of flexibility to these templates not only affect UNDP delivery but also its ability to report effectively to meet the partners' needs. These challenges also impact UNDP's reporting and accountability to its Head Quarters.

#### a) Coordination Issues

While the UNDP collaborates with individual departments, the major government coordinating departments are DIRCO (Strategic international relations), National Treasury (Programmatic and Financial Accountability for government resources) and the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) for M&E and Reporting systems programmatic accountability. It is the view of government stakeholders that these roles are either not understood or accepted by UNDP or that there might be constraints on UNDP that are not clear to partners. What is clear from this is that there is not always a common understanding on these issues between UNDP and its government partners/stakeholders.

Government stakeholders admit that there are weaknesses of coordination on their side because of power structures and internal government relations. These relationships are impacted and determined by relationships between these departments. UNDP also stressed that these government based coordination issues impact working relationships and delivery. The causes of both weaknesses need to be understood and then addressed informed by the realities of South Africa. UNDP stressed that there is an element of a power struggle among the departments which affects working relationships with UNDP.

The evaluation observes that, as UNDP has been in South Africa for a long time now (23years) it should understand that DIRCO is responsible for strategic and international relations coordination. DIRCO and other departments cannot enter into agreements with UNDP where South African national financial resources are used for programme/project implementation without National Treasury involvement. This is currently happening and, based on the so called "cost sharing", has caused a lot of confusion and frustration on both sides leading to delays in programme implementation. This confusion is still going on despite signed documents that are meant to guide these relationships. UNDP understands these complexities and should make plans and negotiate these in advance to avoid complications. UNDP should also put these issues upfront if its own rules and regulations do not allow it to go beyond a certain point. The Government of South Africa should also make these clear so that agreements take all these into consideration and make provisions in advance of how they will be handled. The approach should not be contestations between the parties but rather trying to understand why these differences still exist.

# b) UNDP's Role as a Development Partner

The evaluation established that National Treasury is clear on what a donor agency is. They also understand the relationship between donors and the government as well as the working modalities which have been agreed to by both sides. Further, the definition and working modalities of a Service Provider are also clear. However, there is no clear or shared common understanding nor agreement on what a "Development Partner" in South Africa is especially where the partner is an international organisation that uses South African financial resources to provide technical and other services. The modus operandi of such an entity is neither understood nor do any agreed accountability systems exist. The issues that need to be resolved are primarily about the use of national financial resources by an international organisation. According to National Treasury, UNDP/UN have only come to them when departments are not able to meet their agreements/obligations which have been made/entered into without National Treasury participation and agreement. These agreements do not comply with National Treasury accountability demands and needs even though "cost sharing" agreements exist. The examples of Limpopo and KZN provinces and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) case were used to illustrate this problem. It is therefore critical that a "development partner" in the South African context is clearly defined and the relationships and modus operandi agreed to by all relevant parties to enable the development partner to provide a service using South African government financial resources and within legally agreed to accountability arrangements. The evaluation understands that the issues of financial resources and accountability systems are at the centre of this misunderstanding. The parties need to understand why there is no common or shared understanding on such an issue.

The UN has defined its role in South Africa as a development partner as quite distinct from a donor. The lack of a shared common understanding of what this means in the context of South Africa may have created mixed expectations from sides. The UN has articulated its role as a development partner in the following way:

- Impartiality allows the UN to operate as a trusted and honest broker on some of the most sensitive issues in development.
- Catalytic seed funding available to the UN from its own resources allows it to shed light on often neglected areas of development and which can attract far larger volumes of development finance from donors (bilateral, multilateral and the private sector).
- As a custodian of global normative agendas it can best work with national governments to translate these normative agendas to national agendas.
- Access to global knowledge, resources, expertise and best practices to support national development activities.
- Risk taking posture which allows the UN to take development risks that governments and other partners are either unwilling or un able to take given rigorous funding considerations.
- Transparent fiduciary practices that meet the highest levels on international accountability standards.

# c) Government Decentralisation

The evaluation has established that there is also a need to explain the system of Government in the context of decentralisation and for UNDP to understand this system and take it into consideration when making agreements and supporting government and the people of South Africa. There is autonomy within the provinces; political influences are strong, ethnic profiles matter. The evaluation has established that there is also a lack of expertise and knowledge predominantly at the lower levels of government where it is needed most. All these impact implementation and delivery of services. The link between Integrated Development Plans and the allocation of resources to the provinces must be understood by UNDP if it is to locate its support strategically as all these dynamics impact the partnerships. Additionally, the government departments need to understand the limitations of UNDP as an international organisation and strategically utilise that relationship

# d) Global Expertise, Knowledge and Information Hubs

UNDP has defined its comparative advantage as being its ability to bring global expertise, global knowledge and the existence of information hubs which South Africa can tap into. UNDP has demonstrated this in some of its programmes and projects and South Africa has been able to tap into some of these knowledge hubs. According to National Treasury the existence of this comparative advantage is not always obvious to those who need it most in South Africa. The accessibility of such expertise and information is not always demonstrable at the national, provincial and municipal levels. The information from KZN provided by the trainees also confirmed this to be true. The evaluation concludes that UNDP needs to demonstrate that such expertise, knowledge and information hubs are accessible to the different levels of government in South Africa by putting in place structures and systems that can effectively and efficiently respond to demand.

# e) Alignment to National Priorities

Based on the evidence gathered from DPME, KZN and some Government stakeholders the evaluation concludes that there is a divergence between ordinary South African people's needs and priorities and those expressed in the NDP due to its consultative process not fully involving the public at this level. The partners also agreed that the NDP was not informed by local people's needs as no consultations were carried out at this level and hence does not necessarily address needs and priorities at grassroot levels. People's needs are basic, while government looks at the larger issues which dovetail to global priorities that the NDP is aligned to despite these not being the people's basic needs. The government priorities are closer to the UN Global International priorities such as SDGs and are aligned to them. There is a need to involve people and use their needs as the basis for national planning and ensure that the local priorities dovetail to provincial and national plans and goals. If national priorities meet people's basic needs, then UN/Global priorities will also begin to address people's basic needs in South Africa. UNDP has a unique advantage in helping the government to better marry local people's needs with the larger issues given its exposure and experience to situations in other Middle Income Countries.

Given this diagnosis what can the UNDP contribute to which will create traction between government, the UN and the people? UNDP needs to address this issue urgently if its support is to produce desired results.

#### Lessons

- a) There is a need for long-term planning that informs the future. The evaluation established that UNDP and the government need to understand each other as a way of building understanding and addressing these critical issues.
- b) If UNDP's CPD priorities, which are informed by the government NDP and MTSF, are not fully aligned with those of ordinary people their combined efforts will not meet the basic needs of those they seek to serve. What is needed is to find viable working relationships that make it possible for lasting relevant working arrangements that have a direct impact on ordinary people.
- c) Unless that global knowledge, expertise and experience is translated to meet local needs and hence be accessible, useful and usable in solving and addressing South African needs and priorities at all levels as seen by the people, that knowledge will remain a panacea. If this global expertise and knowledge finds traction with South Africa's priorities at all levels then it will indeed become of value.
- d) There is a need to improve government coordination by being involved in global policy dialogue and making sure it addresses the needs of people at all levels. Further, it has been learned that the language of implementation must be different from the global planning language if it is to address the priorities of ordinary South Africans. There is a need to understand the importance of new tools, new nuances, new language and new concepts that address the needs of South Africa as an upper middle income country.
- e) Both the government and UNDP need to understand that while there is currently alignment between the global, regional and national priorities and agendas this

does not necessarily meet local needs. A clear causality relationship needs to be developed that ensures that the SADC, AU and the global approaches also respond to and meet local needs. Unless UNDP localises the global issues and respond to local needs and issues, this wealth of knowledge and experience will not translate into any value locally.

#### Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations

#### **Finding**

1

There is agreement from both UNDP/UN and the South African government that there is a general lack of clarity and consensus from the government on what a Development Partner is as defined by UNDP. This is still so regardless of all the current efforts to create a common understanding.

The difference between "donor" and "development partner" is not fully appreciated by the government, especially in situations where UNDP utilises South African government financial resources to provide support and services to South Africa. In the view of National Treasury, the so-called "development partner" could be a service provider or a consultant who provides technical expertise.

#### Recommendation

It is recommended that UNDP takes the responsibility and make sure that there is clarity and a common understanding on what a development partner is as compared to a donor, consultant or service provider.

- UNDP, in line with the UN definition, needs to clarify what a Development Partner is and does in the South African context and in the context of the UNDP mandate.
- The UNDP should also address what a Development Partner does in South Africa as compared to a donor or an implementing agency or consultant that provides specialised technical support to government so that it can get full buy in from Government.
- The UNDP should demonstrate its comparative advantage.
- UNDP and the Government of South Africa must reach an agreement and а common understanding on the definition of a Development Partner and work out the modus operandi of such a partnership when the partner uses financial resources from the government to provide support and services to the people of South Africa. If agreed to then the parties must agree on what kind of an agreement is needed between the government and UNDP.

The evaluation has established that Global and Continental agendas are important in South Africa's planning and development efforts.

The South African government has worked hard to align its national development agenda to these global agendas such as previous MDGs and current SDGs. However, the evaluation has established that this alignment has not necessarily resolved the grass root development needs and challenges of South Africa.

While it is important for UNDP to work upstream at the policy level, UNDP needs to find how it can support the South African government to translate these global and continental agendas and priorities to also respond and meet the needs and priorities of local people.

UNDP is strategically placed to assist the government to improve service delivery if it helps the government to translate those

# **Finding**

The disconnect between the NDP priorities and development priorities at the grass root level are because the NDP and the MTSF are not necessarily informed by grassroot people's priority needs. Therefore, UNDP's support in South Africa, which is aligned to these global and continental priorities and agendas, does not necessarily address the basic needs of ordinary people.

UNDP clearly articulates in the CPD and other documents that its comparative advantage is global experience, expertise and global knowledge and the existence of *Knowledge Hubs* that can be of value to South Africa.

The discussions about UNDP's comparative advantage are taking place at the government headquarters and UNDP Country Office level with limited provincial exposure to these issues and this information. The evaluation established that technical people at the provincial and municipal levels do not know about these knowledge hubs nor do they have access to them. These technical people and officials are the ones who need this information, knowledge and global expertise more so that they can use them in meeting development needs of the people at these levels. Currently, the technical staff return money to National Treasury at the end of the year because they are not able to deliver services to the people due to lack of relevant expertise, knowledge and information as was demonstrated in KZN.

Issues of corruption also negatively impact on delivery of services. How can UNDP make sure that these levels and entities that are responsible for delivering services to the people can tap into these international knowledge hubs and expertise and can be capacitated by these international experts so that they can deliver better? This issue was raised repeatedly during the training of KZN senior managers.

The evaluation established that currently, the National Treasury Department has no clarity nor agreement on what "Cost Sharing Agreement" between the government departments and UNDP means. Thus, there is presently no consensus between UNDP and National Treasury on what this means, how the relationship should work or be managed and what accountability systems are needed for this relationship. According to National Treasury UNDP enters into cost sharing agreements with individual departments without its involvement and this has caused problems as these

Recommendation

agendas and contextualise them to meet local basic needs and hence improve service delivery by making sure that the government itself can respond better at these levels. UNDP support to the government would then be more strategic because it will respond to both the global and the local priorities. The GEF Small Grants projects and CPSI are good examples of where UNDP support has found traction with national and local needs.

If this global expertise and knowledge is to be of benefit to South Africa, UNDP, working with the partners, needs to create conditions, structures and systems that enable the national, provincial and municipal government to access these international experts, global knowledge hubs and experience that UNDP has.

There is a need for UNDP to consider using the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) as a vehicle for reaching these levels. UNDP can, and should, organise workshops with SALGA to open channels for these levels to access information and support from UNDP's international sources of expertise, knowledge and information (UNDP's comparative advantage). Above all UNDP, guided by the government, must identify the critical expertise needed by South Africa and then provide that expertise as part of capacity development and hence demonstrate that comparative advantage.

UNDP and National Treasury need to reach consensus on what Cost Sharing arrangements between Government and UNDP mean. This should address the National Treasury requirements in terms of accountability for government funds but also factor UNDP requirements and constraints. This clarity and agreement are necessary to resolve the outstanding issues and bottlenecks that are currently being experienced when UNDP gets into agreements with government departments.

4

#### **Finding**

5

#### Recommendation

agreements do not meet treasury accountability requirements. UNDP cannot use a "One Size Fits All" approach when partnering with developing and upper middle income countries. The use of rigid templates (One Size Fits All) imposed by HQ makes it impossible for the CO to develop appropriate relationships and systems that respond to the needs of the country and the people of South Africa.

South Africa has many priorities, needs and challenges at the national, provincial, municipal and local levels. The evaluation has established that UNDP is thinly spread; trying to do too many things with very limited human and financial resources. UNDP cannot support all these levels with this limited capacity and few resources. While UNDP's up-stream policy support work is commendable it does not necessarily impact the poor in the short term.

UNDP needs to be more strategic and work out what technical expertise is needed by South Africa in areas that UNDP can make an impact, as well as at which levels it must work. UNDP should look at its current successes and use that experience to inform future planning. Secondly, UNDP needs to assess the technical expertise, financial resources and the capacity of staff and tailor make its support to the capacity that it has. Further, UNDP should consider bringing on board critical expertise that is needed in South Africa on a long term or consultancy basis to respond to the challenges and needs of South Africa. This will enable the organization to make an impact and create visibility in those areas that it prioritises. It should concentrate on piloting in specific areas and demonstrate its value as it has done with GEF Small Grants and CPSI with a view enabling the government to up-scale those successes.

The evaluation has established that the ROA reporting system is viewed by many of the UNDP staff and partners as an over centralised reporting system/template that does not allow for real life or unique CO experiences to be shared or reported on. It predominantly serves the purpose, interests and needs of UNDP HQ and does not meet the needs of the Country Office or those of partners. The template is too HQ driven and is not informed by the field experiences. Currently, different reports are needed to meet the needs of partners; a situation that creates a burden by requiring a double reporting system on an already over-burdened small staff.

Given these constraints it is recommended that UNDP HQ and the CO discuss this and find a simplified but effective monitoring and reporting system which meets the needs of all parties (UNDP HQ, partners, and CO). The CO should begin to put down on paper what such a monitoring and reporting system should look like.

The evaluation concludes that CPD currently does not have an effective monitoring and reporting system that meets the needs of the CO, partners and UNDP HQ. This is because it currently uses the templates designed by HQ. As a result, there is no substantive institutionalised monitoring and reporting system in place to produce reports for the benefit of all stakeholders. The current ROA is not and cannot be a report to be shared with stakeholders or used for CO management and decision making.

There is a need to develop a monitoring and reporting framework based on the Results Framework that can be used for management purposes at the country office level which also produces information that meets the needs of partners. The implementation plan and regular reporting would also meet the needs of other stakeholders/partners like the National Treasury and others.

The current CPD 2013 - 2017 has been extended by 15 months to early 2019. This

Given the extension of the current CPD to 2019 it is recommended that UNDP

R

Finding	Recommendatio

means that there is more time for the implementation of the current CPD but also to align the UNDP planning cycle with that of the government.

develops an Implementation Plan and a Monitoring and Reporting Framework for the balance of the extended CPD. This will enable UNDP to monitor and report on implementation progress. This will also assist UNDP to use this period as a testing and learning opportunity for the next CPD but also enable it to put into effect some of the changes.

The evaluation has established that, while programme implementation and the UNDP's effectiveness are working well, these are impacted by a number challenges such as the issue of VAT, delays with recruitment of staff and UNDP finance templates which do not always respond to real life challenges on the ground. These challenges are elaborated on in the report.

It is recommended that the UNDP CO commissions a study of all the administrative and relationship issues that are highlighted in the evaluation report. The study should do a causes analysis and make concrete suggestions and solutions of how the UNDP CO can minimise these challenges which undermine the CO to deliver efficiently and effectively.

#### **Proposed Recommendation on Coordination**

#### **Finding**

9

The 2008 United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation recommended that coordination between the United Nations System and the Government of South Africa should be improved. The SCF assigned DIRCO to propose a coordination structure for the Government and the UN. DIRCO has taken the view that there is not much value that can be derived from an "all government" to an "all UN" coordinating mechanism preferring that coordination between the Government and the UN be left at a more technical and direct bilateral basis. Technical bilateral coordination is what is taking place under the current SCF. The absence of an overarching coordinating mechanism has meant that overall progress reporting and monitoring of the UN efforts in the country are not adequately recognized. While National Treasury plays a lead role in coordinating official development assistance (ODA) to the country, the relatively limited ODA as a percentage of the National budget, and even lesser extent of that channelled through the UN system in South Africa, has created mixed expectations from both sides. UN has positioned itself as a development partner and not a donor while National Treasury priority is placed on tracking financial contribution with those providing larger volumes receiving greater attention.

#### Recommendation

The evaluation therefore recommends that in the light of the above, consideration be given to Government to anchor the primary coordination function between the Government and the UN to the DPME which is mandated to coordinate efforts to implement, monitor and evaluate the NDP. As all UN efforts in South Africa are anchored on the support to NDP, vesting that coordination function within the DPME would ensure clear alignment and regular monitoring of UN support in this regard. DIRCO and National Treasury would continue to play key roles as members of the UN/Government Steering Committee under the overall lead of PDME. It is further

suggested that terms of reference (TORs) for such a steering committee be developed and agreed to among the parties.

#### **Conclusions**

The evaluation concludes that UNDP is a valuable partner of government and government departments in South Africa. The value of its contribution is acknowledged by most as reflected in the achievements section of this summary and in the body of the report. Both its contribution to the up-stream policy work and some of the downstream work in Limpopo and KZN provinces are noted. Other provinces in which UNDP has pronounced impact include the Eastern Cape (GEF Projects, in 2015 and 2016 there are four GEF projects (Wild Coast, Grasslands, protected areas and mainstreaming biodiversity and Mpumalanga where there are two active GEF projects (mainstreaming Biodiversity and Protected Areas).

The evaluation has shown that several challenges also impact UNDP's ability to deliver more effectively and efficiently. Most of these challenges are related to relationships with some partners and issues of coordination between UNDP and the government but also among government departments. The recommendations address many of these challenges. It is concluded that if these are addressed UNDP'S contribution will be much greater. The important thing is for UNDP to keep innovating and remain open to learning as well as take opportunities to capacitate different levels of government.

# 1 Background

Since the beginning of democracy in 1994, South Africa has made significant strides in promoting democratic governance, economic growth and social development. It has established a solid foundation for democratic governance with one of the most progressive constitutions in the world, and it has an active and highly dynamic civil society. Despite the laudable efforts, poverty and unemployment, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, institutional and human resources capacity development, and social and physical infrastructural development continue to pose a major challenge to the country. In fact, the key challenge has been to reduce inequality in all forms of its manifestation. In order to achieve this goal various innovative policies, strategies, and programs have been formulated by government and are under implementation. Additionally, new institutions have been set up while existing ones have been recalibrated and strengthened.

UNDP has developed its 2013 – 2017 Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) within the context of the key national development policy documents, including the National Development Plan: Vision for 2030; the Medium-Term Strategic Framework 2009-2014 and the New Growth Path. The CPD and CPAP are also developed in response to the recommendations of the 2008 United Nations Joint Evaluation Report on the UN in South Africa, the Partnership Framework Agreement between UNDP and the Government of South Africa. Consultations with a broad range of stakeholders including government departments, research institutes, civil society and national non-governmental organisations have also informed the programme.

The UNDP country programme is also firmly anchored in the UN Strategic Cooperation Framework (SCF) 2013-2017 which is also responsive to the key national development policy documents. The SCF over-arching aim is to consolidate the UN response to the national development priorities and outcomes through four main priority areas: (i) Inclusive growth and decent work; (ii) environmentally sustainable development; (iii) Enhancing human capabilities; and (iv) governance and participation.

The CPD has four programme priorities:

- Inclusive Growth
- Climate Change and Greening South Africa's Economy
- Service Delivery and Democratic Governance
- South Africa's Regional and Global Role

# CPD Budget:

- Planned (2013 2017): US\$ 51,797 900
- Mobilised at Dec 2016: US\$ 33, 293, 497
- Shortfall at Dec 2016: US\$ 18,504, 403
- Pipeline Additional (2017): US\$ 15, 326,000
- Shortfall Anticipated (2017): US\$ 3,178,403

When preparing this CPD, UNDP had learnt many lessons during its previous corporation efforts with the Government of South Africa which informed the current CPD. The lessons learnt sent one single message: "UNDP needs to meet the demands of a sophisticated policy environment where partners expect to gain access to the best possible advice available globally as well as skills required for innovation in partnerships and financial mobilisation, not least involving other emerging economies".

According to the DPME, the situation in South Africa is more complex and hence even these lessons are not adequate for UNDP to properly support the country. The challenges that are often not acknowledged are that the United Nations' priorities are based on global issues and priorities (SDGs and previous MDGs). The South African Government has national priorities that are outlined in the CPD. According to DPME these are at a very high level and are aligned to global issues such as the SDGs. Ordinary South Africans, however, have different priorities based on their basic needs. These are also different from those emphasized by both the National Development Plan and the UN.

According to DPME this is because the consultative process during the development of the NDP did not include ordinary citizens. This creates a disconnect between the grassroot people's priority needs and expectations and those of the Government. By implication the UNDP CPD, which is aligned to the NDP, then also does not directly address those ordinary people's needs. The DPME insisted that this is a lesson the South African Government should learn and take into account going forward.

Secondly, South Africa is characterised by two worlds; a developed formal economy that supports a few and an underdeveloped informal economy that supports the majority, who are poor. South Africa is an Upper Middle-Income Country in the middle of underdevelopment and extreme poverty. It is a recipient of modest ODA but it is also a donor to others. The challenges of development and the possible support that UNDP can provide must be understood in this context. It will be seen how this has impacted service delivery to the majority and how this impacts UNDP support to South Africa. As can be seen UNDP responding to the demands of a sophisticated policy environment alone does not meet the needs of the poor majority. The DPME clearly said that this is not a criticism of UNDP current support to South Africa but it is an issue that needs to be addressed going forward in order to increase traction with the needs of the poor.

#### 1.1 Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to examine and establish if and what the planned results of the 2013 – 2017 CPD have been achieved. The evaluation also endeavours to establish if the design of the CPD responds to the needs of South Africa given the complexity of the duality of an upper middle-income country and poverty and underdevelopment. It is also to establish the conditions these results have been achieved. Further, the evaluation has endeavoured to establish which results have not been achieved and why. The evaluation endeavoured to establish if the planned financial, human and material resources were made available in a timely manner to enable UNDP to deliver as expected.

The assessment of what is working and under what conditions as well as what is not working and why are implicit in this Independent Evaluation. The evaluation has also assessed the challenges and constraints that have impacted the delivery of the planned CPD results. Further, the purpose of this evaluation is to draw lessons from both the appropriateness of the CPD design, achievement and non-achievement of planned results with the view of providing lessons to inform the future as well as to take corrective action where necessary. Further, the purpose of this evaluation is to identify opportunities and develop innovative models that can be utilised to improve UNDP's support to South Africa as well as promote better coordination between UNDP and the Government of South Africa for the benefit of the people of South Africa. Finally, the evaluation sought to establish if and how UNDP's work in South Africa contributes to the broader efforts of the United Nations Strategic Corporation Framework. The evaluation also seeks to provide an input into the future CPD.

# 1.2 Scope of UNDP CPD Evaluation

According to the TORs of the CPD the scope of the evaluation will include assessing the mid-term results of four programme components and hence covered the following:

- i) A comprehensive assessment of the progress made towards the achievement of planned CPD results and the contribution of these results to UNSCF achievement. The UNDP evaluation specifically assesses key results and UNDP's contribution to UNSCF, upstream and downstream national policy interventions and how these respond to South Africa's needs and priorities;
- ii) The exercise evaluated UNDP's specific CPD key results and activities nationally and in the provinces where appropriate. The evaluation was undertaken in accordance with UNDP requirements and also assessed the relevance of UNDP's support in meeting the development challenges of South Africa:
- iii) It assessed the timely availability and utilisation of resources by UNDP to achieve planned key results. It also assessed if and how UNDP utilised the cost sharing innovative approach as a way of providing the much-needed technical capacity;
- iv) It assessed the extent to which HIV, Gender and Human Rights are mainstreamed in the CPD and how UNDP and the UN supported the government in meeting the needs of the country;
- v) The UNDP evaluation was participatory and sought to get the views and experiences of those who were involved in the implementation and management of the projects;
- vi) It assessed the performance and value of the partnership in the implementation of the CPD. It also sought the views of partners about the value of the support as well as the constraints and challenges experienced that impacted delivery;
- vii) It documented the lessons learned from this cooperation with the UN agencies and the Government to inform future cooperation;

- viii) The evaluation tried to ascertain whether UNDP's partnership and approach have been appropriate and effective in responding to/addressing the needs and priorities of South Africa;
- ix) The evaluation provides findings, recommendations and lessons learned from the implementation of the CPD. The lessons are intended to inform UNDP's future and work in South Africa.

# 1.3 Methodology

The following methodology was developed and used for this evaluation. The UNEG-DAC evaluation criteria was used in developing the major questions for the evaluation. The criteria were used with the understanding that issues of impact and sustainability cannot be measured at this point but indications of impacts and sustainability can be assessed. Other more specific questions were also developed to capture more specific information from key informants. The framework was used to create a series of templates to summarize and analyse information from the following sources:

- Documents including the UNDAF, CPD and CPAP documents, NDP, MTSF, monitoring, evaluation and progress reports, and other relevant reports.
- Developed and used evaluation instruments semi-structured interview questionnaires for key informants. Key informants included UNDP staff, UNDP partners including DIRCO, DPME, Department of Environmental Affairs, OR Tambo Foundation, New Faces New Voices, GEF staff including Small Grants.
- Guidelines for structured focus group discussions. Focus group discussions
  were particularly suitable and useful for some partners and beneficiaries.
  However, this tool was not extensively used because the expected on-site
  visits were not possible. This evaluator was only able to use these in KZN
  during the RBM, M&E training and in a few partnership group meetings.
- On-Site field visits were not undertaken much as they had been planned due to time, financial and logistical issues (see challenges section).
- The evaluation approach was participatory and intended that there was full participation of all stakeholders from the outset and hence guaranteeing ownership of both the evaluation process and products by all stakeholders. However, challenges were experienced as some stakeholders and key informants were not available during the data collection exercise. Those stakeholders who were available did participate as planned.

#### 1.4 Evaluation Criteria

- **Relevance**: Was the CPD the relevant/appropriate solution for the identified problems, priorities and/or needs of South Africa. Did the programme address the identified priorities identified in the NDP, MTSF and the UNSCF?
- Effectiveness: the extent to which the programme is achieving its desired or planned results (outputs, outcomes and impacts) as reflected in the CPD and CPAP. Has the programme and the initiatives put in place by Government and UNDP been effective in reducing disparities, increasing prosperity and

- sustainable development in South Africa? Does the programme have effective monitoring and reporting mechanisms in place to measure progress towards the achievement of results?
- Efficiency: Have inputs been utilised or transformed into planned activities leading to the achievement of planned outputs and outcomes in the most optimal or cost efficient way. Could the same results be produced by utilising fewer resources?
- **Impact**: The evaluation assessed if the programme and UNDP support produced planned positive changes that have the potential to bring about long term changes? It also examined if, so far, the programme has produced unplanned negative changes?
- Sustainability: Is the implementation of the CPD and the support of UNDP in South Africa creating conditions that will ensure that benefits continue beyond the life of the programme? Is there evidence that ownership is being promoted for those who benefit from the programme and will the government of South Africa continue using what has been started beyond the life of this cooperation with UNDP? Was sustainability built into the programme? Is the programme strengthening the capacity of the Government of South Africa and other partners in financial management and Human Resources?

#### 1.5 Limitations and Challenges Impacting the Evaluation

- a) Evaluation Timing: The major challenge that impacted this evaluation was its timing as it coincided with the end of the year 2016 and the beginning of 2017. Most stakeholders were not available during this period, which led to delays in data collection and hence impacted on the delivery time. It was also clear that some stakeholders did not treat this evaluation as a priority. Some planned field visits were cancelled due to the same reasons and hence the physical verification of achievement of deliverables was not possible in many cases. The absence of primary data from the field was a major constraint to this evaluation. The planned visits and interviews in KZN did not take place as the key informants were not available. Planned interviews with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform were not possible and even the follow up questionnaires did not provide the needed primary data. While the time lines for data collection process were extended three times some key informants were still not available.
- b) CPD 15 Months Extension: The evaluation was also impacted by the extension of the CPD by 15 months, to 2018. This will necessitate an update of this evaluation report in 2018 to take stock of the achievements that will have been accomplished during the extension period. The update will also be necessary to inform the new CPD but also align the CPD with the Government planning cycle.
- c) Resources: As reflected in the document, UNDP had a shortfall on their budget and this impacted delivery. While UNDP entered into cost sharing arrangements as part of its strategy to fund raise there were problems with implementing this given National Treasury's accountability needs. The partner

departments were keen but the lack of agreed contracts and *modus operandi* negatively impacted this facility. The valuation then could not effectively assess achievement because some of the planned activities were not done because of this challenge.

- d) Disconnect: UNDP fully aligned its CPD to the NDP and MTSF, which outlined national priorities but which were also aligned to global priorities. When the NDP was developed, there was extensive national consultation with national and provincial stakeholders and government officials. However, the consultations did not include local/grassroot people and hence the NDP is not fully informed by the needs and priorities of ordinary citizens. Therefore, to a certain extent there is a disconnect between local people's needs and priorities and those of the NDP. Since the CPD is fully aligned to the NPD relevance of its delivery at this level is also impacted.
- e) Analytical Tools: The evaluation had designed analytical tools during the inception period with the view of undertaking an in-depth analysis using these tools. However, these tools were not fully utilised because most of the data collected was at the level of completed activities and outputs at best and did not include most outcomes. Some of the expected evidence was not collected because some key informants were not interviewed and the on-site field visits were not done due to resources and time constraints. The evaluation depended to a large extent on secondary data. Even some of the progress reports did not have adequate information at the outcome level.

# 1.6 Opportunities

The extension of the CPD can also be viewed as an opportunity since it will provide UNDP with an opportunity to align its next CPD with the government planning cycle. Further, this gives UNDP more time to adjust the balance of the CPD, implement the programme and implement some of the recommendations before the start of the new CPD. The identified problems/challenges especially on relationships between UNDP and some stakeholders can be resolved during the extension period. Further, some government stakeholders did not have a clear/common understanding of what a "development partner" is as it relates to UNDP support in South Africa. UNDP has an opportunity to clarify what a development partner is, work this out with the government stakeholders and establish an implementation modality in support of this relationship. This will enable UNDP to be in a much better position by the start of the new CPD.

# 2 Analysis and Findings

The analysis approach that was adopted ensured that data obtained from all sources, including secondary data from documents, key information interviews, focus group discussions and comments made by interviewed stakeholders were triangulated so as to increase the validity and credibility of findings and hence guaranteed accuracy. Data analytical tools were developed as part of this analysis process. Triangulation and validation discussions reinforced the credibility and independence of the evaluation process and products. Further, feedback and comments provided to the initial draft reports were taken into consideration and where relevant incorporated into the final document.

# 2.1 CPD Design

To clearly show the value of UNDP support in South Africa and how this cooperation responds to the needs and priorities of the people of South Africa, the evaluation wanted to establish the following:

- 1. What is the nature of UNDP's up Stream Policy Advice? What are examples of up-stream policy advice provided by UNDP to South Africa and how do these address the needs of the country? Is the CPD a relevant response to the identified problems and is upstream policy advice a relevant response to the identified needs and problems?
  - The evaluation established that UNDP's work up-stream approach was relevant to and responded to some of the priorities as outlined in the NDP. The major areas were policy support and research which culminated in the development of legislation and policies. UNDP provided up-stream policy advice to the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform on shortening the dispute resolution process on land claims. In 2015/16 617 land claims were settled and 30,268 ha. of land were transferred to 63,407 beneficiaries following UNDP advice.
- 2. How has the government and the people of South Africa benefited from this upstream support from the UNDP? The evaluation also established that women, youth and some provincial managers in KZN had benefited from UNDP support. The GEF Small Grants projects have also benefitted many local people as did the UN volunteers' doctors programme in Limpopo. The programme recruited and placed 40 UN volunteers against a target of 120. This was only 48% of the planned target. Notwithstanding, the services provided were greatly appreciated by the local people. According to the Final Evaluation, the programme was relevant as it directly responded to the needs of the department and is aligned to the health priorities identified in the NDP Outcome 2. Many patients benefited from the services of volunteer doctors who worked over and above expected hours. The programme also transferred skills through training which were found to be beneficial to the provision of health services in the province. The terminal evaluation concludes that the programme was efficient and effective in the use of resources (human, financial and material). In that sense, UNDP support did respond to the up-stream as well as some down-stream needs of the people of South Africa.
- 3. The evaluation wanted to establish examples of National Turn- Around Strategy for Local Government to improve policy implementation, oversight and accountability.
  - Again, the evaluation established that UNDP contributed to this as discussed in the report.
- 4. How has UNDP met or currently meets demand of a sophisticated policy a) Access to best policy advice available globally (examples)? b) Skills required for innovation (examples of where this has been done)?
  - The evaluation concluded that UNDP had positioned itself and met some of the demands especially in areas of policy advice and in engaging government through the O.R. Tambo debates and others in engaging debates to improve

- the implementation of the NDP. The CPSI innovations were also found to meet the needs of South Africa but were also of benefit to SADC.
- 5. The evaluation sought to establish how UNDP's limited technical staff and budget were utilised and deployed in response to South Africa's needs. The evaluation established that UNDP has limited staff and financial resources. The National Treasury and DPME made observations about the limited technical staff at UNDP and hence the organization relies on programme managers to provide technical support or the use of consultants. UNDP had deployed these limited resources well and was able to support and contribute to the development of South Africa. However, the government stakeholders observed that UNDP would be able to do and archive more if it had dedicated technical staff in key areas.
- 6. How has the programme/UNDP support strengthened the capacities of the poor, especially women and youth, through training to access productive assets?
  - This report demonstrates that UNDP has contributed to capacity development, especially for women, through the SMMEs initiatives. Some of the GEF Small Grants projects have also provided women with opportunities to develop their skills and participate in projects that address the needs of the poor.

# 2.2 Findings

This section summarises the major findings based on each of the Programme Components. The findings are based on evidence obtained from availed secondary sources and primary sources and outline what has been achieved and what has not been achieved against the planned results. In certain instances, it will be observed that there were differences between the UNDP perspectives and stakeholders' views or understanding of certain issues. The evaluation maintained an objective and independent approach to these positions. But, because some key informants were not available, some critical information was not obtained. This led to certain evidence gaps and a possible bias due to limited sources, especially on primary data. The absence of primary data in certain instances also impacted verification and triangulation.

#### 2.2.1 Programme Component 1: Inclusive Growth

**Output 1:** Enhanced Social Protection Framework. UNDP will support institutional strengthening and capacity development (including e-skills).

As a response to this output research was commissioned by UNDP to investigate policy options for extending social protection to informal workers. However, this has not gone further due to lack of funding. A first national policy dialogue on social protection was held. This was followed by a roundtable discussion involving all relevant stakeholders (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA) to discuss funding. Further, UNDP commissioned an inequality study and the report was disseminated to the stakeholders. While UNDP had committed to assist in data basis integration government was not able to provide funding and hence this effort did not go ahead.

There is a general lack of clarity and common understanding on what cost sharing means, its modus operandi even with the existence of a signed agreement on how the government is meant to contribute to these activities. It is not clear why UNDP went ahead with these initiatives before funding had been confirmed but above all before there was clear agreement and commitment to the "cost sharing" approach. Discussions with National Treasury revealed that there is no common understanding nor agreement on what this should be. According to National Treasury, where government funds are involved agreements cannot be reached and signed between Departments and UNDP without the guidance, agreement and involvement of National Treasury. This is an area that requires further discussion and agreements before this funding mechanism can be implemented. UNDP provided a CPAP signed by National Treasury; Part IV to Part IX which outline engagement modality with National Treasury, programme management with government, monitoring and evaluation of CPD and the commitment by both UNDP and Government. The evaluation was not able to establish why the partnership modality has not been fully utilised as some of this evidence is contested by the parties. Given the views expressed by National Treasury regarding UNDP signing cost sharing agreements with departments without the involvement of National Treasury, this suggests that there is no common understanding between UNDP and National Treasury on this issue even if a signed agreement exists. The evaluation concludes that a signed agreement alone is not enough to defuse the current situation.

**Output 2:** Expanded access to employment opportunities: Accelerating growth and transforming the Skills Capacity Development for the youth and women economy to create employment opportunities.

This was to address high levels of unemployment among the youth and women. Indeed, the latest statistics (2016) by Stats SA show that there is still very high unemployment among the youth and women. This output has not been achieved because there are no properly designed Skills Capacity Development programmes. Further, there is no match between the high levels of unemployment and vacant positions because those who are unemployed do not have the requisite skills that are needed by the market (Stats SA 2016). Accordingly, there are high levels of unemployment and many vacant positions given the mismatch between existing skills and needed skills to fill positions. The same issues were raised by senior managers during RBM, M&E training in KZN (April2017). It is not clear what technical and financial capacity UNDP has in this area to have addressed this issue.

**Output 3:** Competitiveness of SMEs increased through the supplier development programme. UNDP was to develop a project to build capacity of SMMEs.

Some work has been done on making SMMEs more competitive but not enough has been achieved. The UNDP provided technical support to 520 women owned SMMEs integrated into the value chain in the Passenger Rail Service. It was not possible to interview any of the beneficiaries on this project and hence the evaluation cannot make any conclusive judgements about the benefits. 20 specialists were trained on supply development methodology. Again, no interviews were held and no information on how many are using this knowledge and how it is being used. Issues of low business skills

and corruption continue to impact on work being done in this sector. UNDP claims to have the right expertise to provide assistance in this area given the 20 specialists who were trained by UNDP. It was, however, not clear why no information is available on what the trained specialist are doing with the skills. The evaluation recommends that UNDP must look closely at the issue of documentation so that its efforts and support can be timely documented and made available as evidence of its relevant support.

### 2.2.1.1 The Graça Machel Trust: New Faces New Voices

UNDP commissioned the Graça Machel Trust's New Faces New Voices (NFNV) to undertake a study to investigate the barriers that hinder women entrepreneurs from accessing finance. NFNV started working on this project in 2012. The project started with a workshop and issues of difficulties faced by business women in accessing finance were identified.

- According to NFNV, while the study was very comprehensive it took more than two years for any work to be done because UNDP decided to set up an Intergovernmental Steering Committee; a process that took more than two years.
- The study exploring the finance pipeline for women owned Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises (SMMEs) was finally published. The study investigated underlying causes that hinder women from accessing finance despite the array of financial institutions and funding in South Africa. According to NFNV the results of the study were thus overtaken by developments because of the delays that were experienced. The study was only launched in August 2016. By then NFNV had moved on.
- It is not clear how the study is being utilised to address the issues of finding resources for women entrepreneurs because this information was not availed.
- While UN Women was also interested in this study, the internal UN processes took a long time.
- The evaluation was informed by UNDP that UN Women and UNDP have incorporated the findings of the study into some of their projects. UNDP has incorporated the findings of this study into the Supplier Development Programme to promote women entrepreneurs to be included into the value chains of large retail companies. UN Women is looking for ways in which women entrepreneurs can be assisted to bid for government tenders. Given the available information (as at July 2017) no results have been achieved as yet.
- According to NFNV, UNDP has been overtaken by time and events hence the study has taken a life of its own. The urgency has diminished and the opportunity has been lost as needs have changed.
- As stated above the evaluation was not able to determine the results achieved.
   Investing in such projects without follow-up with concrete actions can be viewed as a waste.

#### **Opportunities**

According to the NFNV not all is lost as the UNDP still has opportunities of taking this work forward. The possible follow up actions were suggested as shown below.

- 1. Based on what The UNDP and UN Women are already doing there is a need to put further thoughts on what future cooperation and support could be. This would include what makes sense today and going forward which can still respond to the needs of women entrepreneurs by utilising the information already gathered by the study. If this is pursued the approach must consider the changes that have taken place since the study was completed and possibly update some of that information as well as adapt to the changed situation.
- 2. Using this existing experience and the information UNDP should consider doing a similar study for SADC, based on its South-South Programme.
- 3. The SMMEs policy is very good and resources are being utilised, however there is no monitoring and reporting on the use of resources and what is being achieved. UNDP could provide documentation capacity building, M&E and reporting capacity development to help with accountability for resources and results. Lessons could be documented and used to take this initiative further. Documentation of experiences is still weak and hence lessons are not being documented. Documentation of this is very critical and UNDP should consider investing in this by engaging a researcher to help with this.
- 4. UNDP could help the government in tracking and monitoring by developing Government capacity to enable government to effectively monitor. This is an area where UNDP could provide technical capacity building and make a difference as well as create an impact and visibility.
- 5. What has been done with Women and Rail (PRASA) could be done with other business sectors. Lessons can be drawn from this experience. UNDP and UN Women could work together on this initiative and combine their financial and technical expertise and would be able to achieve much more.

Given its neutrality UNDP can help bring government, private sector and CSOs together to develop a partnership that can translate present policy into action. This is an opportunity that UNDP can take forward without investing a lot of resources.

#### 2.2.1.2 O.R Tambo Debate Series

The South African Government adopted the NDP in 2012. The plan received strong support and endorsement from the broader society (government departments, civil society) but this did not include the ordinary citizens. Government has called on all civil society to own the plan and see to its implementation in different forms. It is in this light that UNDP, the DPME, the Oliver and Adelaide Tambo Foundation (OATF) and the Wits School of Governance collaborated on designing a project to assist the Government in implementing the NDP which includes three mutually reinforcing components:

The *OR Tambo Debate Series* is a policy dialogue platform where a Chapter in the NDP is discussed to identify constraints and bottlenecks to the implementation of the

NDP. This policy dialogue engages a cross-section of South African society in its different formations. Deliberate efforts are being undertaken to exploit South-South Relationships by involving international experts to share their best practices and experiences and hence contribute to the NDP implementation. The debate series has looked at a number of the NDP aspects and has contributed positively to the implementation of the NDP. This is an area where the programme has made a difference in influencing policy development and brought about positive changes as demonstrated by the agreements between government and trade unions on education.

**Roundtable discussions**: This is the second component of the project which involves technical experts who look at the issues raised at the debate series, distil them and make specific recommendations on how to address constraints to the implementation of the NDP. There is evidence that several recommendations have already been or are being implemented.

**Deep dive**: This provides a thorough methodical analysis of a problem through research or a pilot to get information that can be packaged to develop a policy brief and influence policy making. The report proposes a guideline on how the problems are solved using evidence generated during research or a pilot.

# 1. What has been achieved by these debates?

The evaluation wanted to establish the value these debates had on policy change, the implementation of NDP and hence the benefits South Africans can derive from such cooperation between UNDP and these partners. Captured below are some of the highlights of what has been done, achieved and the possible impacts that this cooperation is creating.

The debate or policy dialogue is not a talk-shop. A concept paper usually informs the foundation of the debate to make sure that it is focused. The debates play a critical role in raising society awareness on NDP and their role in implementing the NDP. The project uses social media platforms such as twitter to engage members of the community who are not present at the venue where the event is being held. The debate also provides an opportunity and platform for stakeholders and role players to interact and engage policy makers (politicians) and technocrats (senior government officials) and share views on how to implement the NDP. Usually at either a Minster or a Director General is invited to the debate series to interact with society and other partners. The debate also plays a critical role as an uncensored, unregulated and honest feedback mechanism for policy makers and technocrats to receive up to date information on the impact of NDP on the society. As at Dec 2016 the hashtag #ORTamboDebates# had about 608 posts, 141 users, 445 663 people reached and recorded about 1, 516 357 impressions. At least one international expert participates in the debate to share international experience on the specific topic under discussion.

#### 2. What are their impacts on policies and laws?

As indicated the project is a continuum of activities: debate-roundtable-deep dive.

Policy impacts will happen at the different stages depending on the topic. For example, in the *Capable State Debate*, the Minister of Public Service and Administration indicated that the Public Service Commission is not utilising its constitutionally mandated powers to make sure that public servants conduct themselves and perform appropriately. Based on this remark by the Minister, the Chairperson of the Public Service Commission initiated a meeting with the NDP project to discuss some of the issues raised at the debate and seek recommendations on how things can be improved. Following this there are steps being taken to improve the situation.

The second example is the *Education Debate* which addressed accountability within the public education system. The debate or policy dialogue was attended by both The Minister and The Deputy Minister of Basic Education. One of the issues raised in the policy dialogue were national assessments and their role in improving accountability. The issues of assessment have pitted Government and Trade Unions against each other. After the roundtable discussion, which was hosted and addressed by The Minister of Basic Education, Trade Unions and Government agreed on how to implement national assessments. This demonstrates direct policy shift as the project facilitated the identification of a bottleneck and came up with a solution to address it. The implementation of the national assessment will enable government to identify underperforming schools and assess possible mechanisms to improve performance. This will subsequently lead to the production of good quality students who will easily be absorbed into the labour market therefore reducing youth unemployment.

The third example is the *Social Protection debate/policy dialogue*. One of the suggestions from the social protection debate/policy dialogue was the extension of social protection to informal workers. Partners commissioned a research paper to investigate policy options of extending social protection to informal workers. It was agreed a pilot project is needed to test social protection scheme for informal workers. This again demonstrates how the work of the project is related to the goals of inequality, poverty and unemployment. If government develops a social protection scheme for informal workers it will pull many people out of poverty.

### Impact on Delivery

This project is a policy project. It needs to influence policy in such a way that it will impact grassroots positively. As expected, there is a lag between policy change and impact on the ground. There have already been policy changes in some of the policy areas tackled by the project. However, the impact will only be experienced in the long term. There are clear indications that this project already shows the potential for impacts given the changes that are happening because of the project. There are also clear indications that policies are changing as a result of this cooperation and change is happening.

The UNDP partners on this project alluded to herein above also corroborated the value of these debates in helping ground NDP implementation.

### 2.2.1.3 Challenges

A number of planned and agreed-to projects have been negatively impacted by the challenges experienced during implementation. Below are some of the challenges:

- The uptake and implementation of the results and recommendations of the study on the barriers to women entrepreneurs' access to finance was negatively impacted by the slow establishment of a Steering Committee which delayed the utilisation of the report by two years.
- The issue of non-availability of government funding after projects have been agreed to between UNDP and government departments negatively impacts implementation. The lack of a common understanding on "cost sharing" impacts the implementation of approved and agreed to projects. An example here was the project on "data basis integration" which UNDP was to have done but failed because of lack of funding from government.
- Lack of documentation by UNDP and its partners on skills and capacity development make it difficult to know and account for how this capacity or these skills are being used and how the people are benefiting from these efforts. It is therefore difficult to tell if the investment was worth it.

# 2.2.2 Programme Component 2: Climate Change and Greening South African's Economy

This component targets mitigation and adaptation levers that can have substantial multiplier effects in attaining a low-carbon economy, creating new 'green' products and services and boosting employment. There are three main areas of work:

- Expansion of the knowledge base and capacity for action by assisting key government departments in programming for the Green Economy;
- Scaling-up of tested/proven renewable energy solutions within the framework of the Government's flagship renewable energy solutions Renewable Energy Programme;
- Harnessing South Africa's biodiversity resources to address sustainability whilst creating economic opportunities.

During 2013 – 2017 CPD thirteen GEF projects were programmed, three of which were enabling activities. In total the GEF resources mobilised during this period is US\$ 64,943,109. Of this, US\$ 259, 625,436 was co-finance raised from government partners and non-governmental partners. The thematic spectrum of the projects cover all the areas of the national development priorities and the CPD.

During this time period, five GEF projects were subjected to mandatory Terminal Evaluations by an external assessor. All these projects were evaluated as per GEF guidelines to assess relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact. The evaluations rated one project as moderately satisfactory, two received satisfactory rating and one received a rating of highly satisfactory. Based on these evaluations the projects were found to have performed well.

Project	Rating
Grasslands Project	Highly Satisfactory
Fynbos Fire Project	Satisfactory
Transport 2010 Project	Satisfactory
Orasecom Phase 1	Satisfactory
Wildcoast	Moderately Satisfactory

D-4:---

Table 1: Terminal Project Evaluation Ratings (2013 -2017)

D==:==1

As shown above the UNDP GEF programme in South Africa has many projects which have been evaluated and show that these efforts are beneficial to South Africa's economy and environment. Only a summary of the achievements of the programme are provided here to demonstrate how they contribute to the achievement of the CPD and national priorities of South Africa. The following are some of the examples of what the UNDP GEF projects have contributed towards the CPD results.

# 2.2.2.1 Market Transformation Through Energy Efficiency Standards and Lobbying of Appliances

The goal of this project is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by household appliances using electricity.

- *Outcome 1*: Policy and regulatory framework for S&L programme.
- Outcome 2: Define labelling specifications and MEPS threshold for 12 products considered by DoE and DTI for S&L regulation.
- Outcome 3: Strengthen the capacity of institutions and individuals involved in the S&L programme.

The Mid Term Review (2015) found this programme to:

- Be highly relevant with respect to national priorities;
- Have demonstrated country ownership through co-financing contributions;
- Have strong willingness amongst the industrial sector to comply with new EE regulation;
- Have highly qualified and skilled enabling stakeholders; and
- Have strengthened institutions and individual capacities and facilitated strategic partnerships.

The review also identified some shortcomings that impacted this project:

- Delays associated with the impasse regarding cash disbursement modality significantly impacted project effectiveness;
- Inconsistent project governance (PSC) convened irregularly and inconsistency in following up on agreed recommendations;
- Unclear management arrangements and understaffed PMU. The project was run under National Implementation Modality. Reporting lines and responsibilities between PMU and executing agency (DoE) are not clear;
- Unsatisfactory delivery Project signed in September 2011, project manager appointed 2 years later and project inception July 2013.

# 2.2.2.2 Reducing Disaster Risks from Wildlands Fire Hazards Associated with Climate Change in South Africa

The project addressed the need to reduce the incremental environmental and socioeconomic impacts of wildland fires that are expected to accelerate due to climate change in the Fynbos Biome of South Africa. According to the evaluation the project achieved the following:

- Strengthened the capacity of people and institutions in the Biome to implement effective and proactive integrated management system to reduce hazardous fires;
- Moved away from a reactive to a proactive approach to dealing with fire hazards;
- Strengthened the information and decision making support system which has laid the technological foundation for project impact;
- Government's investment commitment in integrated natural resources management including wildlands management provides a strong incentive to the project stakeholders to design and implement a sustainable strategy;
- Responded to the national identified and government endorsed supported strategy;
- Put fire associations at the centre of its strategy to transition from a reactive to proactive approach;
- Provided scientific, technical and technological support to research and approaches to understanding fire behaviour;
- Has not developed a meaningful presence in the Eastern Cape.

### 2.2.2.3 ORASECOM

The project was about the development and adoption of a Strategic Action Programme for balancing water use and sustainable natural resources management in the Orange Senqu River transboundary basin. The evaluation concluded that the project had delivered quality products and has engendered strong ownership in many stakeholders' levels, from village communities to senior political figures.

- Outcome 1: Project is relevant to the needs of the country and was well thought out. Outcome one progress has been made on strengthening of ORASECOM products on Water Information System Stream assessment Scoring System and general website development and maintenance;
- Outcome 2: Completion of the Transboundary High Quality Diagnostic Analysis;
- Outcome 3: Preparation of Strategic Action Programme good level stakeholder involvement and cross-sectional input to NAPs and SAP;
- Outcome 4: Basin Wide Stakeholder Involvement valuable good awareness involvement materials were developed by the project;

• Outcome 5: Demonstration project- some excellent practices and activities which delivered on the ground changes and lessons which are replicable. There is also high-level support and ownership from communities and government.

# Challenges

- Projects on energy, water and waste management are not included as priorities and hence the failure of the energy efficiency project. There is very little that the staff can do.
- There are challenges with recruiting project staff because of the PPC process, which is cumbersome and this impacts on programme implementation.
- Co-financing is not fully understood nor accepted by National Treasury and in certain cases by the implementing departments. Subsequently resources are not always available when needed. This greatly impacts on implementation and the achievement of planned results. There is a need for clarity on what cofinancing means and the *modus operandi* of this agreement. This issue has also been raised by National Treasury as a major issue as relates to other projects (see main recommendations).
- GEF procedures are not clear to implementing partners and hence increase the gestation period for the projects.

### Recommendations

- There is a need to create an understanding of this programme component among the implementing partners. The PPC issues that impact recruitment of staff and programme implementation should be discussed and reviewed with the implementing partners;
- There is a need for a better understanding of the GEF PPC procedures by the implementing partners. Government should negotiate on the procedures that undermine implementation and allow UNDP to change the projects that are being financed by GEF as this would enhance current efforts and respond better to the country needs in this area. The Government of South Africa should negotiate with UNDP CO who would involve/ negotiate with the GEF in Washington.
- GEF funds are not ring fenced. UNDP management needs to discuss this with GEF and the government and agree on how to review the situation to ensure that resources allocated for programmes are utilised as planned. This will also guarantee achievement of planned results but also account for resources.
- Further there is need for clarity on GEF procedures to enable project staff to operate more efficiently. UNDP should pursue this with GEF on an urgent basis.
- UNDP GEF needs to find a solution of increasing financial resources to provide capacity development in project design and to undertake capacity development field visits when projects are being developed so as to improve the quality of proposals.

### 2.2.2.4 GEF Small Grants Project

The Small Grants Programme (SGP) is a corporate programme of the GEF which provides grant funding to communities and civil society organisations in developing and transition countries to implement projects in the GEF focal areas of biodiversity conservation, climate change, sustainable forest management, land degradation, international waters, persistent organic pollutants / chemical and waste. In South Africa, the GEF SGP started in 2001 and to date (Dec 2016) has supported over 110 projects. The maximum grant provided to each project is \$50,000. Strategic projects have a maximum budget of \$150,000. More than 50% of the projects are in the biodiversity portfolio. The GEF SGP is implemented by UNDP and is executed by UNOPS.

The NDP articulates a framework for South Africa's transition to an environmentally sustainable and climate change resilient, low carbon economy by 2030. NDP firmly creates a link between socio-economic development and a sustainable environmental agenda. South Africa faces urgent development challenges in terms of poverty, unemployment and equality and needs to find ways to link poverty alleviation efforts to the achievement of a sustainable environment free from environmental degradation and carbon-intensive energy consumption (NDP Chapter 5). Poverty alleviation and the empowerment of vulnerable communities is at the centre of government and DEA's environment conservation strategic thrust, which speaks to rural development, poverty alleviation and creation of livelihoods. The implementation of SGP community environmental projects is well aligned with government policy objectives as the SGP projects must meet environmental objectives while supporting poverty reduction and local empowerment objectives. An analysis of a few projects (+- 15) surveyed during the 2015 programme evaluation revealed that project outcomes have been varied, with most projects having a clear linkage between poverty reduction, livelihood and employment creation and environmental conservation whilst others set out to build capacity and catalyse income generation initiatives within communities.

The SGP GEF STAR funding allocation is provided by the Government of South Africa who sit in the National Steering Committee that provides strategic oversight to the programme. In 2014, the government cut the STAR funding allocation to SGP to \$500,000. The GEF Small Grants programme mobilised an extra \$700,000 from GEF core resources. The total funding available for the GEF 6 phase (2015-2019) is now \$1,200, 000. This funding is not part of the CPD funding.

The big GEF programme is not coordinated with the SGP and efforts are currently underway to integrate the GEF full-sized projects with the SGP as a delivery mechanism for community interventions. The evaluation wanted to establish what has been achieved in this portfolio to date and how these projects complement the GEF work in South Africa which is managed by UNDP.

### **Achievements/Impacts**

During the 5<sup>th</sup> phase of the GEF (2010-2014), SGP contributed to over 370 jobs through community conservation initiatives; more than 2,500 people were trained with 65% women and an estimated 11,998 people mainly in the rural areas, have benefitted

from the SGP supported projects. SGP projects also contributed to supporting over 40 small and micro business enterprises e.g. honey production, eco-tourism, vegetable gardens, crafts, waste recycling, indigenous tree nurseries:

- More than 550,000 hectares of community conserved areas and protected areas were established, conserved and/or expanded;
- Over 13,000 indigenous plants were cultivated and replanted in degraded environments and 122 indigenous vegetation and endangered species were protected;
- SGP supported the registration of three sacred natural sites in Limpopo with the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) from provincial to national status;
- Agro-ecology and countermeasures against land degradation has been vital in the conservation of over 9,600 hectares of communal land utilised for sustainable agricultural purpose, improving food security in drought-stricken regions and providing over a hundred people with employment. Many of the small-scale farmers are now producing organic vegetables for subsistence farming whilst generating income by selling surplus produce to local retailers and the local community. One project partner (Heiveld Cooperative) exports organic rooibos sourced from small-scale farmers to international markets and another (Flower Valley Conservation Trust) has facilitated the export of Fynbos flowers to international markets;
- SGP support has also helped small-scale farmers continue to advocate for policy change to support traditional seeds and food sovereignty;
- Between 2010 and 2015, 9 SGP-funded project grantees received national and international awards for the recognition for their work, including the UNDP Equator Prize Initiative, DEA's Women & Environment Awards and SEED Awards.

It is clear from these results that the SGP has found traction among the rural people and that these projects are making a difference to people's lives as they address their immediate needs. This is an area where UNDP, GEF and the Government should put more emphasis and provide more financial and human resources to grow this sector. An opportunity exists for the UNDP to integrate the GEF SGP in the next CPD to help contribute to the country programme outcomes on energy and greening the economy.

# 2.2.3 Program Component 3: Service Delivery and Democratic Governance

According to the CPD UNDP committed to contribute to building a more capable public sector that can deliver higher quality services cost effectively to the population of South Africa. This was aimed especially at those historically disadvantaged and targeting specifically women and the youth. There were three main areas of work:

- Expansion of leadership and management programme targeting senior public service staff at all levels (balance between women and men) who are at the core of designing, planning, resourcing and tracking service delivery.
- Second, strengthening policy research and performance driven planning, monitoring, assessment & evaluation and Results Based Budgeting.

 Third, within the of Government's Active Citizenry Policy: Develop tools for citizen feedback/collaboration with CSOs. Skills development in core oversight bodies (PSC and legislature).

#### 2.2.3.1 Governance

According to the CPD the following are what was planned to be achieved:

- 1. The governance programme seeks to assist and support government to expand and improve delivery of services to all citizens of South Africa.
- 2. UNDP's plan is to participate in the delivery of services.
- 3. Support skills development to improve service delivery to citizens
- 4. Support staff development in government
- 5. Support policy research and Monitoring and Evaluation
- 6. Design evaluation systems and support policies
- 7. Support process redesign in the department of Monitoring and Evaluation
- 8. Support Oversight institutions.

### What has been Done/Achieved

# • Support to KZN Provincial Government

KZN is one of the provinces that had wanted UN Delivering as One. While this did not happen, UNDP supported the provincial government in several areas.

- UNDP supported the Provincial Public Service Training Centre by developing the training curriculum, RBM, M&E training materials in 2015. In early April 2017 training was undertaken for the first two training workshops for 34 provincial senior managers. While it is too early to assess outcomes and impacts of this training the participants found this capacity skills development effort to meet their needs. The managers recommended that for implementation of what they learned it would be necessary to provide similar skills development to their seniors who would drive this process.
- o It also supported the development of a Public Service Human Resources Development (HRD) strategy and Professional Support Programme Development. UNDP made an investment of R 580,000 to the academy outputs. The academy views the efforts as valuable although said they are yet to translate into tangible benefits.
- UNDP also supported the KZN Integrated Public Sector Human Resources Development, Academy Development programme (R800, 000) and the Senior Management Leadership Programme which were co-funded by UNDP and the provincial government to the tune of R369, 875. Again, the value of these efforts is yet to be realised.
- Further in KZN UNDP supported the nerve centre in creating dash boards. It is however not clear at this point if this innovation is being used

and whether it is of value since the on-site interviews were not done because the planned dates coincided with the provincial cabinet meeting. The RBM, M&E training participants (senior managers) referred to the dashboard and felt that the information was not very useful. They felt that there was need to customise the dashboard so that it captures information that is critical and useful to the provincial staff.

- UNDP also supported the Consolidation and Repositioning of the South African Public Service. It was not possible during the evaluation data collection process to establish how the DPSA was benefiting from these efforts.
- Issues of **cost sharing by UNDP and government** have taken nine months to resolve and this has negatively impacted programme implementation. While an agreement on cost sharing exists UNDP and the Government do not have a common understanding of that agreement and this impacted on planned deliverables. The nature of the agreement was not properly addressed from the outset. Additionally, National Treasury is not supportive of this arrangement as there are no clear formal agreements on *modus operandi*. According to National Treasury such a cost sharing agreement must involve them and must meet the national accountability requirements of South Africa. The same argument is used by National Treasury in other similar agreements.
- A programme was implemented on UN Volunteer medical staff in Limpopo supported by UNDP. The programme seems to have been of great help to the province. Beyond the Limpopo Evaluation report the evaluation was not able to get more specific feedback from the province. However, the UNDP staff provided information on how the province benefitted from the doctors who were deployed in the province by the programme. The Limpopo UN Volunteer doctor's programme has been put on hold as of December 2016 because of the new regulations for registering of medical professionals. However, the evaluation report outlines clearly benefits derived from this programme.
- A concept paper developed by UNDP to support parliament was shared with the UN agencies who were supposed to be part of the joint programme but no comments have been received to date. This was meant to be a joint programme but nothing has happened. There seems to be reluctance or difficulties being experienced by the UN agencies as has been noted elsewhere in this report to do joint programmes and hence UNDP will have to decide on how to proceed with this initiative if it is to be implemented.

#### 2.2.3.2 Public Service Innovation

UNDP has excellent working relationship and support the work of CPSI. CPSI values UNDP more than any other partner or stakeholder because of the importance and relevance of UNDP financial and technical promotion of South-South learning on innovative practices are some of the support to the centre. The centre's recognition of innovation as critical to service delivery found traction with UNDP and this enabled this strong partnership.

The United Nations Public Administration Network (UNPAN) is a strategic programme that consists of over 30 partner institutions (Online Regional Centres) covering five

global centres. Its objective is to promote capacity-building through collaboration and the sharing of knowledge, experience and best practices on sound public policies and effective administration globally among the Member States of the United Nations.

The UNPAN workshop for Southern Africa, which takes place annually, was the starting point of the relationship between CPSI and UNDP. Given this excellent relationship CPSI charts the agenda and UNDP supports the centre with financial resources, global knowledge and information. Under this cooperation CPSI has established an online Regional Centre for SADC UNPAN which is a knowledge hub.

CPSI hosts an annual workshop for SADC and publishes The South African Public Sector Innovation Journal entitled "Ideas that Work". Several volumes have been published covering Sustainable Development Goals, The Future We Want, Fore sighting and Innovating Our Future and many others. Public Service employees from SADC contribute articles to the journal. The annual UNPAN SADC Regional Workshop provides a platform for countries to benchmark against each other and beyond in their progress in embracing and entrenching information sharing and public-sector innovation.

CPSI finds it difficult to get adequate funding for innovation and training people in innovation from the public sector. Therefore, UNDP's support and partnership are critical to the work of CPSI. It is extremely useful that the articles are provided by senior in country officials as demonstrated by the articles contributed by the members of SADC. This is an area where UNDP could invest more financial and technical resources and hence increase its impact and visibility because evidence shows that it is meeting a demand which addresses a need, not just in South Africa but in the Southern African Region. The UNDP global knowledge here plays an important role.

CPSI provides feedback to UNDP through reports, regular contact, reports on specific workshops as well as through the publications. As a result, UNDP has agreed to support a four-year programme with CPSI. The funding model for the CPSI works very well for both UNDP and CPSI. The only challenges the CPSI has experienced is synchronising UNDP and government planning cycles. However, now that the current CPD has been extended for another 15 months this now provides an opportunity for UNDP and Government planning cycles to be synchronised a situation that will work in favour of CPSI.

### Recommendations from CPSI

- 1. Resources and support should be provided for those areas that UNDP and CPSI know work. The CPSI work and collaboration with UNDP certainly works and shows clear results and benefits that address priorities in this sector. UNDP support efforts should be concentrated and support provided where experience shows that these efforts to work for the benefit of the people of South Africa and the SADC. CPSI's innovative work is one of those. UNDP should seriously consider making this one of its flagship programmes in South Africa and SADC.
- 2. The templates being used by UNDP are too big and complex, UNDP should consider making these templates more user-friendly by customising them to fit and meet local and regional needs.

3. AU and UNDP need to develop synergies for Agenda 2030. This would guarantee value for money and success for Agenda 2030 because of synergised efforts

#### Recommendation

UNDP/UN need to demonstrate that there is something of value that they bring to South Africa. Further UNDP must learn that recycling old ideas couched in new terminology will not solve the problems of South Africa, there is need to come up with new ideas and solutions to address problems.

### 2.2.3.3 Support to National Electoral System

UNDP has supported and partnered with the Independent Electoral Commission of South Africa (IEC) in areas of management of elections, voter education, voter registration, printing of ballots and in assisting and supporting elections in SADC and elsewhere in Africa. The IEC has taken a lead in this area having been motivated by lessons that it has learned from Africa and elsewhere in the world since 1994.

The IEC said it has learned that many African countries have shaken off the responsibility for elections and provide very few resources (both human and financial) for elections and hence have depended on UN and donor financing and management of elections. In certain instances, the non-provision of resources is so that the current rulers retain power. Due to this the conduct, management, independence and credibility of elections have become questionable. The IEC has endeavoured to avoid this in South Africa and its efforts in voter education, voter registration, and ensuring the independence, free and fair elections have attracted UNDP/UN to develop relationships so that the IEC can support elections in Africa in such countries as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and the pending Kenyan elections (2017).

The IEC continues to ask itself hard questions about what needs to be done to ensure credible elections and to innovate to stay on top of the situation. IEC learns best practices from the global arena, but does not copy these as is; instead, it adapts these to its situation. UNDP has found traction with this approach and cooperates with IEC in bringing other countries to learn from IEC or requests the IEC to support elections elsewhere in Africa. This relationship is growing as demonstrated by the growing demand for assistance in SADC and elsewhere in Africa.

UNDP and the IEC now have a draft agreement that intends to formalise this relationship. DIRCO is the manager of the UN and South African Government relationship. This agreement will strengthen the relationship in support of the six areas of cooperation between UNDP and IEC. Below are the envisaged areas of cooperation between UNDP and IEC:

a) Capacity for Domestic Observers: South Africa has not needed external election observers since 2004 because it has developed and put in place a programme for domestic observers. IEC recognised that the UN has capacity in this and asked the UN to help with training of domestic election observers. The South African government can fund domestic observers and some CSO

- observers are funded by the UN. The IEC now has capacity in this area and has been requested by UNDP to provide this training to other countries.
- b) IEC also realised that there is a need for Civic and Democracy Voter Education. There is always a need for voter education, credible free and fair elections. Education is also needed for new and disillusioned voters to encourage them to vote. The IEC has developed capacity on voter education and hence UNDP CO supports the IEC to deploy staff when requested to do voter education in other African countries.
- c) The IEC does research and, working with UNDP CO, provides technical advisory support to the election process especially on electronic voting and biometrics for voter registration and identification. South Africa has benefited from the UN knowledge and information hubs and is now able to assist other countries in Africa. UNDP CO has played a major supportive role in this partnership.
- d) Sub-regional and Global Knowledge system which covers 15 SADC countries. In 2004 DRC staff spent six months training in South Africa with the facilitation of the UNDP CO. This was funded by the UN and allowed all parties to be trained in South Africa on neutral ground. Burundi and Rwanda are interested in joining SADC because of what is being offered in the region as they feel they are not getting this attention and support in East Africa.
- e) The IEC is mainstreaming disability and mental health in the electoral system by using best practices from elsewhere and UN knowledge systems in this area. UNDP is playing a critical role in providing global information and support to this effort.
- f) Gender mainstreaming in elections: While 52.8% of women are eligible voters only 55% of those are registered as voters. A study on women representation is currently one of the areas of IEC cooperation with the UN in South Africa. One of the areas where IEC would like to cooperate with UNDP CO is on the IEC staff gaining international experience and exposure. This is clearly an area for UNDP to consider and where it could possibly work with other UN agencies as it would respond to a felt need.

### **Opportunities**

- Based on the current good relations with IEC UNDP could establish an office or a programme in South Africa to train staff for managing and supporting elections in Africa which the UN could use when supporting elections in the continent.
- 2. IEC innovation is key. The UNDP CO can provide support to help South Africa in strengthening credibility for elections in South Africa. The South African government has the resources for this and UNDP can provide technical expertise.
- 3. The IEC feels that UNDP should provide an independent view or assessment on what IEC does in South Africa and in the countries where it has provided support. In this way, UNDP could enrich its own position. Part of the UNDP CO's value add should be in relationships, technical skills, partnerships and not just money. UNDP is getting value from partnerships

and should use this to enhance its own influence and visibility. The UNDP CO should demonstrate that it can provide value through technical expertise and global knowledge and not necessarily just finance.

### Challenges

- 1. Elections are sensitive (transparency, independent, free and fair) therefore this can be a constraint when funding is limited to the state resources. Its independence can be compromised and impacted or be viewed as being partisan. An election body must be independent, credible, fair, neutral etc. (ethical issues when funding comes from the state). This is seen by the IEC as a challenge in South Africa.
- 2. UN funds are raised to support election processes and are generally viewed as independent, however IEC said when the sources of the funds are not declared those funds can be regarded by others as being compromised.
- 3. UN has a certain amount of autonomy and is generally viewed as such however where authority is sought elsewhere this can be viewed as being compromised.

# 2.2.4 Programme Component 4: South Africa's Regional and Global Role

Programme Four of the Country Programme Document (2013-2017) is anchored on South Africa's Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF 2013-2017) objective committing the country to create a better South Africa and a better Africa in the better World. The programme is also aligned to the National Development Plan: Vision 2030 chapter on positioning South Africa in the world; and the UN South Africa Strategic Cooperation Framework 2013-2017 output on strengthening national institutions and systems to support SA's contribution to a Better Africa & a Better World. The evaluation takes note of the importance of this programme to UNDP and the South African Government because it can make a significant contribution to regional, African and global issues. This report on this pillar is informed by documents that have been reviewed to date and interviews with key UNDP informants. The findings are also informed by information from some key stakeholders.

The UNDP Country Office committed to supporting government by establishing a flexible facility or channel on human development knowledge exchange programme to fit the requirements of the South African knowledge base and deepen collaboration with the Global South; and cooperate with the South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA) to support national efforts to build local organisational capacity to enhance South Africa's regional and global role. The evaluation finds this approach and commitment to be strategic for South-South cooperation.

### Major achievements to date

The evaluation findings have identified the following as major achievements of the programme pillar four to date.

### 2.2.4.1 Partnership Framework Agreement

- The Partnership Framework for Coordination (PFA) and implementation mechanism signed with DIRCO to enhance cooperation between South Africa and UNDP to promote global development, through the advancement of sustainable and inclusive development in Sub-Saharan Africa through South-South Cooperation
- 2. UNDP and DIRCO jointly organising consultations on the Post 2015 Development Agenda, including the African Common Position on the Post-2015 Development Agenda as well as the 2063 African vision. In this connection, two continental meetings at the level of experts were planned:
  - a. Pillars and Challenges for the Structural Transformation of African Economies;
  - Support in the Implementation of African Vision 2063. However, these proposals were never implemented because DIRCO did not provide the money.
- 3. Facilitating consultations among African Climate Change Negotiators experts and training as a preparation for the COP 21 that was held in Paris in 2015 on key issues to be decided by COP 21;
- 4. Facilitating the establishment of knowledge hubs and knowledge networks;
- 5. Provided support to establish the South African Development Partnership Agency particularly on South-South Cooperation programmes; and
- 6. A dialogue to engage South Africa in the UNDP JPO programme has started.

### 2.2.4.2 South African Development Partnership Agency (SADPA)

The Government of South Africa through DIRCO started a process to establish SADPA. This was envisaged to provide strategic mechanisms to show solidarity in support to the development of the continent and beyond, and a nodal point for all external development cooperation. The UNDP Country Office was engaged by DIRCO and provided technical input to develop the SADPA Concept Paper.

In 2013, the Country Office supported a study tour of the interim SADPA leadership to the RBEC region to learn about some of the experiences of emerging development cooperation agencies in that region. Furthermore, in November 2014, and as part of the OR Tambo debate series, UNDP funded and fully supported the organisation of a third debate in series which focused on Chapter 7 of the NDP on International Relations. A paper was commissioned to explore NDP progress on Chapter 7 and to interrogate how foreign relations can advance the objectives of the NDP (debate paper). The debate panel was led by the DIRCO Minister and convened a cross section of stakeholders. UNDP was represented on the panel by the Director of the Human Development Report Office (HDRO) to share some of his perspectives on the 2013 HDR which was on the topic of the rise of the Global South. This provided useful insight on emerging economies and how South Africa can benefit from this knowledge contained in the report. The debate paper, which was prepared by the Wits School of Governance, made some interesting recommendations including on SADPA which were to become the focus of possible follow-up work with DIRCO. However, of the

follow-up areas considered in the debate, the Minister opted that some attention be devoted to exploring two topics; namely defining national interest and exploring the role of South Africa in SADC. These areas were taken up for follow-up research with DIRCO's Policy Research and Analysis Unit (PRAU) but were overtaken by events. This work remains on the table for the Tambo series to be taken up in 2017 (OR Tambo project steering committee meeting minutes). The evaluation views this as a lost opportunity. It is not clear why these were overtaken by equally unclear priorities. It is also not clear what the OR Tambo series will do with these priorities in 2017. UNDP will certainly have to make concrete plans and reach binding agreements with DIRCO to avoid wastage of resources and opportunities.

In April 2016, the Regional Service Centre in Addis Ababa engaged the new DIRCO team on the South-South Cooperation (SSC) agenda, and organised a regional community of practice meeting on SSC. The UNDP CO, together with DIRCO, actively participated in the meeting. Follow up will be in the form of support to mapping South Africa SSC and the development of an online data base to systematically track South Africa's SSC efforts.

Evidence shows that the UNDP CO has also contributed substantively to the draft Humanitarian Policy Framework of the Government at the invitation of DIRCO's Humanitarian division. UNDP received a request from DIRCO's Humanitarian Division to consider providing support for infrastructure rehabilitation in Tanzania in response to the recent earthquake that hit the country. Discussions are currently (2017) underway to realize this R10 million contribution. This is an opportunity for UNDP to concretely support the South African Government in South-South cooperation and for South Africa to demonstrate concretely what support it can provide.

While the envisaged collaboration with SADPA was unfortunately stalled, and taking into consideration that in the past two years, DIRCO opted for their internal processes to institutionalise SADPA, the UNDP CO continues to engage DIRCO in the hope that once SADPA becomes operational, this would serve as the most viable vehicle for consolidating development cooperation and would facilitate effective coordination between the CO and the Government on this important CPD pillar. The critical issue is whether there is traction and indeed common understanding and agreement between the Government of South Africa and UNDP CO on the way forward. UNDP will have to establish if this change of priorities by DIRCO will permanently paralyse this effort and hence take appropriate decisions on the way forward.

### 2.2.4.3 Development knowledge exchange

Notwithstanding the lack of implementation of the PFA, through SADPA, which is not operational due to factors outside the control of the CO, the CO has continued to facilitate knowledge exchange programmes across all its CPD areas. These include development exchanges in the areas of supplier development; land reform; electoral exchange; innovation; repositioning of the public sector; energy efficiency; HIV and law and mainstreaming of HIV and gender into construction infrastructure project. The exchange programme involved government entities, non-government organisations, research institutions and higher learning institutions. Countries that participated in

these various exchange processes included, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea, Egypt, India, Brazil, China, Central African Republic, Malaysia and Mexico. From the reviews done so far there is evidence from documents that all these have been extensively reported on in ROARs reports.

While SADPA may not yet be operational and while the reasons for its delayed start rest with the Government, it is critical for UNDP to continue to engage with the government on this issue and ensure that some concrete agreements are reached to put this back on track. UNDP needs to quickly make sure that an agreement is reached and a modus operandi put in place with government.

### 2.2.4.4 Peace Mission Training Centre (PMTC)

The objective of the Institutional Capacity Enhancement of the Peace Mission Training Centre project is to enhance the institutional capacity of the PMTC to train personnel for South Africa to effectively participate in the United Nations (UN) and African Union (AU) peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities. To date, the Country Office in partnership with the Government of Japan, has supported the institutional & training capacity of the PMTC by constructing two centres; a multi-dimensional training and education centre, and purchased equipment and vehicles to support the strengthening of the PMTC's training programme. In 2013 and 2014 respectively, the project supported a two-week training titled "Peace Relief and Reconstruction". 87 peace personnel from Defence, National Disaster Management, Department of International Relations and Cooperation and other security structures attended the course. The course focused on technology for disaster management, disaster risk assessment, international charter for disaster, the use of indicators for vulnerability and resilience assessment, project management for Disaster Risk Reduction etc. To date, the training centres and equipment continue to provide space for related peace training programme at the PMTC and have been utilised in various training opportunities. It is, however, still not clear what impact these efforts have on peace keeping.

# 2.2.4.5 Interagency South-South Programme

The UN-South Africa Strategic Cooperation Framework (SCF) 2013-2017 has an output on *Strengthened national institutions & systems to support SA's contribution to a Better Africa & a Better World.* While some progress has been made to date by various agencies, the cooperation is characterised by a lack of structured engagement with government, and most importantly, the absence of a joint interagency programme. As part of the Governance and Participation UN Results Group, UNDP-South Africa took the initiative to develop a concept paper to engage all agencies in such a programme. The concept paper is currently being reviewed by agencies. The Country Office will also be seeking inputs from the Regional Service Centre in this area.

These early efforts by UN agencies to develop a joint support programme in South-South Cooperation have been reviewed by the evaluation team. These efforts should, however, be further encouraged and sustained, as this would create a situation that

would make the UN more effective, efficient and visible. This is an issue that needs immediate attention by the UN Resident Coordinator and Heads of agencies at the country level. The UN's failure to work together has invariably undermined the UN efforts in South Africa and sometimes its credibility in the eyes of the government. The government stakeholders have raised this issue of the UN not working together during this evaluation and this seems to be a major bottle neck that needs immediate attention by the UN.

# 2.2.4.6 National Progress

In addition to South Africa's continued support to the region and participation in global processes on peace and development, and as part of its strategic objective to build a better South Africa & Africa in a better world, South Africa continued to contribute to continental and global development, security and human rights for all through mediation, peace support, post-conflict reconstruction within the Africa Union Peace and Security Council (AUPSC), and the Human Rights Council. Government has also established the Mediation Support Unit and provided training programmes on mediation and conflict resolution. Progress on the finalisation of the Partnership Fund for Development Bill is at an advanced stage. Once the Partnership Fund for Development Bill is enacted into law, SADPA will be operationalised to administer it.

# Challenges

While the Country Office is committed to the planned activities and has engaged with the Government of South Africa on many fronts, progress has been slow because of challenges that the programme has experienced. Below are some of the evaluation observations on some of the major challenges that have impacted delivery on this programme area.

- 1. The programme implementation has been slowed down by delays in government decision making processes resulting in some of the agreed activities being overtaken by events. In general, the government decision making process is slow and this impacts on UNDP's ability to move fast on the programme implementation. Further, UNDP has not fully appreciated nor understood government requirements and indeed constraints that are imposed by accountability needs of government. Until both parties come to the table and find a way forward this will continue to be a major bottleneck.
- 2. UNDP's implementation of this programme has been impacted by rapid staff turnover in government, which impacts on institutional memory and the implementation progress. This is because the UNDP work with most government entities is based on individuals and not institutionalised. UNDP given its global experience should be able to provide the government of South Africa with advice and solutions on how to institutionalise these working arrangements such that there is continuity even on the face of rapid staff turnover.
- 3. The programme has also been negatively impacted by lack of adequate financial resources. This is more so because many of the activities are

- supposed to be funded by government. UNDP has limited resources and hence the country office cannot implement the programmes faster and according to plans. UNDP and government need to have a formalised agreement on cost sharing or indeed on committed resources obligations to avoid this current situation.
- 4. The United Nations agencies have also not been able to work together and put resources together for this priority area. The lack of prioritising joint programmes and devoting adequate resources to them undermines the UN's comparative advantage. This also undermines the UN and its UNSCF commitments in the eyes of the government. This issue was raised repeatedly by government stakeholders.

### Preliminary recommendations, recovery plan and way forward

Whilst the evaluation provides more detailed recommendations, the CO needs to address these challenges and plot a way ahead so that it can begin to deliver on many of these important deliverables for this programme area. If these challenges are not addressed the programme will continue to fall behind and, at times, invest resources in areas that may not produce results. It is critical for UNDP to ensure that resources are efficiently and effectively utilised to produce the planned results to meet South Africa's needs and priorities.

- 1. The CO should seek technical support from the RSC given that the centre has expertise in most of these areas and the CO has limited staff. It is the role of the RSC to provide technical support to country offices. In doing so the CO can demonstrate its comparative advantage in providing world class technical expertise which South Africa is very much short of.
- 2. While UNDP has explained the concept of a development partner as opposed to a donor remains a lack of clarity on what this means from some of the government partners, which impacts on the partnership. UNDP should find ways to ensure that all government partners fully understand and hence commit to the development partnership understanding as a critical pillar of implementation. UNDP needs to be sensitive to accountability constraints and requirements that are the responsibility of National Treasury where South African government funding is involved.
- 3. UNDP and the government need to find ways of institutionalising working relations to create viable institutional memory that will promote continuity even in the face of staff changes in government.
- 4. The UN agencies must find very concrete ways of working together on joint programmes which they have agreed to in the UNSCF as this will give the UN credibility. Working together will produce greater impact and demonstrate the UN's comparative advantage. The RC and the heads of agencies at the country level must find a way of urgently addressing this need. The UN will salvage its image in South Africa where it is viewed as being ineffective by agreeing and signing a UNSCF but failing to work together and to deliver on that agreement.

5. Currently UNDP supports Knowledge Exchange initiatives where officials from other countries come to learn from the South Africa experience. However, there is no feedback on the value and how these exchanges benefit the countries that participate in these programmes. UNDP needs to develop a system and reach an agreement with participating countries and entities to provide feedback reports so that the value of these can be assessed and lessons learned that can inform the future.

### Conclusion

Although progress has been made in the implementation of Programme Four since 2013, the key challenges that hindered programmatic partnership and full implementation included;

- Absence of a development cooperation framework policy to guide the Country Office on possible engagement and support areas.
- Delayed institutionalisation of SADPA to provide a platform for structured and coordinated engagement with the Country Office. Lack of structure also hindered accountability.
- Lack of comprehensive development assistance facility to finance SA's development cooperation.

It is important to address these issues as part of mapping a way forward for current and future cooperation. Given the CPD extension by 15 months UNDP should take advantage of this and begin to address these issues so that the new CPD can already put in place these recommendations. More recommendations are made in overall evaluation report.

# 3 Government UNDP Relationships and Oversight

This section addresses major evaluation issues identified by both the main Government Partners/Stakeholders and UNDP. These issues are critical to the relationships of UNDP/UN and the Government of South Africa as they have paralysed excellent partnerships and projects. Many of the already articulated challenges, problems and constraints emanate from these relationship issues. Unless these are resolved amicably UNDPs/UNs work in South Africa will continue to be under strain. The issues relate to undefined relationships between UNDP/UN and Government, confusion over issues of coordination or lack thereof on both sides as well as paralysis created by unchangeable/inflexible (rigid) UNDP and Government templates.

While the UNDP and the UN collaborate with individual Departments the major government coordinating departments are DIRCO (Strategic international relations), National Treasury (Programmatic and Financial Accountability for government resources) and DPME (M&E and Reporting systems programmatic accountability). It is the view of this evaluation, based on government stakeholders' information, that these roles are either not understood or accepted by UNDP for expedience purposes or because of constraints on UNDP which are not fully appreciated by the partners.

Government stakeholders admit that there are weaknesses of coordination on the government side and the UNDP/ UN also admits that there is a level of unwillingness to work together. The causes of both weaknesses need to be understood and then addressed informed by realities of South Africa. A one size fits all approach will not work in the South African context. The UNDP/UN need to understand and accept that DIRCO is responsible for strategic and international relations coordination given its role in dealing and coordinating the relations of international organizations. On the other hand, DIRCO, cannot enter into agreements with individual departments where South African national financial resources are used for programme/project implementation by UNDP/UN without National Treasury involvement. This is currently happening and, based on the so called "Cost Sharing Agreements", has caused a lot of confusion and frustrations on both sides and needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. According to National Treasury such cost sharing agreements entered into by any part of government with UNDP without the involvement and clearance by National Treasury are null and void.

National Treasury says that there is clarity on what a donor agency is and the relationship between donors and the government are clear as these are governed by legal agreements and hence the working modalities are also clear. This view is also confirmed by traditional donors that were interviewed as part of this evaluation. Further, the definition of a Service Provider and the working modalities are also clear. Service providers bid for the services they provide and set procedures for procuring their services is clear and accountability for resources is also clear. Service providers have "Service Contracts" which are legal and enforceable at law. However, there is no clear understanding nor agreement on what a "Development Partner" is in South Africa, who is an international organisation and who uses South African financial resources to provide technical and other services. The modus operandi of such an entity is neither understood nor do any agreed accountability issues exist. When UNDP has a cost sharing agreement with a department and is using South African Government funds to do work in South Africa whose accountability systems does UNDP use? This is where the problem lies and needs to be resolved.

The evaluation established that UNDP/UN have only come to National Treasury when departments are not able to meet their agreements which have been made/entered into without National Treasury participation and agreement. These agreements do not comply with National Treasury accountability demands and needs. The examples of Limpopo and KZN provinces and the ILO case were used to illustrate this problem and the fact that the UNDP/UN has not always demonstrated value for money in cases of cost sharing. It happens that these arrangements are outside the accountability arrangements of government. It is therefore critical that a "Development Partner" in the South African context is clearly defined and the relationships and modus operandi agreed to by all relevant parties to enable the development partner to provide a service using South African government resources and within legally agreed to accountability arrangements.

Further, for such an agreement to be reached UNDP/UN will need to market their value addition given that they will be competing with other service providers who may have the same expertise or even better expertise than they do. Further the UNDP/UN will

need to show what the advantages are for South Africa to engage the UN instead of going to the market to procure these services from them.

### 3.1 UN and NDP 2030 Priorities

It was clearly articulated by some Government stakeholders that South African people's priorities and needs are different from Government NDP priorities. People's needs are basic while government looks at the larger, global issues which the NDP is aligned to. While these priorities address important national priorities, they do not necessarily address the ordinary people's basic needs as seen and understood by ordinary South Africans. The government's priorities are closer to the UN Global priorities as exemplified by SDGs and the former MDGs and others. The NDP priorities while informed by different levels of government, civil society and the private sector are not directly informed by ordinary people's needs and priorities because the consultative process when the NDP was developed did not include the ordinary citizens (DPME). As a result, the government priorities and UN priorities which are based on the NDP do not necessarily meet the people's basic needs. According to these stakeholders, people are better planners for their level of needs and priorities than professionals because they understand better their own needs. According to DPME there is a need to involve people and use their priorities and needs as part of the basis for national planning.

National priorities can only meet the people's needs if they are informed by the people themselves. Planners need to consult with all levels of society to get a balanced view of national priorities. If national plans are informed by the people's needs, then UNDP programmes which will be informed by the NDP will also begin to address people's needs in South Africa.

# Given this diagnosis what can UNDP contribute to which will create traction between government, UNDP and the ordinary people?

**Lessons:** Need for Long term planning to inform the future

There is a need for UNDP and the Government to understand each other. Awareness building in understanding each other is critical.

UNDP's programme priorities are informed by Government priorities. Resultantly, while they address many national priorities, each do their own thing and not really address the needs of the people nor find viable working relationships that make it possible for lasting working arrangements.

UNDP needs to translate that global knowledge, expertise and experience and make it readily available, useful and usable in solving and addressing South African needs and priorities at all levels and as seen by the people and their government. If this happens then UNDP's support will become more relevant and will find traction with South Africa's priorities and those of its people.

There is a need to improve government coordination by being involved in global policy dialogue and making sure it addresses the needs of the people. Further, the language of implementation must be different from the global planning language currently being

used to address the priorities of ordinary South Africans. There is need for new tools, new nuances, new ideas and new concepts that *contextually* address the needs of South Africa as an upper middle-income country. There is currently a disconnect between the global issues, national issues and local issues. How does the SADC, African Union and the global approaches respond to and meet needs at all levels? UNDP needs to localise the global issues and respond to local needs and issues otherwise this wealth of knowledge and experience does not translate into any value locally at provincial or municipal levels.

### 3.2 Traditional Donors Experiences and Views

A few traditional donors to South Africa such as Embassies and the EU were interviewed as part of this evaluation to understand what their relationships are like in South Africa. It was to understand if traditional donors faced the same challenges and how they were coping with these challenges. The purpose was also to see if there are approaches that would be useful to UNDP. The evaluation also wanted to establish whether traditional donors experienced any challenges when providing support in South Africa and if so how they coped with these challenges. The interviews were therefore very focussed.

The evaluation established that traditional donors also experienced challenges as well when working in South Africa. The following were the major challenges that were experienced:

- Accessibility to senior South African government officials is not easy. Most senior officials are busy with internal issues and problems that draw their energy and have no time to engage with international donors and agencies.
- 2. Director Generals are political appointments and hence have no time to engage at these technical levels. As a result, DDGs are more accessible.
- 3. It is virtually impossible to meet ministers. However other fora can be used to meet ministers and DGs such as using EU or NORDIC fora or meetings. Technical Officials take advantage of these fora to meet more senior government officials.

### 3.2.1 Advantages of traditional donors

Traditional donors have an advantage over UN/UNDP because they provide donor money to finance all their support even if it is limited. The donors pay directly for the expertise and services that are provided to support government. Donors confine themselves to a few very specialised areas where they know they can provide expertise or support that gives them respect and visibility because of the difference or impacts that their support produces. While South Africa is an Upper Middle-Income Country the donors still provide some financial resources for specific areas because of the prevalent historical inequalities. They fully fund the development assistance they provide and hence do not experience some of the challenges that are experienced by UNDP.

### 3.2.2 Traditional donor advice to UNDP/UN

Donors believe that given the UNDP/UN's neutrality and global experience the agencies should be able to use this leverage to do more focussed work in South Africa even if the country is an Upper Middle-Income country. The donors made the following suggestions:

- There is certainly a need for more coordination, cooperation and working together among the UN agencies. This approach would strengthen the UN as a body but also give it better bargaining power and visibility from its support in the country. The donors used their own experiences in taking advantage of the bigger bodies such as the EU which help individual donors with accessibility to senior officials.
- Given the UNDP/UN's world experience, global expertise, knowledge and access to global information the UNDP/UN can provide critical support to areas of policy advice, education and land reform, natural resources planning, migration and issues of refugees. The UN can certainly offer more than any other partners in these areas. Given this global experience and expertise the UN/UNDP could leverage some resources from donors or carry out joint programmes with donors and provide support to South Africa.
- The UN needs to limit the numbers of support areas that the agencies individually and collectively provide in South Africa. UNDP needs to select a few critical but strategic areas where it can make a difference given its expertise, global knowledge etc. and demonstrate the difference it can make in South Africa by providing what no other international agency can provide. UNDP's strength will be in its ability to provide exceptional expertise and not the amount of money.
- UNDP should be able to pilot certain approaches and ideas which can be tested
  and if they succeed then can be scaled up later using local government
  resources once it is proven that they work. This would give UNDP better
  credibility, visibility and respect in South Africa.

# 4 UNDP Challenges for CPD Implementation.

UNDP faces challenges when implementing programmes in support of government priorities in South Africa and in working together with other UN agencies. These challenges impact on UNDP's effective and efficient delivery and achievement of results.

- The evaluation established that UN agencies do not want joint programmes because they do not want to work together. UN agencies in most cases seem to prefer to partner with individual Departments and to do those programmes that give each agency individual visibility as opposed to the UN shared visibility. This view was expressed by government partners as well as certain UN agencies and some traditional donors.
- UNDP does not have a working structured coordination mechanism with National Treasury, DPME, DIRCO and Department of Public Administration and this impacts on programme implementation. DIRCO was supposed to

provide this mechanism but this is not the case as shown in the report. The issue of co-funding/cost sharing seems to present major challenges to the UNDP government relationship. This is because there is no agreed and formalised institutionalised agreement that meets accountability requirements of government but which also meets the needs and address UNDP constraints.

- An observation made by some government partners is that no lessons have been learned by UNDP as the organisation tends to recycle old ideas using new terminology/language trying to implement the same old ideas and this leads to no progress. This issue can be contested by UNDP but the fact that it was strongly raised by partners must compel UNDP to engage the partners on it and seek clarity and understanding on what it is that is at stake.
- Monitoring and performance measurement are a challenge to the Country Office. There is need for UNDP to generate information from programmes and projects based on its monitoring and reporting system and use evidence to inform the content and direction of its work. The office is committed to "owning the means of measurement" and hence dialogue with RBA on how to strengthen its capacity systematically. At present the CO does not have sufficient capacity to do this.
- The CO is short of finances and the government's main challenges are coordination and implementation. UNDP therefore needs specific and action oriented expertise if it is to respond effectively to the needs of South Africa. The Country Office is convinced that it can obtain such expertise globally but it lacks financial resources to do this. However, it believes that South Africa has the capacity to meet the costs of such expertise. What seems to be lacking is a formula or agreement among National Treasury, Technical departments and UNDP to effect this through a legal and formalised agreement accompanied by an agreed modus operandi.
- South Africa is a preferred destination for high level meetings by the United Nations system and UNDP is expected to provide complex logistical support. UNDP has limited operations staff to meet this demand because the UN agencies do not provide adequate financial resources to enable UNDP to provide such services. The evaluation established that UNDP Operations staff spends 70% of their time doing non-UNDP activities.

# 5 Major Recommendations and Issues for Consideration

UNDP and the Government of South Africa need to improve their cooperation and working relationships and hence the following issues should be considered and addressed.

1. There is agreement from both UNDP and the South African government stakeholders that there is a general lack of clarity from Government on what the UN/UNDP is about. The issue of Donor versus Development Partner is not fully appreciated. It is the responsibility of the UNDP/UN to make sure that there is clarity on this issue. There is a need to contextualise the meaning of "Development Partner" given South Africa's own context. Address what a Development Partner does in South Africa as compared with a donor or an

implementing agency as well as a consultant that provides specialised technical support to government. UNDP needs to market its value proposition in South Africa given the fact that it brings very limited financial resources for programme implementation. When UNDP uses financial resources from the government it needs to be able to pay for the technical expertise that it provides and use Government money for programme implementation. This would define the type of agreement needed between the government and UNDP (see also the Executive Summary).

- 2. There is need for UNDP to develop a monitoring and reporting system that meets the needs of UNDP and those of its partners. The CO needs to develop a monitoring and reporting system that captures programme and project information on a continuous basis and hence be able to generate bi-annual and annual programme/project reports. This would enable the CO to use the same monitoring and reporting frameworks for the cost sharing support. These reports would then meet the needs of partners and those of the CO.
- 3. Given the extension of the current CPD to 2018 UNDP needs to develop an Implementation Plan and a Monitoring and Reporting Framework for the balance of the extended CPD. This will enable UNDP to monitor and report on implementation progress (see also the rest of the report).
- 4. Global and Continental agendas are important. The South African government has worked hard to align its National Development agenda to these agendas. However, this alignment has not necessarily resolved the grass root development needs and challenges. There is a disconnect between the National Development Plan priorities and development priorities at the grass root level. While working at the policy level UNDP needs to find how it can support the South African government to translate these agendas to also respond and meet the needs and priorities of local people's needs. UNDP could create real impact in service delivery if it was able to help the government to improve service delivery by making sure that the government itself is able to respond better at these levels. UNDP is uniquely positioned to help the Government of South Africa to achieve this (refer also to the report).
- 5. UNDP claims that its comparative advantage is global experience, expertise and global knowledge and the existence of Knowledge Hubs that can be of value to South Africa. These discussions are taking place at the government headquarters and UNDP Country Office level with limited provincial exposure to these issues and this information. Technical people at the provincial and municipal levels do not know about these knowledge hubs nor do they have access to them. These technical people and officials are the ones who need this information, knowledge and expertise more so that they use them in meeting local development needs of the people. UNDP needs to create conditions, structures and systems that enable the provinces and municipalities to access these global knowledge hubs and experience that UNDP has. There is a need for UNDP to consider using SALGA as a vehicle for reaching these levels. UNDP can and should organise workshops with SALGA to open channels for these levels to access information and support from UNDP's international sources of expertise, knowledge and information (UNDP's

- comparative advantage). Currently, these levels return money to National Treasury at the end of the year because they are not able to deliver services to the people because of lack of expertise, knowledge and information and hence demonstrations on service delivery. UNDP must make sure that these levels and entities that are responsible for delivering services to the people can tap into these international knowledge hubs and expertise and can be capacitated so they can deliver better.
- 6. Currently the National Treasury says there is no clarity nor agreement on what Cost Sharing between the government and UNDP means. There is need for UNDP and Treasury to reach an agreement on what this means and how the relationship will work and be managed and what accountability systems are needed for this relationship. UNDP cannot use a "One Size Fits All" approach when partnering with developing and upper middle-income countries. The use of inflexible templates (One Size Fits All) by UNDP makes it impossible for the CO to develop appropriate relationships and systems and hence respond to the needs of the country and the people of South Africa (see also the report).
- 7. South Africa has many priorities, needs and challenges at the national, provincial, municipal and local levels. UNDP cannot support all these at all the levels. UNDP needs to work out what technical expertise is needed by South Africa and in which areas it can make an impact as well as at which levels it must work. Secondly, UNDP needs to assess the technical expertise that it has and the capacity of that staff and tailor make its support to the capacity that it has. Further, UNDP should consider bringing on board expertise that is needed on a long term or consultancy basis to respond to the challenges and needs of South Africa but above all to develop capacity at provincial and municipal levels. This will enable the organisation to make an impact and create visibility in those areas that it prioritises. This will also ensure that the upstream policy support can be implemented because capacities have been built at those crucial levels. It should avoid spreading itself thinly on the ground as this reduces its impact especially given limited financial and human resources.
- 8. The ROAR reporting system is viewed by many as an over centralised reporting system/template that does not allow for real life changing experiences to be shared or reporting on what unique experiences the CO is experiencing. It predominantly serves the purpose, interests and needs of HQ and does not meet the needs of the Country Office or those of partners. The template is too HQ driven and is not informed by the field experiences. To meet the needs of partners, different reports are needed a situation that creates a burden by requiring a double reporting system on an already over-burdened small staff. The evaluation established that as a result partners do not get useful feedback and this impacts on the value add of UNDP which is diminished by the reporting system. Given these constraints there is need for UNDP HQ and the CO to discuss this and find a simplified monitoring and reporting system. The CO must negotiate with HQ to be allowed to develop and use templates that can respond and meet needs of its partners.
- 9. The evaluation recommends that the UNDP Country Office should prepare an *Implementation Plan* for this evaluation which details out a plan of how and

when as well as by whom these findings and recommendations will be implemented. The plan must also include the needed human and financial resources for its implementation. Further, the plan must include time frames for implementation and reporting. This approach will ensure that this is evaluation report and its recommendation become of value to the organization.

# 6 Lessons from CPD Implementation

# UNDP Acceptance of the following from the evaluation:

- 1. Where UNDP is needed and where its collaboration and support are valued because they make a difference. In the evaluation report and executive summary issues have been raised on what UNDP must take from this evaluation in terms of what works and meets the priorities and needs of South Africa that UNDP should focus on and invest its resources in these areas. An important lesson also coming from this evaluation is that if UNDP can accept what the evaluation says is not working well and why then it can fix it. "As the saying goes you cannot fix what you do not know and accept that it is broken."
- 2. The lessons drawn from the evaluation indicate that UNDP should not spread itself too thinly given its limited financial and human resources but concentrate in a few areas where UNDP has a comparative advantage and can make a significant contribution. UNDP has demonstrated its comparative advantage in a number of areas and should therefore learn from these and use these to inform its future work in South Africa.
- 3. In an Upper Middle-Income Country like South Africa UNDP needs to deploy staff with specialised skills and knowledge aligned to South Africa's needs and priorities make sure that those skills meet South Africa's critical development areas. There should be a clear distinction between programme managers' functions and those of technical experts as demands on programme managers cannot be sustained in the long term to do both.
- 4. UNDP must learn from its own valuable experiences and stop doing the same things and in the same way they have always been done but using different language and terminology but presenting these as new ideas. Doing this is certainly re-inventing failure. Avoid the so called "un speak" which does not clearly articulate what needs to be done (activities) or achieved (results) as these are camouflaged in this imprecise international language. The South African Government partners need UNDP to use clear language and terminology that they can understand and use in articulating UN support to ordinary South Africans.
- 5. UNDP's South African partners said UNDP needs to learn that the language of implementation must be different from the Global Planning language. Currently this global planning language creates a disconnect between the global issues, national and local people's priorities. UNDP needs to find and learn how to develop ways to localise global issues to effectively respond to local needs.
- 6. UNDP should learn from its own experiences and understand that doing monitoring and reporting for mere compliance sake does not provide UNDP

programme management and UNDP stakeholders with useful and critical and usable information. Managers need critical information to make informed decisions while stakeholders need information on the progress being made and results being achieved and how people's lives are changing. Monitoring and reporting must provide this critical information.

- 7. UNDP needs to learn and find ways of how to translate its global expertise, knowledge and experience so that it responds to local needs and issues if this comparative advantage is to produce meaningful results.
- 8. In an Upper Middle-Income Country like South Africa where UNDP also uses government resources for supporting the government to meet the needs of the people, UNDP must find ways of ensuring that the CO produces annuals plans and monitoring reports that meet the accountability needs of the government and the people. When UNDP uses government resources it must be clear about what the government accountability needs are and ensure that they are met. Above all these accountability requirements must be part of the cost sharing agreement as stipulated by National Treasury.

### 7 Conclusions

This evaluation has raised many issues that demonstrate UNDP's importance and value of its support in South Africa. It has also raised many challenges that sometimes seem to overshadow the good work the organisation had done. Many lessons have also been discussed. UNDP is on the forefront of development support and in capacitating South Africa. The evaluation concludes that "knowing your weaknesses and accepting them is a strength". You cannot fix what you do not know is broken but if you know it is broken you can fix it and avoid reinventing failure. The evaluation concludes that knowing what works well and under what conditions is a strength because you can replicate success and create even greater impact. Therefore, learning from successes is as important as learning from weaknesses or failures. Given these lessons UNDP is poised to take control of its future in South Africa and create even greater impacts.

If being a "Development Partner" means many things to many stakeholders it is easy to see why fundamental questions remain even after 23 years of UNDP's work in South Africa. Development is a long-term process of economic and social change which may be misunderstood by project designers and policy makers. Without a clear Results Based Approach to development, programmes and projects cannot be properly designed, implemented, monitored or evaluated. UNDP is at crossroads regarding its initiatives in South Africa. The challenge before must be tackled with timely and appropriate decisions.

### 8 Annexes

### 8.1 Annex 1: CPD/CPAP Mid Term Evaluation Terms of Reference

### 8.1.1 Background and Programming Context

Since the dawn of democracy in 1994, South Africa has made significant strides in promoting democratic governance, economic growth and social development. It has established a solid foundation for democratic governance with one of the most progressive Constitutions in the world, and it has an active and highly dynamic civil society. Despite the laudable efforts, poverty and unemployment, HIV/AIDS pandemic, institutional and human resources capacity development, and social and physical infrastructural development continue to pose a major challenge to the country. In fact, the key challenge has been to reduce inequality in all forms of its manifestation. In order to achieve this goal: (i) Various innovative policies, strategies, and programs have been formulated by government and are under implementation; and (ii) New institutions have been set up while existing ones have been recalibrated and strengthened.

UNDP has developed its 2013 – 2017 Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) within the context of the key national development policy documents, including the National Development Plan: Vision for 2030; the Medium-Term Strategic Framework 2009-2014; and the New Growth Path; and also in response to the recommendations of the United Nations Joint Evaluation Report on the UN in South Africa, the Partnership Framework Agreement between UNDP and the Government of South Africa. Consultations with a broad range of stakeholders including government departments, research institutes, civil society and national non-governmental organisations have also informed the programme.

The UNDP country programme is also firmly anchored in the UN Strategic Cooperation Framework (SCF) 2013-2017 which is also responsive to the key national development policy documents. The SCF over-arching aim is to consolidate the UN response to the national development priorities and outcomes through four main priority areas: (i) Inclusive growth and decent work; (ii) environmentally sustainable development; (iii) Enhancing human capabilities; and (iv) governance and participation.

UNDP South Africa is seeking for the services of a qualified and experienced service provider/consultant to assist with the mid-term evaluation of its 2013 – 2017 Country Programme Document and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). The purpose and scope of the evaluation have been outline in detail below.

### 8.1.2 Evaluation Purpose

This evaluation is being undertaken to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation of our 2013 – 2017 Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) in South Africa. The country office is currently

implementing the new programme which started from 2013 to end in 2017 which is due for mid-term evaluation. The findings, conclusions, good practices, lessons learned, and recommendations of this evaluation will be used by UNDP to improve its development partnership support services to the Government of South Africa to achieve its national development aspirations. The financial and technical resources of this evaluation have been budgeted by the programme.

### 8.1.3 Evaluation Scope and Objectives

The scope of the evaluation will include assessing the mid-term results of 4 programme components as outlined in our Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP):

# i. Enhancing Inclusive Growth

Under this programme area, UNDP has been supporting the government of South Africa in its efforts to address triple challenge of poverty, inequality and unemployment, especially among youth, women and those living in rural areas. In collaboration with Government, UNDP is implementing four key areas to: (i) support policy dialogue on mechanisms to address the challenges highlighted above (ii) engage the private sector to enhance supplier development programme (SDP) and innovative programmes to help match skills including e-skills with employment opportunities, particularly among youth and women, (iii) build capacity of Government officials in implementing rural development and land reform policies, and (iv) strengthen social protection mechanisms. This evaluation is envisaged to assess UNDP's contribution to Government's efforts on reducing poverty, inequality and enhancing inclusive growth.

# ii. Climate Change and Greening South Africa income

The effects of climate change are posing major threats to the ecosystem and natural resources in South Africa, affecting various sectors and areas where the poor and most vulnerable often earn their livelihoods (i.e., fishing, agriculture, forestry and biodiversity). As a rapidly industrializing country with a rich endowment of natural resources, South Africa's energy use is derived almost entirely from fossil fuels. UNDP has been supporting the Government to achieve its national priorities to green the economy in two key areas (i) Promoting sustainable energy for all through policy advisory services on climate-resilient development strategies, institutional strengthening, and enhancing access to renewable energy technologies; and (ii) Enhancing biodiversity management through policy advisory services on protected area management and employment generation opportunities for improved livelihoods, with particular emphasis on women and youth. These efforts will contribute to stabilizing and reducing carbon emissions and adapting to climate change, thereby contributing to the overall goal of greening the South African economy. Under this programme area, various mid and end of programme evaluations were conducted to assess their contribution to Government's efforts of achieving its national priorities to green the economy.

# iii. Service delivery and Governance

The South Africa's public sector across all spheres of governance has been experiencing uneven public service delivery due to insufficient institutional capacities, and increasing corruption. To address this challenge, the government of South Africa has embarked on a comprehensive public sector reform. UNDP has been providing policy advisory services and targeted institutional interventions to strengthen government capacity to expand and improve equitable delivery of public services, promote community participation, enhance oversight and accountability mechanisms of relevant institutions across national, provincial and municipal levels.

### iv. South Africa's Regional and Global role

One of South Africa's national development outcomes is to create a better South Africa and contribute to a better Africa and a better world on a host of development issues. The achievement of this outcome was envisaged to contributing the South Africa's role in the regional and global arena to advocate for South-South Cooperation, effective development cooperation and raising Africa's voice on development issues through expanding development exchanges, conducting sound analytical and policy work with a regional and global impact as well as organizing dialogues to inform the Post-2015 process among others as well as implement good practices on sustainable development, development in post-conflict and peace-building, in collaboration with government, respective research institutes, and UNDP Bureaus.

# Specifically, this mid-term evaluation has the following objectives:

- to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the results that the programmes have been able to achieve against the objectives, targets and indicators stated in the project document;
- (ii) to assess the effectiveness of the work and processes undertaken in the programmes as well as the performance of all the partners involved in the programme implementation;
- (iii) to assess whether the programmes are the appropriate solution to the identified problem(s);
- (iv) to determine the programme's relevance, and sustainability of results and benefits
- (v) to provide feedback and recommendations for subsequent decision making and necessary steps that need to be taken by the national stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the programme's outcomes/results;
- (vi) to reflect on how efficient the use of available resources has been;
- (vii) to document and provide feedback on lessons learned and best practices generated by the programme during their implementation;
- (viii) to identify unintended results that emerged during implementation (beyond what had initially been planned for);
- (ix) to identify other factors that contributed to the outcomes, if any; and

- (x) to identify key adaptations in response to unforeseen circumstances; and
- (xi) to ascertain whether UNDP's partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective.
- (xii) to assess sustainability of results and benefits

### 8.1.4 Evaluation Criteria & Questions

The following outcome evaluation questions have been defined to generate appropriate information about the effective implementation of the programmes and envisaged outcomes. The proposed questions would help to provide relevant information to make decisions, act, and add to knowledge. These outcome evaluation criteria and questions include:

#### Relevance

- Examine the extent of the CPD/CPAP's relevance to the government of South Africa and its key stakeholder's needs and challenges.
- Examine whether the programmes have been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, social, institutional, etc., changes in the country
- Assess the relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP support to Government in general and specifically to supporting institutional strengthening of the government institutions to address triple challenge of poverty, inequality and unemployment, especially among youth, women and those living in rural areas.
- Examine the extent to which the programme's design related to or responded to the challenges facing the South Africa.
- Analyse how the programme's strategies tackled the causes of those challenges especially the root causes, and whether or not it was informed by genuine consultations of relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries including women.
- Assess whether the capacity of the Government institutions was enhanced to deliver on their mandate;
- Assess whether the activities and outputs of the programme were consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives.
- Assess whether the activities and outputs of the programmes were consistent with the intended outcomes and effects.

#### **Effectiveness**

- Examine how far the programmes have achieved its goals, purpose and targets and whether it is satisfying the expectations of the different groups of beneficiaries.
- Identify indirect or unintended results and the extent to which cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender, governance and accountability) have impacted on, and/or been impacted by the programmes
- Have the outputs been transformed by programme partners into outcomes?
- Assess whether other have stakeholders been involved in programme implementation. How effective have the programmes been in establishing national ownership? Is programme management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the programme objectives?
- Establish whether the programmes make reference to vulnerable and minority groups such as those effected by gender equality, disability, displacement and chronic poverty.
- Establish in which areas does the programmes had the greatest achievements. Why this and what could have been the supporting factors? How can the programmes build on or expand these achievements?
- Determine in which areas the programmes have the least achievements. What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the programme's objectives?
- Establish whether UNDP's contribution added value to the capacity building efforts of the Government institutions

# Efficiency

- Determine the smoothness with which programme activities were being implemented, monitored and evaluated. Has programme implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective?
- Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? In general, do the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results be attained with fewer resources? Assess whether the programme methodology, management/implementation arrangements, activities and resources (funding, staffing and other resources) are being used economically and wisely for achievement of the objectives and results.
- Appraise the sustainability of the programme, including the institutionalisation of interventions;
- Assess whether the programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner

### **Impact**

- To examine the effect of the programmes and their contribution to the Overall Objectives as stated in the CPD. Consideration should also be given on any changes that are being brought about by the programmes and the values of these changes.
- Assess relevance and utilisation of M&E processes

# Sustainability

- Assess the overall management and structure of the programmes, particularly
  focusing on the potential of the programmes to be owned by the local government
  stakeholders, and for it to continue beyond the lifetime of the capacity building
  programme. Consideration should be made for these issues; stakeholder
  ownership of the processes, institutional capacity, whether a supportive
  environment exists and structures have been put in place for continuity
- Provide recommendations on how to build on the achievements of the programmes and ensure that it is sustained by the relevant stakeholders;
- Determine whether the programmes generated the buy- in and credibility needed for sustained impact.
- What changes if any should be made in the current partnership (s) in order to promote long term sustainability?

### **Lessons Learnt**

 To illuminate lessons (both positive and negative) from the programme implementation and evaluation experiences; key lessons from the programme should be harvested. It is from these lessons that recommendations can be drawn from.

### **Cross-Cutting Issues**

- To capture the contribution (positive and negative) to the realisation of crosscutting issues such as gender, MDGs, etc.
- Review the programme's efforts to mainstream gender and ensure the application of UNDP's rights-based approach;

### Recommendations

- To make pragmatic recommendations on improving current and future programmes of this nature.
- To make specific recommendations on how to effectively mainstream gender in future programmes taking advantage of national, regional and international gender equality and local governance contemporary developments and instruments

However, the evaluation team is expected to add and refine these questions in consultation with key stakeholders.

# 8.1.5 Methodology

An evaluation approach is indicated below, however, the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in-line with international criteria and professional norms and standards (as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group). They must be also approved by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. It must be easily understood by programme partners and applicable to the remaining period of the programme duration.

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should be presented in the report in detail. It shall include information on:

- Documentation review (desk study) the list of documents to be reviewed will be provided in advance by the Project Implementation Unit;
- Interviews will be held with the relevant organisations and individuals at minimum;
- · Field visits;
- Questionnaires;
- Participatory techniques and other approaches for the collection and analysis of data.

The consultants should also provide **ratings** of Programme achievements according to programme/Project Review Criteria. Aspects of the Programme to be rated are:

1	Implementation approach	
2	Country ownership/drivers	
3	Outcome/Achievement of objectives (meaning the	
	extent to which the programme's development	
	objectives were achieved)	
4	Stakeholder participation/public involvement	
5	Sustainability	
6	Replication approach	
7	Cost-effectiveness	
8	Contribution to human rights and gender equality	
9	Monitoring and evaluation	

The ratings to be used are:

HS	Highly Satisfactory
S	Satisfactory
MS	Marginally Satisfactory

MU	Marginally	
	Unsatisfactory	
U	Unsatisfactory	
HU	Highly Unsatisfactory	
NA	Not applicable	

# 8.1.6 Evaluation Products (Deliverables)

The key evaluation products that the evaluation consultant is expected to produce should include:

- Evaluation Inception Report An inception report will be prepared by the consultant before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. It should detail the evaluator' understanding of what is to be evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. The purpose of the inception report is to provide an opportunity to verify and share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.
- Draft Evaluation Report The programme unit and key stakeholders will review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.
- Final Evaluation Report.
- Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.

### 8.1.7 Evaluation Team Composition and Required Competencies

The consultant selected should not have participated in the programme preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with programme related activities. The evaluator shall have prior experience in evaluating similar programmes. Former cooperation with UNDP is an advantage.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximising the overall "team" qualifications and competencies in the following areas:

- (i) At least Masters' Degree, preferably in Development and Public Management, Public, Policy Analysis, or related fields in social science;
- (ii) Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies;
- (iii) Experience applying participatory monitoring approaches;

- (iv) Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- (v) Recent knowledge of the UNDP Monitoring and Evaluation Policy;
- (vi) Recent knowledge of UNDP's results-based evaluation policies and procedures
- (vii) Demonstrable analytical skills;
- (viii) Work experience in relevant areas for at least 5 years;
- (ix) Experience with multilateral or bilateral supported capacity development programmes;
- (x) Programme evaluation experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;
- (xi) Excellent English communication skills (oral and written).

The consultant must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore, a consultant who has had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project will not be considered. This may apply equally to evaluator who is associated with organisations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the programme policy-making process and/or delivery of the programme. Any previous association with the programme or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application.

If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation:

- Independence
- Impartiality
- Transparency
- Disclosure
- Ethical
- Partnership
- Competencies and Capacities
- Credibility
- Utility

### 8.1.8 Evaluation Ethics

The consultant must read to be familiar with the evaluation ethics and procedures of the UN System to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information, for example: measures to ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and young people; provisions to store and maintain security of collected information; and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

### **8.1.9 Implementation Arrangements**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNDP South Africa Country office. UNDP South Africa will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the consultant. UNDP will liaise with the consultant to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, etc.

# 8.1.10 Timeframe, Resources, Logistical Support and Deadlines

The evaluation will be completed in a period of about 30 days, from the date of commencement. The report shall be submitted to the UNDP South Africa Country Office.

Prior to approval of the final report, a draft version shall be circulated for comments to government counterparts, programme team and UNDP South Africa. If any discrepancies have emerged between the findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties, these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

Table 1: The activities and timeframe are broken down as follows:

Activity	Timeframe and responsible party
Desk review	5 days by National Consultant
Briefings for consultant	1 day by the UNDP procurement Unit
Field visits, interviews, questionnaires, de- briefings	15 days by the Consultant
Preparation of first draft report	2 days by the Consultant
Review of preliminary findings with programme stakeholders through circulation of the draft report for comments, meetings and other types of feedback mechanisms	4 days UNDP South Africa Office and Government Counterparts
Incorporation of comments from programme stakeholders and submission of second draft report	1 day by the National Consultant
Finalisation of the evaluation report (incorporating comments received on second draft)	1 days by the Team Leader and National Consultant
Stakeholder Validation Workshop of the evaluation report	1 day facilitated by the Team Leader

# 8.1.11 Format of Final Report:

The key product expected from this programme evaluation is a comprehensive analytical report in English that should, at least, include the following contents:

- Title and opening pages
  - Name of the evaluation intervention
  - Names and organizations of evaluators
  - Acknowledgements
- Table of contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Findings and conclusions
  - o Programme Relevance
  - o Programme Results: Progress towards Programme Outcome
  - o Programme Efficiency and Effectiveness
    - -Internal programme efficiency
    - -Partnership strategy
  - Changes in context and outside of programme control
  - Sustainability of results
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learned (including good practices and lessons learned)
- Annexes: ToRs, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, etc.

All interested applicants should submit: a recent CV; Evaluation Proposal with a brief outline of the evaluation approach and methodology; period of availability, a proposed budget for the assignment implementation to: <a href="https://www.undp.org.za">www.undp.org.za</a>. Application Deadline: 31 March 2016.

### 8.2 Annex 2: UNDP CPD Interview List

- 1. Dr Daniels: CEO and Executive Director, Graça Machel Trust
- 2. Mr Walid Badawi: UNDP Country Director
- 3. Mr Khepi Shole UNDP
- 4. Frederick Shikweni: UNDP M&E
- 5. Bongani Motomela: UNDP Governance
- 6. Letsolo: UNDP Inclusive Growth
- 7. Ms Janice Goldings: GEF Programme Manager UNDP South Africa
- 8. Ms Anele Moyo: Small Grants Project UNDP South Africa
- 9. Dr Jenatha Badul GEF/UNDP
- 10. Ms. Nontsikelelo Ngcangumasiya: DDG PDME
- 11. Mr. Stanely Ntakumba: PDME
- 12.Ms. Thuli Radebe: CEO CPSI
- 13. Mr Lindani Mtetwa: CPSI
- 14. Mr Jacques Van Zuydan: DSD
- 15. Deputy Head of Mission: Denmark Embassy
- 16. Japanese Ambassador: Embassy of Japan
- 17. Mr Mosoto Moepys: CEO IEC
- 18. Mr Schaefer: European Union (EU)
- 19. GEF Steering Committee
- 20. GEF Learning Meeting
- 21. Mr Joni Musabayana: ILO
- 22. National Treasury: Mr. RobinToli Chief Director,
- 23. Ms. Nathalie Vereen: Director Social Governance National Treasury,
- 24. Mr. Phozisa Ngadolo: Portfolio Manager, National Treasury,
- 25. Mr. Akona Nakani: Portfolio Manager, National Treasury,
- 26. Ms. Seena Naran: Director Economic & infrastructure cluster, National Treasury.
- 27. Mr Cedrick Crowley: DIRCO
- 28. Ms Percy Moleke: DPME

### 8.3 UNDP CPD Evaluation – List of documents

- 1. Country Program Document for the Republic of South Africa (2013 2017)
- 2. Results Oriented Annual Report 2014, 2015 and 2016
- 3. O.R. Tambo Debate Series Aligning the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to the NDP. Towards Domestication of the SDGs in South Africa
- 4. O.R. Tambo Debate Series Concept Paper for O.R. Tambo Debate 7: Economy, Inclusive Growth and Jobs
- 5. O.R. Tambo Debate 5 Building a Capable State
- 6. UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability an Optional Protocol Department of Social Development
- 7. White Paper on the Rights of Persons with Disability Implementation Matrix 2015 2030 Department of Social Development
- 8. Exploring The Finance Pipeline for Women Owned SSMEs in South Africa UNDP and UN Women: New Faces New Voices
- 9. National Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Framework Strategy Department of Social Development
- Ideas that Work: The South Africa Public Sector Innovation Journal: Fore Sighting and Innovating our Future: Envisioning 2030 and Beyond Vol. 7 Issue 1 2016.
- 11. Ideas the Work: The South African Public Sector Innovation (CPSI) Journal Vol 5. Issue 1 2014
- 12. 10th Public Sector Innovation Conference: Theme Aligning Innovation and Service Delivery Value Chain (CPSI)
- 13. CPSI Ideas that Work Vol 6 Issue 2 2016
- 14. Institutional Capacity Enhancement of Peace Mission Training Centre 00076039 South Africa UNDP Project Report 2013 2015.
- 15. CPSI 2016 Public Sector Innovation Awards
- 16. The 13th CPSI Public Sector Awards 2015
- 17. National Development Plan 2030 Our Future: National Planning Commission
- 18. Turn Around: The Story of South Africa's HIV Response UN AIDS
- 19. The GEF Small Grants Programme South Africa: department of Environmental Affairs.
- 20. The 7th Regional SADC/UNPAN workshop
- 21. UNDP Annual Work Plans 2014; 2015 and 2016.
- 22. UNDP Partnership Action Plan for South Africa
- 23. UNDP Support and Partnership with the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa 2016 2017
- 24. Letter to the Secretary of Parliament September 2016
- 25. Letter to the Secretary of Parliament July 2016
- 26. Minutes of First UNDAF Technical Working Group Inclusive Growth
- 27. Note to the File meeting with Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA).
- 28. Request for Sponsorship to Support the Advisory High Level Panel by Secretary to Parliament.
- 29. UNDP Programme Four: South Africa Regional and Global Role State of the Implementation 2013 2016

- 30. The Consolidation and Repositioning of the south Africa Public Service letter to Resident Coordinator.
- 31. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation June 2016
- 32. Workshop on Integrating Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development (SDGs) and agenda 2063 into NDP and strategies in East and Southern Africa.
- 33. Market Transformation through Energy Efficiency Standards and Labelling of Appliances in South Africa Mid Term Review Report 2015 May
- 34. Terminal Evaluation of the National Grasslands Biodiversity Programme Project May August 2014
- 35. Terminal Evaluation Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity on the South African Wild Coast May 2014.
- 36. Reducing Disaster Risk from Wildlands fire Hazards Associated with Climate Change in South Africa Mid Term review May 2014
- 37. ORASECOM Terminal Evaluation June 2014
- 38. Draft Concept Note (National Treasury UNDP) 26th Nov 2015
- 39. National Treasury and Programme Partnership Coordination (002)