RESULTS REPORT
2016
SAF1001911

FACILITY FOR FRONT LINE SERVICE DELIVERY IMPROVEMENT – TIRELO BOSHA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms

BTC	Belgian Technical Cooperation, the Belgian Development Agency
COGTA	Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
DPSA	Department of Public Service and Administration
PMU	Programme Management Unit
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
BIs	Beneficiary Institutions
DG	Director-General

1 Intervention at a glance (max. 2 pages)

1.1 Intervention form

Intervention title	Public Service Improvement Facility (Tirelo Bosha)
Intervention code	NN 3009760
Location	South Africa
Total budget	€11,000,000
Partner Institution	Department of Public Service and Administration
Start date Specific Agreement	28 June 2013
Date intervention start /Opening steering committee	25 March 2014
Planned end date of execution period	31 December 2018
End date Specific Agreement	27 June 2019
Target groups	• Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) • Department of Corporate Governance (DCOG) • All South African Government Departments (national, provincial and local) • Institutions referred to in *Chapter 9* of the 1996 Constitution of South Africa • Non state actors involved in public service delivery
Impact[1]	Front-line Public Service Delivery is Improved
Outcome	New Ways of Delivering Public Services by Funding Improvement Initiatives are Piloted
Outputs	A Grant Facility to Support Initiatives to Improve Public Service Delivery is Established and Implemented
	New and Innovative Ways of Public Service Delivery are Piloted and Implemented
	Sound Practices and Lessons Learned from Improved Public Service Delivery Pilots are Enhanced and Sustained
Year covered by the report	2016

---

[1] Impact refers to global objective, Outcome refers to specific objective, output refers to expected result

1.2 Budget execution

	Budget	Expenditure		Balance	Disbursement rate at the end of year n
		Previous years: 2013-2015	Year covered by report (n)		
Total	€ 11.000.000	€ 3.505.229,41	€ 3.052.559,07	€ 4.442.211,52	59,62%
Output 1	€ 35.000	€ 35.000	€ 0	€ 0	100%
Output 2	€ 9.100.000	€ 2.870.000	€ 2.660.992,98	€ 3.569.007,02	60,78%
Output 3	€ 220.000	€ 80.000	€ 140.000	€ 0	100%
Budgetary reserve & general means	€ 1.645.000	€ 520.229,41	€ 251.566,09	€ 873.204,50	46,92%

1.3 Self-assessment performance

1.3.1 Relevance

	Performance
Relevance	A

The programme clearly conforms to the policies of South Africa and Belgium. Support provided by the programme represents "seed money" that will assist the beneficiary institutions to initiate the intervention. The beneficiary institutions have set aside, from their government budget, funds to continue supporting the initiative after one year of piloting. The interventions are part of the strategy and policy of the beneficiary institutions. Service delivery remains a high priority for the government of South Africa.

1.3.2 Effectiveness

	Performance
Effectiveness	A

The programme is a learning facility with progress being made at activity, output and outcome level towards contributing to frontline service delivery innovation. Calls for Proposals were well communicated and responded to. Evaluation, management, coaching and compliance are built on that basis with continuous improvement through learning of the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) and the Programme Management Unit (PMU). Given that the intervention forms part of the beneficiary institutions policies and strategies, the outcome will be achieved. If there are modifications to be made, these have already been mitigated during the planning of the intervention. The beneficiary institutions have submitted a list of potential risks and also a plan on how those risks will be mitigated

1.3.3 Efficiency

	Performance
Efficiency	A

All applications from beneficiary institutions were received on time. Although there was an initial delay with the transfer of funds most projects are on track and will be implemented within time, scope and budget. Lessons learned in the 1st call for proposals have been considered in the decisions for the 2nd call for proposals. The action plans and work plans are monitored closely by the PMU.

1.3.4 Potential sustainability

	Performance
Potential sustainability	A

South African ownership of the programme design and implementation is obvious at all levels (for example the high level of sustained active participation by senior government officials in PSC meetings), policy support is 100% and the programme and pilots are firmly embedded in SA government at all levels. Capacity development in terms of promoting a culture of innovation and of using M&E as a mutual learning tool between stakeholders at facility and pilot level are at the core of TB. The Programme Steering Committee (PSC), through the Programme Management Unit (PMU), will be intimately involved in the implementation of the interventions and the PMU will also form part of the implementation committee at the local level. The Director-Generals (DGs) and Head of Departments (HoD) of the beneficiary institutions have signed off on the applications and thereby confirming full departmental support for the interventions. The costs of implementing the interventions will be borne by the beneficiary institutions after the pilot phase. These interventions are an integral part of the policies of beneficiary institutions (BIs) and the only reason why they have applied for funding is to use that as seed funding. Two pilots were assessed for replication in 2016 and both have been approved by the PSC for replication.

Upscaling, which is the next phase after replication, will be taken up by GoSA and will provide for a mechanism to lead flagship projects towards long-term sustainability and broad-based implementation. The project has drawn lots of attention from the Donor community and Canada has subsequently approved a budget to support the programme in the Replication and Upscaling phase through the financing of activities and personnel.

1.4 Conclusions

The project got off to a very good start with lots of enthusiasm from the Beneficiary Institutions, partnerships with government, Government Departments working directly on the programme and other potential Donors. The full cycle of the first call for proposals has been completed and the overall results are satisfactory.
  • It was proven that providing technical support to beneficiary institutions was critical as these institutions now are familiar with the logical frameworks and reporting requirements.
  • Buy-in from the Directors-General and Head of Departments has been obtained and the intervention is part of the department policies, strategies and budget.
  • The Programme Steering Committee, through the Programme Management Unit, is and will be intimately involved in the implementation of the interventions.
  • Risks have been identified and a plan mitigating the risks has been submitted which indicates how the identified risks will be managed.
  • A total of 41 agreements have been executed through the 2014 and 2015 calls for

proposals.

- An additional 19 applications have been approved by the PSC in December 2016. Once the agreements have been executed, at most 60 projects will be implemented.

National execution official	BTC execution official
Raymond Reddy 10 – 04 – 2017	Moti Motshwane 10/04/2017

2 Results Monitoring[2]

2.1 Evolution of the context

2.1.1 General context

The second decade of democracy has been characterized by the escalation of service delivery protests. Despite its successes, South Africa still faces major socio-economic challenges. The delivery of basic municipal services still needs to be improved, in particular at local level. Therefore challenges in the system of governance, such as capacity gaps in local government and the poor quality of some public services, require special attention.

2.1.2 Institutional context

The financial year 2014/15 was a transitional year between the conclusion of the implementation of activities in the 2009/14 strategic plans and the implementation of priorities in the draft 2014/19 Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF). The Annual Performance Plan of DPSA for 2014/15 included ministerial priorities, targets from the draft 2014/19 MTSF as well as targets as articulated in the 2013/15 Strategic Plan. The ministerial priorities include the following:
- Support interventions for service delivery improvement
- Improved management of discipline
- Implementation of PSCBC Resolutions
- Public Service Charter
- Complaints and Compliments Framework
- Monitoring compliance to public service regulations
- Annual sports and wellness days
- Productivity Management framework
- Directive on Compulsory Training and Mandatory Training Days
- Performance Awards and Recognitions System
- Single Public Service policies and legislative frameworks
- Framework for Section 100 interventions
- Investigation of corruption related cases
- E-Disclosure System

2.1.3 Management context: execution modalities

South African ODA guidelines require donor funds to flow via the GoSA system. This alignment to GoSA's advanced system of public financial management is recommendable and very appropriate in order to allow DPSA to enforce the accountability of the Beneficiary Institutions in the implementation of the programme and to allow effective M&E through the appropriate channels within the GoSA.

---

[2] Impact refers to global objective, Outcome refers to specific objective, output refers to expected result

2.1.4 Harmo context

The strong political focus is on ensuring an efficient, effective, and development-orientated public service and an empowered, fair, and inclusive citizenship, as outlined in the National Development Plan. This has attracted many actors vying to support or to work with the Government in achieving this objective. The programme management, BTC and the Belgian Embassy have therefore received many inquiries on complimenting Tirelo Bosha.

2.2 Performance outcome

2.2.1 Progress of indicators[3]

Outcome: New Ways of Delivering Public Services by Funding Improvement Initiatives are Piloted					
Indicators[4]	Baseline value[5]	Value year N-1[6]	Value 2016[7]	Target 2017 N[8]	End Target[9]
Number of proposals selected for replication.	0		2	5	7

2.2.2 Analysis of progress made

The programme commenced in January 2014 and was officially launched in April 2014. The Programme Manager was recruited, however, with budgetary challenges. The agreement between the GoSA and UNDP to fund the PMU did not materialise and the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) had to approve the re-allocation of project budget to fund the Programme Manager and the Finance & Grant Facility Officer. Given that the programme was moving at a faster pace, the PSC approved that all PMU staff had to be funded from the programme budget. A budget re-alignment was made in November 2016. This did not, however, have any negative impact on the project funds since DPSA absorbed start-up costs and certain general budget lines.

The following has transpired since the launch:
- From the first call for proposals, 15 applications were approved amounting ZAR 24,152,509; 10 of those agreements have expired
- 4 of the remaining 5 agreements will expire by 31 March 2017 and 1 by 30 June 2017.

---

[3] You can use the table provided, or you can replace it by your own monitoring matrix format. Add/delete columns according to the context (some interventions will need to add columns for previous years while other – new - interventions will not have a value for the previous year).
[4] Use the indicators as shown in the logical framework (from TFF or last version of logical framework)
[5] The value of the indicator at time 0. Refers to the value of the indicators at the beginning of the intervention (baseline)
[6] The achieved value of the indicator at the end of year N-1
[7] The achieved value of the indicator at the end of year N. If the value has not changed since the baseline or since the previous year, this value should be repeated.
[8] The planned target at the end of year N
[9] The target value at the end of the intervention

- From the second call for proposals, 195 applications were received and of the 195, 27 applications amounting to ZAR 44,904,460 were approved by the PSC.
- Agreements to 26 institutions totalling ZAR 43,079,804 were signed while 1 application was withdrawn.
- During the second evaluation round based on the second call for proposals, three groups of applicants (50 in total) were invited to submit full applications:
  - Two groups of similar proposals that were successful in the 2015 call for proposals, in the field of Information Management Systems and telemedicine;
  - Successful concept note applicants that did not submit a full application;
  - Unsuccessful concept note applicants that received a high score on relevance;

  The PMU received 30 applications, of which 19 were approved by the PSC for an amount of R34 484 840. Agreements are currently being processed.
- 2 of the 15 grantees for 2014 (Department of Environmental Affairs) were assessed to determine whether they were worthy to be replicated. The assessment recommended that the 2 projects were to be replicated.
- A Midterm Programme Review was conducted and the results were very positive.

Some challenges were:
- The PMU is fully staffed and this issue is no longer a challenge.

2.2.3 Potential Impact

The Programme management is guided by the mandates of the implementing department with a mission that is aligned with the objective of the programme. The evaluation and approval processes are quite stringent and focus on adhering to the objectives of the call for proposals. Implementation of the 2014 grants has been satisfactory and the 2015 grantees have confirmed that they will be able to meet targets as indicated in their work plans.

2.3 Performance output 1[10]

2.3.1 Progress of indicators

Output 1: A Grant Facility to Support Initiatives to Improve Public Service Delivery is Established and Implemented					
Indicators	Baseline value	Value 2015	Value 2016	Target 2017	End Target
Number of Calls for Proposals launched	0	0	2	0	2
Number of full applications approved for funding	0	0	15+26+18 =59	N/A	59
M&E plan developed	0	0	1	1	1

2.3.2 Progress of main activities

Progress of __main__ activities [11]	Progress:			
	A	B	C	D
1 Define admission and selection criteria and the process by which a call for proposal will be ruled.		X		
2 Launch an information campaign and implement a communication strategy with the objective to inform about the Facility and to ensure that potential Beneficiary Institutions know how to apply and get support in doing so.		X		
3 Launch call for proposals twice a year.		X		
4 Develop and implement a support strategy of Beneficiary Institutions.		X		

2.3.3 Analysis of progress made

Since the programme was launched in April 2014 and 15 applicants were approved by the programme steering committee for funding, implementation is well underway. The 2nd call

---

[10] The template accommodates up to 3 Outputs (chapters 2.2, 2.3, 2.4). If the intervention has more outputs, simply copy and paste additional output chapters. If the intervention has less than 3 outputs, simply delete the unnecessary chapters).
As for the outcome level, you may also replace this table by the intervention's own format (e.g. from your operational monitoring tool)

[11] A: The activities are ahead of schedule
B   The activities are on schedule
C   The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
D   The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

for proposals was finalised in November 2015 and 27 proposals were approved by the steering committee. However, only 26 agreements were processed because 1 application was withdrawn. Based on the second evaluation round based on the 2015 Call for Proposals as mentioned in 2.2.2, an additional 19 projects were approved for funding.

The PMU capacity was increased with the approval of positions for an Administrative Assistant and Grants Facility Manager who is focussing on the support to the individual projects by providing technical assistance to applicants when requested. The additional resources have allowed the PMU to conduct regular site visits to monitor progress. Through these monitoring visits the PMU has managed to identity implementation challenges, and has been and will be able to manage them effectively.

2.4 Performance output 2

2.4.1 Progress of indicators

Output 2: New and Innovative Ways of Public Service Delivery are Piloted and Implemented					
Indicators	Baseline value	Value year N-1	Value year N	Target year N	End Target
Number of individual result frameworks developed	0	0	35	35	59
Number of site visits	0	0		30	104

2.4.2 Progress of main activities

Progress of <u>main</u> activities [12]	Progress:			
	A	B	C	D
1 Support proposals for improvement initiatives that are innovative and lead to better frontline public service delivery.		X		
2 Establish individual result frameworks for improvement initiatives and monitor their implementation.		X		
3 Evaluate the outcomes of the improvement initiatives.		X		

2.4.3 Analysis of progress made

Implementation of these activities is on track.

---

[12] A: The activities are ahead of schedule
B The activities are on schedule
C The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
D The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

2.5 Performance output 3[13]

2.5.1 Progress of indicators

Output 3: Sound Practices and Lessons Learned from Improved Public Service Delivery Pilots are Enhanced and Sustained					
Indicators	Baseline value	Value year N-1	Value year N	Target year N	End Target
Number of projects in the system meeting the criteria of replication	0	0	0	7	Minimum 7
Number of users of data management system	0	0	0	0	/
Number of publications by government entities and/or their partners publishing successful projects	0	0	Target will be added later on		
Number of pilot projects up-scaled by government	0	0	0	0	5

2.5.2 Progress of main activities

Progress of main activities [14]	Progress:			
	A	B	C	D
1 Establish a data management system to monitor all improvement initiatives and record all lessons learned in order to establish a body of knowledge related to improving public service delivery.			X	
2 Disseminate innovative ideas, best practice and share piloted experiences with stakeholders through appropriate methods.			X	
3 Create awareness about the grant Facility and the piloted improvement initiatives.			X	

2.5.3 Analysis of progress made

These activities will only be implemented in 2017/18.

---

[13] *If the Logical Framework contains more than three Outputs, copy-paste the 2.4 chapter and create 2.6 for Output 4 , 2.7 for Output 5, etc.*

[14] A: The activities are ahead of schedule
B   The activities are on schedule
C   The activities are delayed, corrective measures are required.
D   The activities are seriously delayed (more than 6 months). Substantial corrective measures are required.

2.6 Transversal Themes

2.6.1 Gender

Although there are only 4 projects that focus specifically on women and girl child, this group will benefit from all projects as they are geared towards the improvement of whole communities.

2.6.2 Environment

14 applications are focussed on waste management including e-waste, energy preservation, municipal waste, water preservation and sustainable farming..

2.6.3 Good Governance

The bulk of the applications are geared towards making things work better in government including developing policy on farm workers' housing needs, setting up a model for residents to lodge complaints and getting the municipality to respond to those complaints.

2.6.4 HIV/AIDS

No proposals on HIV/AIDS. However, there are health related agreements.

2.7 Risk management

Risk Identification			Risk analysis			Risk Treatment			Follow-up of risk	
Description of Risk	Period of identification	Risk category	Probability	Potential Impact	Total	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status
• High turnover of Beneficiary institution staff nationally and in the provinces.	12 months	Low		It will delay implementation		Will ensure that the programme deals with more than 1 person from institutions	PMU/BI	2017	So far, there has been no turnover of staff at the beneficiary institutions	ongoing
• Restructuring of Government departments and organisations.	12 months	Low		It will delay implementation		Will remain vigilant and ensure proper handover	PMU/BI	Open-ended	There were no restructurings following the 2016 local elections that negatively impacted on the projects managed by the PMU.	ongoing
• Shifting government prioritizations result in some aspects of the programme not being sustained into the future.	12 months	Low		It may lead to the cancellation of the non-achievement of key result area 3		Will remain vigilant and ensure that relevant adjustments are made to the results/indicators	PMU	Open-ended	The themes for calls for proposals are based on government priorities	ongoing

3 Steering and Learning

3.1 Strategic re-orientations

Implementation started in 2015 and valuable experience has been learned. A Midterm Programme Review was conducted in 2016, which came out with recommendations and these were accepted by the PSC. These recommendations coupled with the M&E plan will have the effect of ensuring that the programme have SMART performance indicators and a useful framework. The Knowledge Management Expert will develop tools that will ensure that information and knowledge are captured and used strategically.

Replication Assessment started in October 2016 and as at the reporting period, 2 projects have been assessed and recommended for replications.

3.2 Recommendations

Recommendations	Actor	Deadline
Evaluation	PMU	Finalized
Replication	PMU	October 2016 to May 2017
Knowledge Management Expert	PMU	April 2017
Monitoring & Evaluation Expert	PMU	July 2017

3.3 Lessons Learned

Lessons learned	Target audience
There should be more provincial meetings before calls for proposals are made. These meetings were held and led to the improvement of quality of applications from less resourced provinces.	Officials of the provincial governments
Themes for calls for proposals must be focussed and not be too broad. The themes were focussed on back to basics and ICT. This focus led to fewer applications being rejected as compared to the first call.	Applicants

It was decided to lower the level of authority to sign off on concept note applications, as many challenges were encountered with the unavailability of high level government officials. This led to the administrative disapproval of many concept notes. During the 2015 Call for Proposals, concept notes were expected to be signed off as follows: | National level	Deputy Director General
Provincial level	Chief Director
Local level	Executive Managers/Managers directly accountable to City/Municipal Managers in terms of Section 57 of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act. 2000. | To ensure high level ownership of the projects, full applications were still expected to be signed off by the head of organisation.	At provincial level, chief directors sign, at national government, deputy director generals; and at municipality level executive directors
Site visits should be conducted to successful grantees to ensure that they are familiar with the terms and conditions of the grant agreements.	Grantees

4 Annexes

4.1 Quality criteria

1. RELEVANCE: The degree to which the intervention is in line with local and national policies and priorities as well as with the expectations of the beneficiaries				
In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D'= C; at least one 'D' = D				
Assessment RELEVANCE: total score	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**
	X			

1.1 What is the present level of relevance of the intervention?

X	A	Clearly still embedded in national policies and Belgian strategy, responds to aid effectiveness commitments, highly relevant to needs of target group.
...	B	Still fits well in national policies and Belgian strategy (without always being explicit), reasonably compatible with aid effectiveness commitments, relevant to target group's needs.
...	C	Some issues regarding consistency with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid effectiveness or relevance.
...	D	Contradictions with national policies and Belgian strategy, aid efficiency commitments; relevance to needs is questionable. Major adaptations needed.

1.2 As presently designed, is the intervention logic still holding true?

X	A	Clear and well-structured intervention logic; feasible and consistent vertical logic of objectives; adequate indicators; Risks and Assumptions clearly identified and managed; exit strategy in place (if applicable).
	B	Adequate intervention logic although it might need some improvements regarding hierarchy of objectives, indicators, Risk and Assumptions.
	C	Problems with intervention logic may affect performance of intervention and capacity to monitor and evaluate progress; improvements necessary.
	D	Intervention logic is faulty and requires major revision for the intervention to have a chance of success.

2. EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION TO DATE: Degree to which the resources of the intervention (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted into results in an economical way				
In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least two 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B', no 'C' or 'D' = B; at least one 'C', no 'D'= C; at least one 'D' = D				
Assessment EFFICIENCY : total score	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**
	X			

2.1 How well are inputs (financial, HR, goods & equipment) managed?

X	A	All inputs are available on time and within budget.
	B	Most inputs are available in reasonable time and do not require substantial budget adjustments. However there is room for improvement.
	C	Availability and usage of inputs face problems, which need to be addressed; otherwise results may be at risk.

	D	Availability and management of inputs have serious deficiencies, which threaten the achievement of results. Substantial change is needed.

2.2 How well is the implementation of activities managed?

	A	Activities implemented on schedule
X	B	Most activities are on schedule. Delays exist, but do not harm the delivery of outputs
	C	Activities are delayed. Corrections are necessary to deliver without too much delay.
	D	Serious delay. Outputs will not be delivered unless major changes in planning.

2.3 How well are outputs achieved?

	A	All outputs have been and most likely will be delivered as scheduled with good quality contributing to outcomes as planned.
X	B	Output delivery is and will most likely be according to plan, but there is room for improvement in terms of quality, coverage and timing.
	C	Some output are/will be not delivered on time or with good quality. Adjustments are necessary.
	D	Quality and delivery of outputs has and most likely will have serious deficiencies. Major adjustments are needed to ensure that at least the key outputs are delivered on time.

---

3. EFFECTIVENESS TO DATE: Degree to which the outcome (Specific Objective) is achieved as planned at the end of year N

In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: 'At least one 'A', no 'C' or 'D' = A; Two times 'B' = B; At least one 'C', no 'D'= C; at least one 'D' = D

Assessment EFFECTIVENESS : total score	A	B	C	D
	X			

3.1 As presently implemented what is the likelihood of the outcome to be achieved?

X	A	Full achievement of the outcome is likely in terms of quality and coverage. Negative effects (if any) have been mitigated.
	B	Outcome will be achieved with minor limitations; negative effects (if any) have not caused much harm.
	C	Outcome will be achieved only partially among others because of negative effects to which management was not able to fully adapt. Corrective measures have to be taken to improve ability to achieve outcome.
	D	The intervention will not achieve its outcome unless major, fundamental measures are taken.

3.2 Are activities and outputs adapted (when needed), in order to achieve the outcome?

X	A	The intervention is successful in adapting its strategies / activities and outputs to changing external conditions in order to achieve the outcome. Risks and assumptions are managed in a proactive manner.
	B	The intervention is relatively successful in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in order to achieve its outcome. Risks management is rather passive.
	C	The intervention has not entirely succeeded in adapting its strategies to changing external conditions in a timely or adequate manner. Risk management has been rather static. An important change in strategies is necessary in order to ensure the intervention can achieve its outcome.
	D	The intervention has failed to respond to changing external conditions, risks were insufficiently managed. Major changes are needed to attain the outcome.

4. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY: The degree of likelihood to maintain and reproduce the benefits of an intervention in the long run (beyond the implementation period of the intervention).

In order to calculate the total score for this quality criterion, proceed as follows: At least 3 'A's, no 'C' or 'D' = A ; Maximum two 'C's, no 'D' = B; At least three 'C's, no 'D' = C ; At least one 'D' = D

Assessment POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY : total score	A	B	C	D
	X			

4.1 Financial/economic viability?

	A	Financial/economic sustainability is potentially very good: costs for services and maintenance are covered or affordable; external factors will not change that.
X	B	Financial/economic sustainability is likely to be good, but problems might arise namely from changing external economic factors.
	C	Problems need to be addressed regarding financial sustainability either in terms of institutional or target groups costs or changing economic context.
	D	Financial/economic sustainability is very questionable unless major changes are made.

4.2 What is the level of ownership of the intervention by target groups and will it continue after the end of external support?

X	A	The steering committee and other relevant local structures are strongly involved in all stages of implementation and are committed to continue producing and using results.
	B	Implementation is based in a good part on the steering committee and other relevant local structures, which are also somewhat involved in decision-making. Likeliness of sustainability is good, but there is room for improvement.
	C	The intervention uses mainly ad-hoc arrangements and the steering committee and other relevant local structures to ensure sustainability. Continued results are not guaranteed. Corrective measures are needed.
	D	The intervention depends completely on ad-hoc structures with no prospect of sustainability. Fundamental changes are needed to enable sustainability.

4.3 What is the level of policy support provided and the degree of interaction between intervention and policy level?

X	A	Policy and institutions have been highly supportive of intervention and will continue to be so.
	B	Policy and policy enforcing institutions have been generally supportive, or at least have not hindered the intervention, and are likely to continue to be so.
	C	Intervention sustainability is limited due to lack of policy support. Corrective measures are needed.
	D	Policies have been and likely will be in contradiction with the intervention. Fundamental changes needed to make intervention sustainable.

4.4 How well is the intervention contributing to institutional and management capacity?

	A	Intervention is embedded in institutional structures and has contributed to improve the institutional and management capacity (even if this is not an explicit goal).
X	B	Intervention management is well embedded in institutional structures and has somewhat contributed to capacity building. Additional expertise might be required. Improvements in order to guarantee sustainability are possible.
	C	Intervention relies too much on ad-hoc structures instead of institutions; capacity building has not been sufficient to fully ensure sustainability. Corrective measures are needed.
	D	Intervention is relying on ad hoc and capacity transfer to existing institutions, which could guarantee sustainability, is unlikely unless fundamental changes are undertaken.

4.2 Decisions taken by the steering committee and follow-up

Decision to take	Period of identification	Timing	Source	Actor	Action(s)	Resp.	Deadline	Progress	Status
Adjustment of the Facility budget to reflect DPSA contribution and PMU funding	2016			PMU	Amendment of budget to reflect changes	PMU	2016	Done	Completed
More Strategic meeting with key roles players should be convened to gauge how far the project would extend post Belgian Funding	Continuous			DPSA/ NT/ DPME & BTC	Convene regular meeting	PMU	2016	Regular meetings are held	ongoing
Unsuccessful applicants with relevant concepts should be given an opportunity to resubmit in the next call with support from experts	2015			PMU	PMU to engage with applicants to determine problems encountered and what assistance is required to prepare better proposals. 26 concept applicants who scored high points (12 or more) on relevance but could not obtain the overall average score of 30 were requested to submit full applications. 17 such applications were received and evaluated, and 8 were approved and 9 were not approved.	PMU	2015	Provincial workshops were held in poorly resourced provinces (North West, Free State, Limpopo, Mpumalanga, KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape and Free State) and there is an improvement on the number of applications received and approved from those provinces	Complete
Strengthening of intergovernmental information sharing	2015			PMU	PMU should explore GoSA platforms to advertise/ communicate the programme and to list approved interventions	PMU	2016	PMU is working with DPSA communications unit.	ongoing
Evaluations of future calls should adopt a developmental approach to	2015			PMU	Action to be elaborated during task team meetings	PMU	2015	A decision was taken that it will not be necessary for this	complete

allow the process to handle better the applications from poorer Provinces						action since projects will be upscaled to these poorly resourced provinces
						completed
Conducting of a Midterm Programme Review	2016	PMU	The Midterm Programme Review was conducted in August 2016 and finalized in September 2016. The PSC accepted its recommendations	PMU	2016	PSC accepted recommendations
Holding workshops for grantees who are implementing similar projects in order to share knowledge and experience.	2017	PMU	PMU to facilitate these workshops	PMU	2017	The PSC agreed that the workshops be held after the awards have been made, if necessary. The Programme is currently being developed
						ongoing
Partner with Government Technical Assistance Centre to conduct a replication assessment on fourteen 2014 grants. Fund projects that are recommended for replication.	2017	PMU	The PSC approved 2 projects implemented by the Department of Environmental Affairs for replication	PMU	2017	A No-Objection-Letter was requested from BTC and once received, agreements will be finalized
						ongoing

4.3 Updated Logical framework

Not applicable

4.4 MoRe Results at a glance

Logical framework's results or indicators modified in last 12 months?	None
Baseline Report registered on PIT?	Report under validation.
Planning MTR (registration of report)	Finalized in September 2016
Planning ETR (registration of report)	N/A
Backstopping missions since 01/01/2012	2

4.5 "Budget versus Current (y – m)" Report

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of SAF1001911

Project Title : The Belgian-South African Training Facility Partnership

Budget Version : D01
Currency : EUR
YtM : Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

Year to month : 31/12/2016

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2015	Expenses 2016	Total	Balance	% Exec
A To PILOT NEW WAYS OF DELIVERING PUBLIC SERVICES BY			9.355.000,00	2.985.000,00	2.800.992,98	5.785.992,98	3.569.007,02	62%
01 A grant Facility to support initiatives to improve public			35.000,00	35.000,00	0,00	35.000,00	0,00	100%
01 Start-up activities		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
02 Definition of admission and selection criteria		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
03 Definition of information and communication strategy		COGES	35.000,00	35.000,00	0,00	35.000,00	0,00	100%
04 Definition of support strategy of Beneficiary institutions		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
05 Launching of information and communication strategy		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
06 Launching calls of proposals		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
07 Implementing of support strategy for Beneficiary		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
08 Selection of improvement initiatives (including study tours,		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
09 Implementation of improvement initiatives		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
10 Visibility and knowledge dissemination		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
02 New and innovative ways of public service delivery are			9.100.000,00	2.870.000,00	2.660.992,98	5.530.992,98	3.569.007,02	61%
01 Support proposals for improvement initiatives		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
02 Establish individual result frameworks for improvement		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
03 Evaluate the outcomes of the improvement initiatives		COGES	90.000,00	0,00	90.000,00	90.000,00	0,00	100%
04 Launching calls of proposals		COGES	15.000,00	15.000,00	0,00	15.000,00	0,00	100%
05 Implementing of support strategy for Beneficiary		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
06 Selection of improvement initiatives (including study tours,		COGES	25.000,00	5.000,00	20.000,00	25.000,00	0,00	100%
07 Implementation of improvement initiatives		COGES	8.800.000,00	2.850.000,00	2.550.000,00	5.400.000,00	3.400.000,00	61%
08 Visibility and knowledge dissemination		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
09 Visibility and knowledge dissemination		REGIE	130.000,00	0,00	992,98	992,98	129.007,02	1%
	REGIE		670.000,00	5.229,41	52.559,07	57.788,48	612.211,52	9%
	COGEST		10.330.000,00	3.500.000,00	3.000.000,00	6.500.000,00	3.830.000,00	63%
	TOTAL		11.000.000,00	3.505.229,41	3.052.559,07	6.557.788,48	4.442.211,52	60%

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of SAF1001911 Printed on donderdag 23 maart 2017

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of SAF1001911

Project Title : The Belgian-South African Training Facility Partnership

Budget Version: D01
Currency : EUR
YtM : Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

Year to month : 31/12/2016

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2015	Expenses 2016	Total	Balance	% Exec
10 Establish individual result frameworks for improvement		REGIE	40.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	40.000,00	0%
03 Sound practices and lessons learned from improved			220.000,00	80.000,00	140.000,00	220.000,00	0,00	100%
01 Establish a data management system		COGES	80.000,00	80.000,00	0,00	80.000,00	0,00	100%
02 Analyse the results of the experiences		COGES	60.000,00	0,00	60.000,00	60.000,00	0,00	100%
03 Disseminate innovative experiences and results		COGES	80.000,00	0,00	80.000,00	80.000,00	0,00	100%
X BUDGETARY RESERVE (MAX 5% * TOTAL ACTIVITIES)			200.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	200.000,00	0%
01 Budgetary reserve			200.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	200.000,00	0%
01 Budgetary reserve		COGES	200.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	200.000,00	0%
02 Budgetary reserve		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
Z GENERAL MEANS			1.445.000,00	520.229,41	251.566,09	771.795,50	673.204,50	53%
01 Investments			0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
01 Office equipment		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
02 IT equipment		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
02 Operational & maintenance costs			460.000,00	60.000,00	35.000,00	95.000,00	365.000,00	21%
01 Transport		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
02 Telecommunication		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
03 Office supplies		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
04 Missions		COGES	100.000,00	45.000,00	25.000,00	70.000,00	30.000,00	70%
05 External communication & representation		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
06 Training		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
07 Consultancy		COGES	125.000,00	15.000,00	10.000,00	25.000,00	100.000,00	20%
08 Other operational costs		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
		REGIE	670.000,00	5.229,41	52.559,07	57.788,48	612.211,52	9%
		COGEST	10.330.000,00	3.500.000,00	3.000.000,00	6.500.000,00	3.830.000,00	63%
		TOTAL	11.000.000,00	3.505.229,41	3.052.559,07	6.557.788,48	4.442.211,52	60%

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of SAF1001911 Printed on donderdag 23 maart 2017

Project Title: The Belgian-South African Training Facility Partnership

Budget Version: D01
Currency: EUR
YtM: Year to month: 31/12/2016

Report includes all closed transactions until the end date of the chosen closing

	Status	Fin Mode	Amount	Start to 2015	Expenses 2016	Total	Balance	% Exec
09 Office Space		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
10 Service and maintenance (office)		COGES	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
11 Training		REGIE	50.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	50.000,00	0%
12 Consultancy		REGIE	135.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	135.000,00	0%
13 Missions		REGIE	50.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	50.000,00	0%
03 Audit, monitoring & evaluation			250.000,00	5.229,41	51.566,09	56.795,50	193.204,50	23%
01 Monitoring & evaluation		REGIE	100.000,00	4.955,33	39.325,36	44.280,69	55.719,31	44%
02 Final evaluation		REGIE	25.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	25.000,00	0%
03 Audit		REGIE	100.000,00	0,00	10.600,00	10.600,00	89.400,00	11%
04 Backstopping		REGIE	25.000,00	274,08	1.640,73	1.914,81	23.085,19	8%
04 Personnel Costs			735.000,00	455.000,00	165.000,00	620.000,00	115.000,00	84%
01 Assistant Technique - Programme Manager		COGES	325.000,00	225.000,00	0,00	225.000,00	100.000,00	69%
02 Grants/ Finance Manager		COGES	200.000,00	130.000,00	70.000,00	200.000,00	0,00	100%
03 M & E Expert		REGIE	15.000,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	15.000,00	0%
04 Communications Management Expert		COGES	0,00	0,00	80.000,00	80.000,00	-80.000,00	?%
05 Administrative Assistant		COGES	30.000,00	0,00	15.000,00	15.000,00	15.000,00	50%
06 Grants Facility Manager		COGES	165.000,00	100.000,00	0,00	100.000,00	65.000,00	61%
99 Conversion rate adjustment			0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
98 Conversion rate adjustment		REGIE	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	?%
REGIE			670.000,00	5.229,41	52.559,07	57.788,48	612.211,52	9%
COGEST			10.330.000,00	3.500.000,00	3.000.000,00	6.500.000,00	3.830.000,00	63%
TOTAL			11.000.000,00	3.505.229,41	3.052.559,07	6.557.788,48	4.442.211,52	60%

Budget vs Actuals (Year to Month) of SAF1001911 Printed on donderdag 23 maart 2017

4.5 Communication resources

A draft communication strategy was developed by DPSA Communication Unit. This strategy will be shared with a Knowledge Expert who is expected to come on board in April 2017. In the meantime, DPSA Communication Unit is providing assistance to the Facility.