cooperative governance
& traditional affairs

Department:
Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DISASTER MANAGEMENT MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

March 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. **INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

The international community agrees that monitoring and evaluation has a strategic role to play in informing policy making processes. The aim is to improve relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of policy reforms. Over the last two decades, countries around the world have undertaken and implemented reforms that are aimed at improving the effectiveness and relevance of public sector management. The importance of outcomes was reinforced by governments, driven by a political imperative to produce and to be able to demonstrate results of importance to the political leadership and to the citizenry. This resulted in many countries developing country-led monitoring and evaluation systems to enhance evidence-based policy making. This important development is aimed at facilitating the availability of evidence relevant to country-specific data needs to monitor policy reforms and national development goals, whilst at the same time, ensuring technical rigour through monitoring and evaluation capacity development. However, effective country-led monitoring and evaluation systems will also have to address a second challenge: to bridge the gap between policy-makers (the users of evidence) and statisticians, evaluators and researchers (the providers of evidence).

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) provides decision makers with the ability to draw on causal linkages between the choice of policy priorities, resourcing, programmes, the services actually delivered and the ultimate impact on communities. M&E provides answers to the "so what" question, thus addressing the accountability concerns of stakeholders and give public sector managers information on progress toward achieving stated targets and goals. It also provides substantial evidence as the basis for any necessary corrections in policies, programmes, or projects. Whilst the primary purpose of monitoring is to determine if what is taking place is as planned, evaluation is intended to identify the causality between intervention, a public policy and its results.

The main aim is to ensure that performance is improved and the desired results are achieved, by measuring and assessing performance in order to more effectively manage the outcomes and associated outputs known as development results. The development of an effective M&E system will result in advancing the objects of a sustainable development for the country. The outcome-based approach will serve as a frame of reference to ensure that inputs, activities and outputs are appropriate. It is also a form of demonstrating the value and benefits of public services to the citizens and legislature. An outcome-based approach is also an essential component of a learning approach that do not only demonstrate that outcome has occurred, but that government interventions have contributed to these positive changes in some way. It is therefore, important that the coordination of disasters in the country is fully supported by both at political and top administrative levels. The engagement and involvement of the Department of

Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in the establishment of an effective M&E system for disaster management is therefore of outmost importance.

Of importance to state is the cost of repairing, rehabilitation and reconstruction of damaged infrastructure after every disaster has occurred. For this reason, it is important to develop an M&E system that will link outcome information appropriately with the budget allocation process, so as to illustrate the benefits that arise from expenditure especially for post disaster rehabilitation and disaster risk reduction.

The introduction of a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system in a public institution or on a country-wide basis is a significant undertaking that generally requires both organisational changes as well as cultural changes within the public sector. For example, establishing clarity of 'purpose' for the M&E system, and communicating the 'vision' are important elements at the outset. In an effort to ensure the implementation of the Disaster Management policy and legislation and all other related matters, the NDMC has created a Monitoring and Evaluation Chief Directorate. The main functions of the unit is to ensure that the country has an integrated system for monitoring reporting and evaluating disaster management initiatives across the spheres of government.

Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System

The White Paper on Local Government directs national government to provide a coherent framework that seeks to ensure that the reporting requirements placed on municipalities are reasonable, and should also ensure the rationalisation and standardisation into an annualised national data collection system. The outcome of this process will enable government to acquire reliable information from local government on progress in the implementation of policies and programmes.

In 2009, the South African government adopted an Outcome-Based Approach to track the performance and impact of service delivery to the citizens. A number of policies and frameworks have been developed by the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPM&E) as well as National Treasury (NT) and the department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) to monitor the progress on service delivery across the spheres of government. The Presidency's document on Improving Government Performance, which has some of its guiding principles as:

- Strengthening our ability to cooperate across the three levels of government and work as a single delivery machine,
- Build a partnership between government and civil society so that we can work together to achieve our goal of a better life.

Further the Policy Framework for the Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation document, states that the aim of having a government wide system is to provide an improved integrated monitoring an evaluation of outcomes and impact across the whole of government. Improving M&E will lead to quality of planning, implementation, reporting, decision making and policy review and development.

2. LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY MANDATES

The management of disasters in the country is informed by the Disaster Management Act no 57 of 2002. The NDMC is established an institution within the public service and forms part of the, and functions within a department of state for which the Minister is responsible as indicated in section 8 and 9 of the Disaster Management Act, 2002. The Disaster Management Act provides for an integrated and coordinated disaster management policy that focuses on preventing or reducing the risk of disasters mitigating the severity of disasters, emergency preparedness, rapid and effective response to disasters and post-disaster recovery. It further provides for the establishment of national, provincial and municipal disaster management centres, disaster management volunteers and any other matters incidental thereto.

The monitoring and evaluation framework of disaster and fire services management is underpinned by the values and principles governing public administration as enshrined in the South African Constitution, Chapter 10 which includes accountability of public administration and transparency to the public fostered through provision of timely, accessible and accountable information.

In addition to this, the National Development Plan 2030, in its objectives for environmental sustainability and resilience provides for an improved disaster preparedness for extreme climate events. This calls for system that will monitor the achievement of this objective. It is therefore important to monitor the extent to which mitigation and adaptation are mainstreamed across the three spheres of government. This will ensure the promotion of intergovernmental relations and thus giving expression to the concept of cooperative government. The outcome of an integrated system is to ensure a smooth flow of information within government, and between government and communities, with a view to enhancing the implementation of the disaster management policies and programmes.

One of the general powers of the NDMC is to monitor compliance and performance of the organs of state and other relevant key stakeholders and evaluate the impact on the implementation of the DM Act and its framework. Disaster Management Act requires that the NDMC should establish an information management system that is able to collect information from all stakeholders, process, analyse and share it with others. In addition, the NDMC is required in terms of section 21 of the Disaster

Management Act, 2002, for monitoring, measuring and evaluating disaster management plans, and prevention, mitigation and response activities. This should also be based on the four Key Performance Areas (KPAs) as well as the Enablers as stipulated in the Disaster Management framework.

M&E should measure the performance of all NDMC policies, programmes, and projects. It should identify what works, what does not, and the reasons why. It will also provide information about the performance of orangs of state and other relevant stakeholders that deal with issues pertaining to disaster management.

The following are some of the ways in which monitoring information and evaluation findings can be highly useful for the effective management of disasters in South Africa:

(a) To provide quality information on the coordination of disaster management across the three spheres of government.
(b) To support planning, budgeting and policy making decisions that are based on evidence rather than opinion.
(c) To help government ministries in their policy development and policy analysis work, and in programme development.
(d) To help government ministries and agencies manage activities at the sector, programme, and project levels. This includes government service delivery and the management of staff. M&E identifies the most efficient use of available resources; it can be used to identify implementation difficulties. For example, performance indicators can be used to make cost and performance comparisons (performance benchmarking) among different spheres of government. Comparisons can also be made over time which helps identify good, bad, and promising practices. This can prompt a search for the reasons for this level of performance. Evaluations or reviews are used to identify these reasons. This is the learning function of M&E, and it is often termed "results-based management".
(e) To enhance transparency and support accountability relationships by revealing the extent to which the NDMC has attained its desired objectives, with specific reference to the overall coordination of disaster management in the country.
(f) To provide the essential evidence necessary to underpin strong accountability relationships, such as of government to the Parliament and civil society.
(g) To support the accountability relationships within government, such as between sector ministries, provinces, municipalities and key stakeholders. Strong accountability, in turn, can provide powerful incentives to improve performance. M&E is closely related to many other aspects of public sector management, such as decentralization, and the extent to which they encompass a focus on government performance.
(h) To create a platform for civil society (non-government organisations (NGOs), universities, research institutes, think tanks, and the media) to play meaningful

roles in M&E in several ways, including both as a user and producer of M&E information. Disaster management requires coordination

The importance of creating, implementing and strengthening a unified and integrated Disaster Management M&E system at the country level cannot be overemphasised. A strong unified M&E system for disaster and fire services management will ensure that:

- Relevant, timely and accurate data are made available to national program leaders and managers at each level of implementation; and
- Selected high-quality data can be reported to national leaders; and the national program can meet international reporting requirements under a unified global effort, in this instance the progress report on the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015) as required by the International Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction. The main objective of the Hyogo Framework for Action is to build Resilience of Nations and Communities to disasters was adopted by the World Conference on Disaster Reduction and endorsed by the United Nations in 2009. The expected outcome of the framework is *"Substantial reduction of disaster losses in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries"*

All countries that signed for the implementation of the framework are expected to periodically report progress on the following five priorities:

I. ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with strong institutional basis for implementation;
II. identify, assess and monitor disaster risk and enhance early warning;
III. use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels;
IV. reduce the underlying risk factors; and
V. strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.

A unified, integrated M&E system has several advantages. It contributes to more-efficient use of data and resources when it ensures, for example, that indicators and sampling methods are comparable over time and by reducing duplication of efforts. As data collection resources are limited, this is an important asset, which will assist the country to pool funds into a shared data collection agenda.

The benefits of the creation of a Monitoring and Evaluation Unit within the NDMC will ensure that the NDMC and other relevant stakeholders move from "opinion-based policy" towards *"evidence-based policy" or "evidence-influenced policy".* This is mainly due to the nature of the policy environment as well as national technical capacity to provide good quality and trustworthy evidence needed within the disaster management environment.

Although the term "monitoring and evaluation" tends to get run together as if it is only one thing, monitoring and evaluation are, in fact, two distinct sets of organisational activities, related but not identical.

Monitoring is the systematic collection and analysis of information as a project/programme progresses. It is aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of a project or organisation. It is based on targets set and activities planned during the planning phases of work. It helps to keep the work on track, and can let management know when things are going wrong. If done properly, it is an invaluable tool for good management, and it provides a useful base for evaluation. It enables one to determine whether there are sufficient resources and whether these are utilized correctly, whether there is sufficient and appropriate capacity and capability, and whether what has been for is being implemented.

Evaluation is the comparison of actual project impacts against the agreed strategic plans. It looks at what you set out to do, at what you have accomplished, and how you accomplished it. It can be **formative** (taking place during the life of a project or organisation, with the intention of improving the strategy or way of functioning of the project or organisation). It can also be **summative** (drawing learnings from a completed project or an organisation that is no longer functioning). Someone once described this as the difference between a check-up and an autopsy!

What monitoring and evaluation have in common is that they are geared towards learning from what one is doing and how ones does it, by focusing on:

- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Impact

Efficiency tells you that the input into the work is appropriate in terms of the output. This could be input in terms of money, time, staff, equipment and so on.

Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which a development programme or project achieves the specific objectives it set. If, for example, we set out to improve the qualifications of all the high school teachers in a particular area, did we succeed?

Impact tells you whether or not what you did made a difference to the problem situation you were trying to address. In other words, was your strategy useful? Did ensuring that teachers were better qualified improve the pass rate in the final year of school?

3. OBJECTIVES AND CONTEXT

Planning for Monitoring and Evaluation involves decisions on what needs to be done, why, how by whom and when. The Monitoring and Evaluation framework and implementation plan for NDMC will be drawn up against strategic objectives of NDMC to support the implementation of activities towards the achievement of

outcomes. This framework must be read in conjunction with M&E implementation plan for insights on how the framework will be operationalized.

The objective of this document is to provide a framework to monitor, report and evaluate the management and administration of the NDMC programmes within the context of Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBM&E). This thinking is consistent with the Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation and can be extremely difficult. A set of guidelines to overcome some of the challenges faced by M & E will be developed to ensure effective implementation of the framework.

An integrated RBM&E framework is the first in a series of tools developed by the Department: Monitoring and Evaluation. It is also a building block intended to foster and support a growing monitoring and evaluation culture within the NDMC. All Monitoring and evaluation planning processes should be guided by the National Planning Framework. This framework defines the cycles of policy strategising, programme development, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation and public communication of these processes. Strategic Planning and Operational Planning processes within NDMC should also be used as important tools to assist M & E planning processes.

This framework is envisaged to provide a comprehensive and integrated strategic monitoring and evaluation direction to the entire Disaster and Fire services management to determine, on an on-going basis, how best to maximise the value of prevention, reduction, response and intervention. It is also intended to provide a step-by- step approach to the process, procedures and methods for monitoring and evaluation NDMC administration and management. This will be complimented by a compendium document of core indicators as well as guidelines applicable to both Disaster Management practitioners and by:

- Outlining key processes, mechanisms, tools, templates, strategies and methods for M & E;
- M & E architecture, system design and performance monitoring and evaluation plans; and
- How evaluation findings will be used to enhance evidence-based decision making and accountability within NDMC, and feedback to policy development or implementation review mechanisms.

3.1. The framework has seven main strategic objectives, namely:

- to promote a culture of continuous learning and improvement within the NDMC:
- to promote the effective and efficient deployment of resources for implementation and administration of NDMC policies and programmes;
- to facilitate accountability across the three spheres of government;
- to facilitate the utilisation of reliable; timely and relevant information to all relevant stakeholders;

- to disseminate best practice findings for improved project and programme performance;
- to strengthen evaluation capacity; and
- to coordinate and standardise processes and procedures used for monitoring and evaluation.

The monitoring and evaluation practice within NDMC is therefore carried out under the auspices of pieces of legislation and policy frameworks, strategic objectives and priorities over the MTEF period. Notwithstanding the fact that there are other pieces of legislation policy imperatives that are applicable to manage disaster, the primary ones includes the following:

- The National Disaster Management Act, 2002
- The Fire Brigade Services Act
- The Disaster Management Framework, 2005

The NDMC Monitoring and Evaluation framework follows the simplified log frame and results-based model for the implementation and administration of NDMC programmes and policies. For this purpose, the statements of purpose and goals, objectives, inputs, processes, expected outputs, outcomes and impact of NDMC's interventions are reviewed as a basis for the development of suitable monitoring tools to be used to measure programme performance.

In order to bring context to the development of the M&E framework, the Monitoring and Evaluation Chief Directorate embarked on a process of conducting a Rapid Assessment on how disaster management is being coordinated at both national and provincial level also in terms of the legislative mandate. A separate report has been developed

4. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

In order to effectively monitor and evaluate, M&E officials will describe the explicit and implicit objectives for all initiatives aimed at monitoring, reporting and evaluating the activities of the NDMC, PDMC and DMMC.

The monitoring and evaluation unit embarked upon an assessment of the readiness of the provinces to implement the framework as well as the current gaps in the implementation of the Key Performance Areas and Enablers in the disaster management framework. Some of the challenges identified with regards to monitoring and evaluation includes the following:

- Lack of standard reporting formats, templates, terminology, definitions, Key Performance Indicators, baselines and targets;
- Limited or lack of appropriate capacity and capability of the M&E units at different levels of government;

- Lack of appropriate institutional arrangements for M&E, leading to confusion on who implements, who monitors and reports;
- Current evaluation practice is limited to process rather than impact evaluation since there are limited impact and outcome indicators;
- Lack of community monitoring and oversight; and
- Lack a central database/data warehouse to store and retrieve information as and when needed

The above challenges can only be overcome through institutionalisation and coordination of an integrated M&E system. An integrated system means a system that contributes towards shifting the whole of government to achieve the characteristics of a developmental local government that includes community monitoring and oversight.

Institutional arrangements and delivery mechanisms

M & E framework will describe the Internal and External Institutional arrangements for national, provincial and local governments. It will also include key strategic partners and stakeholders that have specific responsibilities for the effective implementation of the Disaster Management Act and Framework for example the role that the South African Weather Services play in Disaster Risk Reduction.

The M & E section will report the results of any evaluations that have been conducted for each programme. This is usually an area where M & E can highlight the need for evaluation studies of major programmes and the implementation of a Multi-Year Evaluation Plan.

It is therefore necessary to address the *internal* monitoring and evaluation reporting requirements within the NDMC as well as the *external* requirements across the three spheres of government to ensure that the integration and alignment requirements are met.

The M&E framework document sets out an approach with an internal within the NDMC and the external focus:

The internal focus within the NDMC will address the following:

- Developing a common understanding in respect of the monitoring, evaluation and reporting discipline.
- The adoption of a single monitoring and evaluation framework for monitoring and evaluation for both the NDMC and the external stakeholders.
- Developing a common set of indicators that ensure that line function responsibilities of the various Units within the NDMC are catered for.
- Development of a common business process that will foster a high level of integration in respect of monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

- Establishment of a monitoring and evaluation forum that is representative of all the line function units within the **NDMC** to enhance coordination and support the monitoring, evaluation and reporting business press.
- In the long term, integrate the existing monitoring and reporting systems using existing and future software technology to support the integration objectives.

Responsibility for Monitoring and Evaluation is currently centralised within the national office, with each of the Provincial Disaster Management Centres in particular, being responsible for the monitoring of various programmes within their jurisdiction. This framework delineates key role players in the NDMC's Monitoring and Evaluation system.

Responsible Unit	Roles and responsibility
Minister of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs	In an effort to promote good governance, the Ministry will monitor and evaluate the efficient and effective utilization of resources in order to render an accountable, transparent, and development-oriented NDMC Administration and Management in South Africa. The Minister will use M & E findings in the political oversight of institutional performance to ensure that the desired outcomes and impact are achieved. This will assist in providing Parliament and Cabinet with detailed regular reports. An annual consolidated report which is a culmination of all provincial reports is developed and submitted to Parliament.
Office of the Head: National Disaster Management Centre	As an Accounting Authority, the Head of the NDMC has a responsibility to ensure that the Monitoring and Evaluation system is integrated within the existing NDMC management processes and systems. This means that the office of the Head of the NDMC will also strategically advise on the appropriate positioning of some of the responsibility to manage performance information, monitoring and evaluation, within the context of this framework.
Monitoring and Evaluation Unit	The M & E section in strategy and Business will have the overall responsibility for collecting and analysing data as well as preparing statistical, service delivery monitoring, institutional monitoring and assessments as well as evaluation reports to the Executives, Senior Management, staff and other stakeholders on timely basis. (See Part 2 for details)

Responsible Unit	Roles and responsibility
	In summary the M & E section will have oversight of the application of a structured monitoring and evaluation system within NDMC by: - The setting of standards and principles for monitoring and evaluation; - Provision of guidance, advice on best practices and support in the effective utilisation of monitoring and evaluation as a management tool; - Coordination, promotion and use of evaluation findings to improve quality of NDMC programme interventions; - Assessment of monitoring and evaluation capacity within NDMC on a systematic basis; - Conduct of periodic capacity development on M & E to build and inculcate a culture of learning among staff, programme/project managers and senior management; - Conduct thematic/strategic evaluations that cover cross-cutting themes or issues pertinent to NDMC; - Conduct evaluations with significant implications for national policy and other strategic evaluations requested by the Governance and Administration Cluster Executive Management of NDMC/COGTA and the Minister; Conduct other non-strategic evaluations and rapid appraisals in special circumstances where an independent assessment is requested, though the Minister.
Roles and responsibilities	**Chief Directorates within NDMC (including Provinces, Metro/ District municipalities)** Chief Directorates have the responsibility of M & E in their areas, as a management tool. Thus, the specific roles within these units will, among other things, be to enhance and develop service delivery performance indicators as well as to report on these service delivery and institutional performance indicators. Chief Directorates will generally be responsible for programme performance. This approach emphasizes planning and managing inputs and activities to achieve these results for each chief directorate. It also entails the process and output/outcome monitoring of NDMC's programmes and projects internally as well as quarterly and annual reporting. This will be based on

Responsible Unit	Roles and responsibility
	the Key Performance Areas as structured in the Disaster Management Framework.
Roles and responsibilities of the Internal NDMC Units	
Policy and Legislation	• Develop policy and legislation on Disaster and Fire Services management. • Support the three spheres of government and key stakeholders to implement Policy and legislation to ensure compliance. • Use M&E reports to identify and make policy change proposals. • Ensure the development and submission of the Annual report to Parliament • Support provinces to develop and submit their annual reports • Coordinate Fire Services management
Planning Coordination, Intervention and Support	• Support and monitor development and submission of Disaster Risk Reduction plans • Develop, implement and support all spheres to implement Disaster response and intervention standard operating procedures • Support provinces and provinces to submit proper documentation on classification, request for funding, verification. Assessment and application for funding from Immediate Grant and Post Disaster Rehabilitation and reconstruction. • Monitor and report funding expenditure • Early Warnings & Capability Management Systems • Capacity building • Research
Information Technology	• Create a IT infrastructure that support the NDMC and PDMC to collect, store and chive information relating to all disasters in the country • Ensure the functionality of the Situation Reporting System
Communication	• Develop and implement Disaster Management Communication Strategy Develop and implement communication protocols aligned to the Government Communication Information Centre (CGIS) • Statistical finding shall be reported using various methods such as internal submissions and reports, brochures, facts sheets, booklets, newsletters, oral presentations as well as symposiums.

Responsible Unit	Roles and responsibility
	• Reports shall be produced monthly, quarterly, bi-annually and annually, and disseminated accordingly to internal and external stakeholders, strategic partners, research and academic institutions, non-governmental organisations and the general public.
	• The methods and frequency of reporting will be identified by conducting an information needs analysis survey in which stakeholders will be requested to specify their information needs, frequency of reporting, etc.
	• Results of data analysis and key research findings shall be disseminated efficiently to internal and external stakeholders, strategic partners and the general public using statistical reports, brochures, fact sheets, newsletters and a dedicated M & E web page. Suitable templates, methods and frequency of communication and reporting have been identified by conducting an information needs analysis

External Stakeholders have been identified and these include the all organs of state i.e. national sector departments, State Owned Enterprises (SOEs), PDMCs, MDMCs, other key relevant stakeholder s e.g. South African Weather Services and NGOs/CBOs. High level Key Performance Indicators per Key Performance Area will be developed and agreed upon by all stakeholders. The reporting requirements and timeframes will also be clearly defined.

The external focus will be as follows:

- Facilitating a common understanding in respect of monitoring, evaluating and reporting. This includes standardising definitions, terminology and monitoring and evaluation modelling
- Institutionalising monitoring, evaluation and reporting within all three spheres of government by providing the necessary leadership, support and guidance where required
- Facilitating the establishment of a single set of indicators for local government at a national level that covers all line function department requirements
- Ensuring that the necessary capacity is established for monitoring and reporting to be undertaken within the three spheres of government so that the **NDMC** is able to fulfil the responsibilities that have been assigned as part of the Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Implementation Plan.

Responsible partner/stakeholder	Roles and responsibilities
Sector departments	Reports on the implementation of the DRM plans Monitoring and Evaluation of response and post disaster rehabilitation
PDMC	Reports on implementation of the plans, risk reduction efforts and post disaster grants both immediate relief, medium and long term rehabilitation and reconstruction
Key Stakeholder (to be defined e.g. SA Weather)	These will be defines as per area of speciality/expertise

5. MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

PURPOSE

To provide strategic monitoring support to the NDMC and stakeholders

5.1 FUNCTIONS:

1. Develop, manage and update a consolidate matrix of indicators, including dashboard.
2. Collect, collate, analyse, clean and maintain data storage systems for M & E.
3. Manage and maintain a centralised and integrated M& E information system.
4. Coordinate the production and dissemination of all M & E reports, including statistical reports, publications, web reports, etc.

Performance Monitoring Plan for Strategic Monitoring Support	
Key Performance Areas	The key performance areas of the M&E Unit are the following: Manage the development of a centralised monitoring and evaluation database; Manage the information needs and requirements of stakeholders; Manage the development of a consolidated matrix of monitoring and evaluation indicators; Manage the production and dissemination of monthly, quarterly and annual reviews reports; and Manage financial resources and the recruitment of staff needed for strategic monitoring and evaluation support.
	Process
Plans for Data collection	The Situational Reporting system (SRS) will used in future for the production of statistical report. In addition, NDMC will collaborate with the National Statistics Systems (NSS) Division of Statistics South Africa with a view to having access to various data sets that are required for assessing and monitoring variability in performance indicators.

	The Monitoring and Evaluation Chief Directorate of the NDMC interacts with various governmental agencies, non-governmental agencies as well as relevant academic and research institutions that might have data sets that are valuable for the statistical data analysis of performance indicators.
Data sources and data sets	National sector departments and SOEs Provincial reports District reports In addition to this, data is gathered from the National Statistics South Africa and other non-governmental agencies such as World Vision (part of the NDMAF) as well as research and academic institutions such as the Human Sciences Research Council (HRSC) Universities.
Indicators	The M&E Unit will coordinate the task of gathering data on key performance monitoring and evaluation indicators on behalf of the three Units of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the NDMC (Institutional Monitoring, Service Delivery Monitoring and NDMC Evaluations). These indicators are organised and properly defined in a form of a consolidated matrix of M & E indicators. In future, the M&E Unit intends to track changes in selected indicators that are relevant to NDMC (as defined by the Key Performance Areas and the Enablers) and these will be populated onto an automated dashboard of indicators still to be developed in collaboration with the IT unit
Methods of Data Collection	Data will be collected from various sources electronically as well as manually. From time to time, the M&E Unit will gather data based on surveys in order to assess the quality and reliability of data sets by the Unit for the production of statistical reports. In this respect, both quantitative data gathering methods are used.
Frequency and Schedule of Data Collection	Data shall be extracted once a month, during the first week of each month, from the SRS system of NDMC by the ICT/PIS Units of NDMC, and transferred online, electronically to an M & E data storage system in accordance with the data extraction schedule will be agreed upon

Frequency and schedule of data collection will be developed and agreed upon by all stakeholders e.g.

Type of Data Collection	Data Source	Data Set	Frequency	Responsible person

Plans for Data Analysis, Reporting, Review and Use

Data Analysis	The method of data analysis depends on the objective of study as well as the type of variable analysed. Results of analysis shall be disaggregated by various socio- demographic and economic variables of interest such as gender, residential area, level of education, level of income, etc. Statistical data analysis shall be performed by the M&E Unit utilising both simple and advanced statistical methods of data analysis. Example of simple quantitative method of data analysis are descriptive statistics (the mean, mode and median, the variance, standard deviation, co-efficient of variation, range, graphical methods, etc.), across-tabulations, tests of association, simple linear regression, one and two-sample tests, etc. Examples of advanced statistical methods of data analysis are multiple linear regression analysis, the analysis of variance, time series analysis, categorical data analysis, etc.
Review and Use	In order for the M&E Unit to ensure accuracy, it is essential to perform verification of all sources of data sets used for the production of reports. Verification entails checking, editing, validation, etc. of all data sets used for data analysis. The methods of data gathering, analysis, reporting and dissemination of results shall be reviewed regularly by the Unit. Methods of review are face-to-face interviews, structured questionnaires, formal and informal queries, media reports, workshops, symposiums, conferences, formal and informal discussion of results with stakeholders, etc. Reviews shall be done based on internal best practice and requirements of efficiency. The M&E Unit shall make a regular assessment and review of the quality and reliability of statistical reports produced by the Unit, methods of data gathering, analysis and dissemination of research findings. This done with a view to improve the efficiency of data collection, the production of reports and dissemination of results of data analysis.

5.2. Plan for verification

Data collected will be verified to ensure that it is of good quality, it makes sense, it's valid and it's based on correct inputs. Data will be verified by checking where it originated from, who was responsible for its collection and the methods and standards used to collect it. Data verification will also be done when a problem is identified, for instance when there is repeated lack of response on certain issues. Verification will also be done through the principle of triangulation whereby different methods will be used to gather information on the same issue. Data

collected will be recorded using video recording or camera, tape recording and taking detailed notes.

5.3. Plan for Data Analysis, Reporting, Review

Analysing monitoring findings require looking closely at the information, clarifying and structuring it in order to arrive at conclusions that can lead to action. The NDMC Planning, Intervention and Support (PIS) unit will participate in data analysis and reporting because it is imperative that people who gathered data should be involved in the analysis and the report writing as they would have in-depth knowledge of aspects that were not noted down. Linked to this is the importance of analysing data and reporting as soon as it is collected to avoid losing critical issues, while one's memory is still fresh.

The sign of a healthy M & E plan is that it evolves over time. As the programme evolves, activities will change and the understanding of what information is useful will grow. In line with this, it is essential to plan for regular reviews of the information needs, indicators and tools which in effect will mean an eventual update of the Service Delivery Monitoring plan. The SDM Monitoring Plan will be reviewed and updated on a quarterly and annual basis to accommodate the evolving nature of the social security programme.

5.4. Plan for communication and Using Performance Information

Data travels, and the journey involves transformation from data to information and knowledge, which become the basis for decision-making. Communicating findings is an essential component of M & E since communication to the target audience is the justification for the whole exercise of data collection, analysis and report writing. Developing a standardised procedure or strategy for appraising partners and colleagues on findings will be special area of focus for the Unit. The Unit will need to work closely with M&E Support Unit whose specific mandate is to ensure effective dissemination of findings to a wide range of stakeholders.

Communication of monitoring findings is essential for accountability, finding solutions to problems, action and decision-making. A good dissemination strategy can generate more support and interest in the reports. Hence, it is worth investing in a good communication strategy. Monitoring reports have many potential audiences. It will be important for the Communication Unit to first know its audience, hence the necessity to reach agreement with stakeholders on who needs to receive what kind of information.

6. ASSESSMENTS, REVIEWS & EVALUATION

PURPOSE

To evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness & appropriateness of the NDMC

FUNCTIONS:

- Develop and manage an evaluation system.
- Undertake and coordinate all evaluation studies
- Disseminate evaluation findings and maintain a feedback loop to policy decision making
- Determine best practice models and co-ordinate partnership evaluation studies

6.1 Evaluation mechanisms, methods and Tools

The evaluation will have three components:

Firstly, an internal rapid assessment will be conducted followed by a long-term impact and multi-dimensional evaluation projects, and lastly Joint Venture Evaluation Projects with strategic partners.

The definitions and technical explanations of evaluation methods, tools and templates are outlined in the Glossary of Key Terms in the Monitoring & Evaluation Tool. Other standardised methods such as qualitative and participatory will be considered to complement qualitative data techniques to support the interpretation element of evaluations. Best practice evaluation methods will be applied.

6.2 Evaluation steps

In order to execute the evaluation programme the following steps need to be followed as depicted.

Process	Definition	Role	Activities
Stakeholders Engagement Consultation	Involvement of person or organisations having an investment what will be learned from the evaluations This might be stakeholders or partners involved in programme operations, those served of effected by the programme. These will be our	Help increase the usefulness of evaluations through their inputs and buy-in	- Conduct workshops with stakeholders - Coordinate stakeholder input through the process of evaluation design - Only relevant stakeholders to be engaged in order to avoid excessive

	beneficiaries and recipients, and primary users of evaluation		stakeholder's identification.
Describe the programme	Describe the features of the programme being evaluated. This should include purpose, background information on the intention of the programme, what does the programme address, expected changes/outcomes, the activities and available resources	To help stakeholders and partners understand how programme features fit together	List specific expectations as goals, objectives, and criteria for success, - Analyse the context within which the programme operates.
Identify the relevant indicators that will inform evaluation programme	Outcomes and impact indicators	To ensure that progress of indicators are tracked and informed by evaluation studies.	Collection of relevant indicators, Review indicators and consolidate into indicator matrix, Population of indicators on the dashboard.
Evaluation Design	The direction and process of the evaluation must be focused on assessing issues of greatest concern. An evaluation plan should anticipate intended uses and create an evaluation strategy with the potential for being useful, feasible, ethical and accurate	Provide investment in quality: increases the chances that the evaluation will succeed by identifying procedures that are practical, politically viable, and cost effective.	Discuss purpose of evaluation with stakeholders -Write evaluation questions that should be answered by the study. Identify who will benefit from the evaluation findings Describe practical methods for sampling, data collection, data analysis and judgement.
Gather credible evidence	Collect data with accurate and realistic information. Compiling information that stakeholders perceive as trustworthy and relevant for answering their questions. Such evidence can be experimental or observational,	Credible evidence will enhance the evaluation's utility and accuracy, guide the scope and selection of information and promote	- Choosing indicators that meaningfully address evaluation questions. - Describe the information sources and the rationale for their selection.

	qualitative, or can include a mixture methods	the collection of valid, reliable and systematic information, i.e. the foundation of effective evaluation.	- Monitor the quality of information obtained and taking practical steps to improve quality. - Establish criteria for deciding when to stop collecting data. - Safeguard the confidentially of information and information sources.
Justify conclusion Ensure use and share lessons learned	Evaluation conclusions will be justified they are linked to the evidence gathered and judged against agreed upon values for or standards set by stakeholders.	Reinforces conclusions central to the evaluation's utility and accuracy; involves values clarification, qualitative and quantitative data analysis and synthesis	- Appropriate methods of analysis and synthesis to summarize findings should be used. - Considered alternative ways to compare results. - Recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions - Limiting conclusions to situations, time periods, persons, contexts, and purposes for which the findings are applicable.
Ensure use and share lessons learned	Deliberate effort to be considered in ensuring that the evaluation processes and findings are used and disseminated	Ensure that evaluation achieves its primary purposes	- Design evaluation to achieve intended use by intended users. -Preparing stakeholders for eventual use by

			rehearsing would affect programme operations. - Provide continuous feedback to stakeholders. - Schedule follow-up meetings with intended users to facilitate the transfer of evaluation conclusions to appropriate actions or decisions. - Disseminate both the procedures used and the lessons learned from the evaluation to stakeholders, using tailored communications strategies that meet their particular needs

7. EVALUATION REPORTING

The evaluation findings normally follow a particular cycle through the reporting period. The report should be kept simple, acronyms should be avoided, and enough information about evaluation methods should be provided so that others can judge evaluation's credibility. Limitations to the study should be provided with cautions to interpretations and major themes or research questions should be organised.

7.1 Management Arrangement for Evaluations

The multi-year evaluation will be centralised at national office in terms of the development of processes and procedures. Furthermore, it involves the establishment of partnerships and appointment of external service providers. This will be aligned to the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework.

Every evaluation activity conducted will be documented in the form of a report, article and paper to create an evaluation database. Any evaluation activity as discipline should involve the social security evaluation unit.

The multi-year evaluation plan will be conducted internally through rapid studies and partnership programmes with organisation which have an interest on any kind of social assistance grants offered by NDMC. Furthermore, it will focus on social security themes which are from current and future debates.

Stakeholders will play different role in evaluation studies as follows:

- The NDMC and PDMC will identify evaluation needs,
- M & E will conduct evaluation studies and ensure management of commissioned projects;
- Partners: Joint funding and management will determine, identify and approve evaluation projects and use of evaluation results.

7.2 Dissemination / Repository Portal Evaluation Studies: Reporting and dissemination strategy)

Dissemination is the process of communicating either the procedures or the lessons learned from an evaluation to relevant audiences in a timely, unbiased, and consistent fashion. Like other elements of the evaluation, the reporting strategy will be discussed in advance with intended users and other stakeholders. Such consultation ensures that the information needs of relevant audience are met.

Planning effective communication will also require considering the timing, style, tone, message source, vehicle, and format of information products. Regardless of how communications are constructed, the goal of dissemination is to achieve full disclosure and impartial reporting.

There will be an NDMC action plan to dress any recommendations that come out of the evaluations. The evaluation reports and action plans will be made public. As responsibility and accountability for achieving results are shared among the parties in relation to partnership projects, all parties stand to benefit from these evaluation activities. By the end of the evaluation, all parties will have access to valuable information that can be used to help guide and improve various processes in the future. The information and knowledge gained through this process may also be used to shape future policy development.

7.3 Review Process of A Multi-Year Evaluation Plan

The plan is subject to review after 2019, however, project-related review processes will be conducted annually in order to align to government planning processes and informed by budget and priority questions emanating from the Minister, Portfolio Committee and other stakeholders based on e.g. political environment, demand side evaluation, socio-economic reforms, etc.

- The first stage will be engagement of the plan with the stakeholders, i.e. looking at achievements and challenges of the previous year.
- The second stage will be the enhancement and amendment of the plan based on the consolidated comments and inputs.
- The third stage will be to finalise the plan with all the stakeholders.

- The fourth stage is the approval of the plan which involves approval by Executive Manager: Monitoring and Evaluation.
- The fifth stage is the implementation of the plan which involves conducting evaluation studies.
- The sixth stage will involve reporting by all who conducted evaluation studies

7.4 Limitation

The implementation of the Evaluation Plan is informed by budget allocations and buy-in from stakeholders. For the NDMC to sustain evaluation, management has to ensure that evaluation forms part of the planning process, including the budget and the MTEF. This informed by the principles and standards of evaluations (See the attached M & E Principles and standards)

The implementation of the multi-year evaluation plan is possible only with the buy-in from all management levels within the agency and various key stakeholders. More workshops are therefore required in order to encourage various institutions to focus their efforts in the identified areas. Evaluation projects are expensive; hence a need for earmarked funding for the identified projects is a necessity. Evaluation also requires consolidation of efforts in order to minimise duplication of resources. More focus should be devoted to international engagements and knowledge sharing on best practices.

8. MINIMUM NORMS & STANDARDS FOR MONITORING & EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION, ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT OF NDMC

This section sets out the M & E principles, including minimum norms and standards for Monitoring and Evaluation within the NDMC. It focuses on procedures to be adopted by NDMC in the implementation and management of NDMC.

8.1 Interpretation

In this document, unless the context indicates otherwise, any expression to which a meaning has been assigned has that meaning. 'Practices 'means principles and standards as may be applied

8.2 Application of the principles & standards

The principles and standards in this document apply to national, regional, districts and local offices of the NDMC and are intended to prevail under the Basic values and principles governing public administration as enshrined in the Constitution of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996, Chapter, Batho-Pele principles as well as NDMC

8.3 Monitoring of Implementation

Guidance on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation will be provided in M & E guidelines, while operational procedures will be also be provided in Manuals and Guidelines and aligned with the development of M & E capacity development plan at national, regional and local levels.

8.4 General M &E policy statements

Monitoring and evaluation are essential management functions that are interactive and mutually supportive. Monitoring and evaluation must be continuously strengthened to enable NDMC to respond to demands for:

Greater accountability in the use of resources, (b) a clearer basis for decision making and (c) more practical lessons from experience to guide future development interventions. Monitoring and evaluation must be results-oriented and provide assessments of the relevance, performance and success of government interventions.

8.5 Government-wide monitoring and evaluation framework

All monitoring and Evaluation processes should be guided by Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (2005); Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (2007) as well as National Treasury's Managing Performance Information (2007). International Best Practice Models are also recommended.

8.6 Monitoring coverage

Monitoring and systematic reporting must be undertaken for all programmes and projects regardless of duration and budget.

8.7 Monitoring standards

a) **Monitoring must be simple.** A complex or complicated monitoring system is self-defeating. The basic task of monitoring is to simplify the field-level complexity, sifting the more important concerns from the less important.

b) **Monitoring must be timely.** Timeliness is of the essence in monitoring. Management requires input from the monitoring system so that timely action may be taken. Also timeliness is closely related to the credibility of monitoring itself.

c) **Monitoring must be relevant.** It must concern itself only with parameters which are relevant to programme/project/policy objectives. This also ensures that monitoring does not generate information that is not used or is not usable by management.

d) **Information provided though monitoring should be dependable.** Management will rely on monitoring findings only if the information is believed to be reasonably accurate.

e) **Monitoring efforts should be participatory.** Effort should be made to ensure participation by all concerned.

f) **Monitoring must be flexible.** It is iterative in nature. It also gets routinized with the passage of time. These two features should not, however, lead to rigidity.

g) **Monitoring should be action oriented.** Monitoring often leads to action. Consequently, it should follow pragmatic approaches, keeping the requirements of clients uppermost in view. Generating information for which there is no intended use should be assiduously avoided.

h) **Monitoring must be cost-**effective. Monitoring efforts cost money and time. It is therefore essential to make it cost-effective. While principles of simplicity, timeliness, relevance, and accuracy will lead to cost-effectiveness, computerization also can help to make monitoring more cost-effective by reducing staff hours in data processing.

i) **Monitoring efforts should be top management oriented.** Monitoring units should keep in mind the requirements of top management when designing and operating a monitoring system. Yet at the same time, monitoring must take into account the fact that those who provide information to the system also must benefit or the quality of the information provided will decline.

j) **Monitoring units represent specialised undertakings.** Monitoring is not merely concerned with the collection and analysis of data, but with diagnosis problem and suggesting alternative practical solutions.

k) **Monitoring is an ongoing, continual exercise.** Data collection should be undertaken to obtain benchmark information and again, the period for collection of data should not be more than a month.

9. CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS

The critical success factors in the development and institutionalisation of the Disaster Management Framework relies on the establishment of the M&E units across the spheres of government. The effectiveness and efficiency of the Disaster Management M&E system needs adequate resources in terms of human capital and sufficient funding.

In order to make progress towards equity in project funding, NDMC need to use relevant data much more intensively in budgeting and planning decisions; and develop the necessary data systems to guide planning and allocations; and be able to demonstrate to government that progress is being made. M & E should be in a position to provide mechanism for improving the accuracy of data, and undertaking relevant analytic studies. M & E has to be well resourced in order to assist budget allocation and strategic decision making.

In addition to M&E funding at the national level, provinces and municipalities should are also expected to have sufficient budget to be able to monitor and evaluate their

own performance, particularly when funds have been allocated to deal with both Immediate Relief and Post-Disaster Rehabilitation and Reconstruction funds. Furthermore, funding should be allocated for the establishment of M&E Units across the three spheres.

ANNEXURE A:

M & E standards principles

These principles are meant to be used as:

- **as guide to professional M&E practice**

The principles are intended to guide the professional practice of M&E and to inform clients/beneficiaries, staff and management of NDMC as well as the general public about the principles they can expect to be upheld by professional M&E practitioners. Of course, no statement of principles can anticipate all situations that arise in the practice of monitoring and evaluation. However, principles are not just guidelines for reaction when something goes wrong or when a dilemma is found. Rather, principles should proactively guide the behaviours of professionals in everyday practice.

- **as a matter of choice**

The principles proposed in this document are not independent, but overlap in many ways. Conversely, sometimes these principles will conflict, so that M&E officials will have to choose among them. At such times evaluators must use their own values and knowledge of the setting to determine the appropriate response. Whenever a course of action in unclear, M & E officials should solicit the advice of fellow colleagues about how to resolve the problem before deciding how to proceed.

- **as official NDMC position on M&E**

These principles are not intended to supersede any requirements by the frameworks on the Government-Wide M&E system, previous work on M&E standards, principles, or ethics adopted by other organizations, but recommended for adoption as the official position NDMC on M&E matters. They will be aligned to the government current Outcome-Based approach.

- **nor replacement**

These principles are not intended to replace standards supported by evaluators or by the other disciplines in which evaluators participate.

- **not rules to provide basis for sanctioning violators**

Each principle is illustrated by a number of statements to amplify the meaning of the overarching principle, and to provide guidance for its application. These illustrations are not meant to include all possible applications of that principle, nor to be viewed as rules that provide the basis for sanctioning violators.

- **as part of evolving process of self-examination**

These principles are part of an involving process of self-examination by NDMC's M&E practitioners, and should be revisited on a regular basis. Mechanisms might include reviews of principles at annual meetings, and other forums for harvesting experience with the principles and their application. On a regular basis, but at least every three years, these principles ought to be examining for possible review and revision. In order to maintain awareness and relevance, all relevant stakeholders will be encouraged to participate in this process.

An effective system must be compatible with political and public administration systems and consistent with national data-collection and analysis capacity. In this regard, the NDMC needs to develop an overall framework for a system of monitoring and oversight within which other organs of state will perform their functions as indicated in the Disaster Management Act