

# **EVALUATION INCEPTION REPORT**

## **Inception Report on the Implementation of the Gender-Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (GRPBMEAF)**

Department of Women, Youth and  
Persons with Disabilities

**MARCH 2021**

## Table of Contents

|                                                                              |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Introduction .....                                                        | 5  |
| 2. Background .....                                                          | 5  |
| 3. Overview of the GRPBMEAF .....                                            | 6  |
| 4. Formative Evaluation .....                                                | 7  |
| 4.1 Purpose and Objectives .....                                             | 7  |
| 4.2 What is a Formative Evaluation? .....                                    | 8  |
| 4.3 Revisions to the Original Terms of Reference.....                        | 8  |
| 4.4 Components of the Evaluation .....                                       | 9  |
| 4.5 Key Evaluation Questions.....                                            | 9  |
| 5. Evaluation Methodology .....                                              | 10 |
| 5.1 Evaluation Approach.....                                                 | 10 |
| 5.2. Analytical Framework .....                                              | 11 |
| 5.3 Tools for Data Collection.....                                           | 11 |
| 5.4 Tools for Data Analysis.....                                             | 12 |
| 5.5 Evaluation Scope and Limitations .....                                   | 12 |
| 5.6 Sampling.....                                                            | 13 |
| 5.7 Quality Assurance.....                                                   | 13 |
| 6. Literature Review .....                                                   | 13 |
| 7. Preliminary Findings .....                                                | 16 |
| 7.1 Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2019 – 2024 .....                 | 16 |
| 7.2 Medium Term Budget Policy Statement (MTBPS) 2020 .....                   | 16 |
| 7.3 DPSA Public Service Women Management Week Report (PSWMW) 2019 .....      | 16 |
| 7.4 Rapid Evaluation of Early Implementation .....                           | 17 |
| 7.5 State of the Nation Address (SONA) 2021.....                             | 17 |
| 7.6 Country Gender Indicator Framework (CGIF).....                           | 18 |
| 7.7 The South African Economic Reconstruction and Recovery Plan (ERRP) ..... | 18 |
| 7.8 Analysis of Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans .....           | 19 |
| 7.9 Self-assessment Monitoring .....                                         | 19 |
| 8. Outputs, Deliverables, Timeline and Skills Transfer .....                 | 20 |
| 8.1 Outputs and Deliverables .....                                           | 20 |
| 8.2. Timeframe for the Evaluation.....                                       | 21 |
| 8.3. Capacity Building and Skills Transfer .....                             | 22 |
| 9. Ethical Consideration.....                                                | 22 |
| 10. Management Arrangements .....                                            | 22 |

|                                                                                                                                                                    |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>11. Financial Implications.....</b>                                                                                                                             | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Annexure A: Evaluation Steering Committee members.....</b>                                                                                                      | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Annexure B: Data sources used .....</b>                                                                                                                         | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Annexure C: Terms of Reference for the Formative Evaluation of the Gender-Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework ...</b> | <b>25</b> |

## **Tables**

|                                                                |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Table 1: Criteria and related evaluation questions.....</b> | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Table 2: Limitations and mitigating factors .....</b>       | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Table 3: Timeline for the evaluation .....</b>              | <b>21</b> |

## ACRONYMS

|          |                                                                                      |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| APP      | Annual Performance Plans                                                             |
| AU       | African Union                                                                        |
| CEDAW    | Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women           |
| CGIF     | Country Gender Indicator Framework                                                   |
| COG      | Centre of Government                                                                 |
| COGTA    | Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs                                       |
| CSP      | Civilian Secretariat for Police                                                      |
| DBE      | Department of Basic Education                                                        |
| DCDT     | Department of Communications and Digital Technologies                                |
| DD       | Deputy Director                                                                      |
| DG       | Director General                                                                     |
| DHS      | Department of Human Settlement                                                       |
| DMRE     | Department of Mineral Resources and Energy                                           |
| DOT      | Department of Tourism                                                                |
| DPME     | Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation                                    |
| DPSA     | Department of Public Service and Administration                                      |
| DSAC     | Department of Sports, Arts and Culture                                               |
| DSBD     | Department of Small Business Development                                             |
| DSD      | Department of Social Development                                                     |
| DWYPD    | Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities                             |
| ERRP     | Economic Reconstruction and Recovery Plan                                            |
| ESC      | Evaluation Steering Committee                                                        |
| GBVF     | Gender-Based Violence and Femicide                                                   |
| GCIS     | Government Communication and Information System                                      |
| GFP      | Gender Focal Points                                                                  |
| GPW      | Government Printing Works                                                            |
| GRPB     | Gender-Responsive Planning and Budgeting                                             |
| GRPBMEAF | Gender-Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework |
| HLSC     | High Level Steering Committee                                                        |
| HOD      | Head Of Department                                                                   |
| IPID     | Independent Police Investigative Directorate                                         |
| MDG      | Millennium Development Goals                                                         |
| M&E      | Monitoring and Evaluation                                                            |
| MTBPS    | Medium Term Budget Policy Statement                                                  |
| MTSF     | Medium Term Strategic Framework                                                      |
| NDP      | National Development Plan                                                            |
| NGM      | National Gender Machinery                                                            |
| NT       | National Treasury                                                                    |
| PSWMW    | Public Service Women Management Week                                                 |
| SADC     | Southern African Development Community                                               |

|         |                                            |
|---------|--------------------------------------------|
| SAPS    | South African Police Services              |
| SCM     | Supply Chain Management                    |
| SDG     | Sustainable Development Goals              |
| SMME    | Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises        |
| SONA    | State of Nation Address                    |
| SP      | Strategic Plans                            |
| StatsSA | Statistics South Africa                    |
| TID     | Technical Indicator Descriptions           |
| TOC     | Theory of Change                           |
| ToR     | Terms of Reference                         |
| WEGE    | Women's empowerment and gender equality    |
| WYPD    | Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities |

## **1. Introduction**

The Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (DWYPD) is mandated to regulate, lead and coordinate the fulfilment of South Africa's mandate to realise gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls, youth and persons with disabilities and their full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms. The mandate is derived from multiple instruments at global, regional and national level. These instruments facilitate and guarantee the full and equal enjoyment of all rights and freedoms by people of all genders through ensuring that the public sector, the private sector, and civil society eliminate and remedy gender, race, and social inequalities. Amongst others, the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) provides a comprehensive framework to guide all rights-based action for gender equality. The 1995 Beijing Platform for Action is "an agenda for women's empowerment" signed by UN member states is seen as a "necessary and fundamental pre-requisite for equality, development and peace." From 1994 onwards, the South African democratic government placed the rights of women at the centre of its progressive transformation agenda. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996 entrenched non-sexism, non-discrimination, equality and human dignity as fundamental rights for all citizens of the country.

To achieve the above, the Department (DWYPD) developed the Gender-Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (GRPBMEAF), which was approved by Cabinet in March 2019 as a critical strategy for harnessing gender equality and ensuring a paradigm shift towards gender mainstreaming and institutionalisation across the state machinery. The GRPBMEAF is a tool for effective results and evidence-based management for how government is meeting its obligations in achieving gender equality and women's empowerment.

Given that the framework is in its early stage of implementation, a rapid evaluation on the early implementation of the framework was undertaken in the 2019/20 financial year to assess progress, challenges and inform improvements, as well as lay the basis for a more comprehensive formative evaluation. Building on the rapid evaluation and to contribute towards the enhanced design and implementation of the framework, the DWYPD conducted a formative evaluation in the 2020/21 financial year.

## **2. Background**

The South African Government has prioritised gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights as cross-cutting issues in national, provincial, sectoral and local policy and planning instruments as well as programming interventions. The South African Government's commitment, further affirmed by the introduction of new legislation designed to root out gender discrimination and to

promote women's rights and empowerment; by the prioritisation of the basic needs of South Africa's poorest citizens through improving access to health, welfare, housing, water and education; by the growth in the numbers of women occupying senior positions in government, and by the advancement of democratisation of all institutions of the state and civil society.

While significant progress has been made in many aspects of women's social and economic empowerment, South African women continue to face serious inequality and disadvantage in a wide range of spheres: in government, in business, in their communities and in their homes. These disadvantages are further complicated by, amongst other, unequal gender relations within the categories of race, disability and, sexual orientation.

In South Africa, gender equality and women's empowerment are the constitutional requirement that the government must strive to achieve and therefore needs to be evaluated. Equality between women and men, girls and boys is seen both as a human rights issue and as a precondition and indicator of sustainable people-centred development. It is also an essential component for the realisation of all human rights.

The role of evaluation is therefore critical in assisting the Department (DWYPD) and government to understand the extent to which its policies and programmes/interventions are relevant and effective in achieving desired gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights outcomes. The DWYPD has the responsibility to lead and coordinate the fulfilment of South African government's mandate to realise gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls and their full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms.

### **3. Overview of the GRPBMEAF**

Gender-Responsive Planning, Budgeting Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework seeks to ensure women's empowerment and gender equality goals are at the centre of public policy, planning and budgeting. It further seeks to ensure allocation of adequate resources to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment goals. All government departments, public entities, provinces and municipalities are expected to deliver on women's empowerment and gender equality (WEGE).

The need for the GRPBMEA Framework was prompted by, amongst others, poor accountability for WEGE performance across the public sector. This included lack of coherent gender-responsive policy, research, planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation and gender auditing policies, programmes and systems; country's legislative framework and justice system continues to disadvantage most women, particularly those from vulnerable sectors and weak institutionalisation of gender mainstreaming across the state machinery.

The following progress has been made in terms of implementation:

- The 2019-2024 MTSF is explicit on gender priorities, deliverables and indicators and cross-cutting 2024 impacts across seven priorities.
- The 25-year Review on WEGE was approved by cabinet in December 2020.
- SONA 2021 highlighted WEGE content including on women's economic inclusion and Gender-Based Violence.
- There has been improved gender-responsive institutional planning through:
  - Revised Framework for Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans (DPME, 2019);
  - National Treasury Instruction No. 5 of 2019/20, which gives legal effect to the Revised Framework (NT, 2019);
  - Guidelines on the Implementation of the Revised Framework (DPME, 2019);
  - Guidelines on assessment of Draft Strategic Plans and APPs (DPME, 2019);
  - Analytical framework and template to analyse the responsiveness of SP-APPs (DWYPD, 2019);
  - Analysis of Gender-Responsiveness of selected SPs and APPs (DWYPD, 2019) and feedback provided to DGs;
  - All institutions are required to include gender mainstreaming in the Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans including Technical Indicator Descriptions (TIDs).

## **4. Formative Evaluation**

### **4.1 Purpose and Objectives**

The purpose of the formative evaluation is to assess progress and enhance knowledge to contribute towards the enhanced design and implementation of the framework going forward.

The following are objectives of the Formative Evaluation:

- Further develop the Theory of Change and develop a detailed programme theory to inform the design, implementation and adaptation of the programme.
- Test selected components of the Theory of Change.
- Establish baseline data across areas of implementation.
- Undertake an evaluability assessment to determine and improve evaluability going forward.
- Assess implementation and determine effectiveness and relevance of implementation to date.

## 4.2 What is a Formative Evaluation?

Evaluations may be classified into two main types namely: formative and summative. Formative Evaluation assess ways in which a programme, policy, or project can be or is implemented. They are undertaken before or while the program is under implementation, and the focus is typically on design or improvement of implementation. On the other hand, summative evaluation focus typically on the outcomes of a project, policy, or program, and to a lesser degree on how implementation could have been improved.

Since evaluation is embedded within the framework, different types of evaluations will be undertaken to assess the implementation of the framework with a key focus on design, theory of change, effectiveness and improvement of implementation. In addition, it is intended that the evaluation results will be effectively utilised and assist in providing further impetus to the implementation of the GRPBMEAF going forward. This would be at the level of centre of government departments, other national departments and provinces (Office of the Premier).

## 4.3 Revisions to the Original Terms of Reference

The following revisions have been made to the original Terms of Reference (ToR):

| <b>Revision 1 – Commissioning the Evaluation</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The formative evaluation was initially going to be undertaken internally by the Monitoring and Evaluation Chief Directorate. However, the evaluation will be commissioned by an external service provider and the M&E team (DWYPD) has commenced with the SCM processes to procure a service provider for the evaluation.       |
| <b>Revision 2 – Evaluation Team</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| The evaluation team now comprise of three (3) officials, i.e. CD: M&E; D: Evaluation; and DD: Evaluation. Further, since the evaluation will be undertaken by an external service provider, the roles of the evaluation will change.                                                                                            |
| <b>Revision 3 – Chairship of the Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| The ESC will be chaired by the CD: M&E (Ms Dineo Mmako) until further notice.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| <b>Revision 4 – Members of the ESC</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| The ToR initially indicated that DWYPD had identified members from ten (10) departments. However, the Department of Telecommunications and Postal Services did not respond to the request and therefore there are currently nine (9) members serving in the ESC. This is still sufficient to carry through the work of the ESC. |
| <b>Revision 5 – Financial Implications</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| The M&E Chief Directorate had initially planned to utilise the savings of R250 000 for outsourcing the Theory of Change component of the evaluation. However, since a decision was taken to outsource the entire evaluation, the M&E unit has planned to utilise an estimated amount of R 750 000 for the evaluation.           |

## **4.4 Components of the Evaluation**

The evaluation will have three components namely: the review of the implementation of the GRPBMEAF, the M&E framework for the GRPBMEAF (Theory of Change for the framework), and baseline data.

### ***Component 1 – Review of the implementation of the GRPBMEAF***

The review will focus on assessing the performance of the GRPBMEAF in terms of implementation and achieved results. It will also look at what worked and what did not work, identifying enabling and hindering factors to the achievement of outcomes. The review will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability criteria.

### ***Component 2 – Monitoring & Evaluation Framework for GRPBMEAF***

This will entail focus on the assumptions made in the development of the Theory of Change within the framework, explicit and testing these assumptions. A theory of change works well as long as its assumptions are valid (they explain why the chain of changes can/should work). This component will be developed by the service provider once appointed.

### ***Component 3 – Baseline data***

Baselines are needed to measure change over time. Comparing data at the onset of an intervention (baseline data) with data at the end (end-line survey) change may be measured by comparing the situation before and after the intervention. Further, the baseline data complements the M&E framework, and are the first steps to make the framework operational and useful. The baseline of the formative evaluation will supplement the baseline from the Rapid evaluation which was undertaken in the 2019/20 financial year.

## **4.5 Key Evaluation Questions**

The following are key evaluation questions that the evaluation will seek to address:

- To what extent has the GRPBMEAF being implemented as planned and institutionalised?
- What has the implementation process entailed?
- What is the theory of change underlying the intervention and is it working?
- What interventions have been implemented effectively?
- What results have been achieved? (effectiveness, outputs, early outcomes)
- What are the lessons learnt (obstacles, challenges, successes, innovations and good practices) in the implementation of the GRPBMEAF?
- How can the GRPBMEAF be strengthened?
- How can the evaluability of the GRPBMEAF be strengthened?

## **5. Evaluation Methodology**

### **5.1 Evaluation Approach**

The approach used in undertaking of evaluation draws from the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) (DPME, 2020, p15), which defines evaluation as “The systematic collection and objective analysis of evidence on public policies, programmes, projects, functions and organisations to assess issues such as relevance, performance (effectiveness and efficiency), value for money, impact and sustainability, and recommend ways forward”.

Since the Framework is fairly new, a formative evaluation will be undertaken to contribute to improving the knowledge base of the programme, including the theory of change and performance data; understanding what works, what does not work and factors behind the performance in order to contribute to improved design, implementation and results going forward.

The formative evaluation will apply a mixed methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative methods to collect, generate and analyse data relating to the conceptual foundations of the GRPBMEAF and its implementation from a variety of sources. The approach will be mostly qualitative because of the formative and exploratory nature of the exercise: understanding what worked and what did not work, how, why and in what circumstances.

Data will be collected and analysed against, but not limited to, the following ten (10) pillars identified in the GRPBMEAF:

- Gender-responsive country planning and monitoring
- Gender-responsive institutional planning
- Gender-responsive policy priorities
- Gender-responsive evaluation, knowledge and evidence
- Gender-responsive monitoring and auditing
- Gender-responsive budgeting
- Other related systems, incl. cabinet and parliamentary systems
- Gender-responsive legislation
- Gender-responsive performance management
- Communication, advocacy and training

Among the key focus areas is an assessment of whether, amongst others, there is any change in departmental plans and budgets from being gender blind to being gender-targeted, gender-responsive and gender transformative.

## 5.2. Analytical Framework

The evaluation criteria in the table below are linked to the evaluation questions for the formative evaluation. Although the formative evaluation will be focusing primarily on the implementation of the framework, emerging outcomes will be included in the evaluation.

| Criteria                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Related evaluation question(s)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Relevance:</b> the extent to which an intervention is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient, and funder.                                                                                                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What interventions have been implemented effectively?</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Effectiveness:</b> the extent to which an intervention achieves its intended objectives.                                                                                                                                                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What has the implementation process entailed?</li> <li>• What is the theory of change underlying the intervention and is it working?</li> <li>• What interventions have been implemented effectively?</li> <li>• What results have been achieved? (effectiveness, outputs, early outcomes)</li> <li>• What are the lessons learnt in the implementation of the GRPBMEAF?</li> </ul> |
| <b>Efficiency:</b> measuring programme outputs against programme inputs. It looks at how well a programme is being implemented to achieve its intended objectives.                                                                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the GRPBMEAF being implemented as planned and institutionalised</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <b>Sustainability:</b> the extent to which the benefits are likely to continue after the intervention has been withdrawn or as it continues. This includes assessing environmental as well as financial aspects of the programme design and efficiency. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the lessons learnt in the implementation of the GRPBMEAF?</li> <li>• How can the GRPBMEAF be strengthened?</li> <li>• How can the evaluability of the GRPBMEAF be strengthened?</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                 |

Table 1: Criteria and related evaluation questions

## 5.3 Tools for Data Collection

This will include a study of internal and external documentation and of secondary data sources such as:

- Literature review including relevant literature on GRPB and its components; the literature review will aim to identify existing theories and conceptual frameworks as well as causal mechanisms;
- Documentary analysis, including of government planning and budgeting instruments and other evidence related to the framework, which will be analysed to assess their gender-responsiveness;
- Theory of Change workshop with stakeholders; this will be utilised to surface implicit theories of change from practitioners as a key source in the development of the refined Theory of Change;
- Self-administered questionnaire to be completed by respondents without the presence of the interviewer;
- Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with the relevant centre of government departments such as National Treasury, which play a critical role in the implementation of the framework. Interviews will also be conducted with sampled departments to establish progress and challenges in the implementation of the framework;
- Focus groups will consist of interviews conducted with more than one person simultaneously, generally a group of people from the same organisation or discipline;
- Analysis of existing monitoring and performance data; and
- Case studies.

#### 5.4 Tools for Data Analysis

The following tools will be used for analysing data:

- **Content analysis** will be applied to analyse qualitative data obtained from literature review, self-assessments as well as interviews.
- **Comparative analysis** will be applied in the benchmarking of well-functioning practices for the implementation of the framework.

#### 5.5 Evaluation Scope and Limitations

The scope of the evaluation includes the following:

- All ten pillars of the GRPBMEA Framework.
- National and provincial government departments, selected municipalities.
- Selected other relevant institutions and bodies such as Parliament.
- Implementation in the period from 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2021.

The following limitations could influence the project from being finalised within the envisaged time frame:

| No. | Limitation(s)                                                                                                                      | Efforts to mitigate the limitation(s)                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.  | Non-availability of departmental officials to populate the self-administered data collection tool.                                 | Send data collection tools to departments on time and make constant follow-ups.                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2.  | Non-cooperation of officials with provision of information and data collection tools not being completed timeously by departments. | Liaise with the higher office in the departments (office of the DGs) to get cooperation from the officials in the departments. Request intervention support by the DG of DWYPD of departments that are not cooperative with provision of information. |
| 3.  | COVID-19 regulations may limit physical engagements (interviews) with departmental officials as means of data collection.          | Utilise alternative methods of engagement such as virtual meetings as means of data collection.                                                                                                                                                       |

**Table 2: Limitations and mitigating factors**

## **5.6 Sampling**

Departments will be selected using purposive sampling, particularly centre of government departments and those, which have a significant impact in relation to WYPD deliverables.

## **5.7 Quality Assurance**

Quality management is an important process in all evaluations. Quality assurance should be applied in the evaluation methodology as well as other critical areas to ensure quality in the evaluation. In this regards, triangulation and internal and external validation mechanisms will be used to ensure the reliability and credibility of the findings. Triangulation will imply crosschecking findings from different sources. Internal validation will take place through internal revisions/peer reviews among team members. External validation will consist of working sessions with the ESC.

## **6. Literature Review**

The existing literature on gender mainstreaming in Public Service highlights the importance of gender equality and promotion of women's empowerment in societies and households. Gender mainstreaming is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making the concerns and experiences of women as well as men an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all policies and programmes in all

political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated (United Nations 2003).

In 1995, the mainstreaming of gender was identified as a key process for instituting change to the new South African democracy. South Africa ratified the Beijing Platform for Action, an agenda towards female empowerment, and made a firm commitment to the mainstreaming of gender within the Public Service by creating the National Gender Machinery. However, appreciation for the diversity between men and women still remains limited across government departments, and the processes currently in place are not making much of a difference (Rai, 2006).<sup>1</sup> South Africa further made commitments to eliminate gender equality through various national, regional and international treaties such as the Convention for the Elimination of All Forms Discrimination against Women, Southern African Development Community Declaration on Gender and Development and African Union Protocol on the African Charter on Human.

To honour these treaties, South Africa introduced a number of strategies, initiatives and measures to assist in gender mainstreaming across the state machinery. These included, amongst others, the development the South Africa's National Policy Framework for Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality, i.e. Gender Policy Framework, the establishment of the National Gender Machinery (NGM) and the development of Gender Mainstreaming Training programme through the National School of Government. The Ministry of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities was established in the Presidency to monitor the implementation of mainstreaming these initiatives and strategies. Youth and Persons with disabilities were included in the notion of gender mainstreaming as these groups needed to equally access resources, get development benefits and be included in programme operations.

Even though different measures were put in place in South Africa to recognise and implement gender mainstreaming in government and to monitor the process of gender mainstreaming, different reports published have revealed that there are many challenges related to gender mainstreaming in the South African government and there is a lack of knowledge about gender mainstreaming in most departments. The report on the analysis of Strategic Plans by DWYPD (2021) highlighted that most government plans (APP/SP) are failing to translate their vision (policy/plans) into practical interventions and programmes to address the issues of gender mainstreaming at operational level<sup>2</sup>. As highlighted by Riley (2004, p.111), experience in organisations has indicated that changing from gender mainstreaming as a policy to implementing or practising gender mainstreaming has been challenging<sup>3</sup>. For

---

<sup>1</sup> South African Public service Commission Report, 2006 Rai, S.M. (2008) (ed.), *International Perspectives on Gender and Democratization*, Basingstoke: Macmillan

<sup>2</sup> Report on Analysis of National Government 2020-2025 Strategic Plans (SP) For Responsiveness to priorities of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities 2020/21

<sup>3</sup> Riley, J. "Some Reflections on Gender Mainstreaming and Intersectionality." *Development Bulletin*. (64), 2004

Moser, the biggest challenge lies in identifying correct indicators, which would require four interrelated indicators measuring inputs, outputs, effects and impacts (Moser 2007).

Furthermore, Rai (2006, p. 14) mentioned that the reason for the lack of knowledge with regard to gender mainstreaming in government departments is that departments do not understand “what it is that needs to be changed, why it needs to be changed, how to go about the change process, and what results should be produced”. This was alluded by Moser (2007) who identified the biggest challenge as the lack of identifying correct indicators, which would measure inputs, outputs, and impacts related to women<sup>4</sup>. This was evident that the strategies and initiatives put in place in government departments were not effectively gender mainstreaming effectively and not yielding the desired change

Therefore, gender mainstreaming needed to include other disciplines (e.g. finance, auditing) in order to fully focus on the key country and institutional planning mechanisms that are needed to support the mainstreaming of gender such as the inclusion of gender, age and disability at the MTSF level and accountability by government executive managers. The DWYPD developed the GRPBMEA Framework as a tool to assist the South African government with the necessary practical aspects of implementing gender mainstreaming from different disciplines and to mainstream gender effectively. The framework was initially implemented by government departments in the financial year 2019/2020. This implementation need to be monitored and evaluated regularly in order to create a culture that recognises gender as a marginalised issue and create a clear reporting strategy that will enable government departments to align their plans to be engendered at all planning level.

Additionally, constant monitoring and evaluation is needed in ensuring that gender mainstreaming is done effectively at all levels of government as this will ensure that the implementation of the GRPBMEA Framework is done effectively and drive policy making decisions. Guzura (2017) indicated that the ultimate test of whether gender mainstreaming strategies implemented are succeeding or failing lies in the rigorous monitoring and evaluation<sup>5</sup>. It will ultimately drive departments to be gender transformative, transparent and honest about documented performance in relation to gender, youth and persons with disabilities issues.

---

<sup>4</sup> Moser, A. 'Gender Indicators: Overview Report. Sussex. IDS/UNDP, 2007.

<sup>5</sup> Tobias Guzura (2017). An overview of issues and concepts in gender mainstreaming. Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences Volume VIII, No I Quarter I 2017

## **7. Preliminary Findings**

### **7.1 Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2019 – 2024**

The MTSF 2019 – 2024 outlined seven priorities that the government wants to achieve by the end of the 5-years period. In implementing all the priorities, the government has committed to factor-in the priorities and interests of WYPD. The MTSF 2019-2024 indicated that the country's triple challenges (poverty, inequality and employment) are excessively felt by WYPD and this should inform all the interventions of government in the next five years. The MTSF 2019-2024 indicated that WYPD need to be mainstreamed into all elements of South Africa's developmental future and all plans of all three spheres of government. The MTSF provides the government departments an illustration of measures to implementing the GRPBMEA Framework. The planning at the MTSF level prioritises the interests of WYPD.

### **7.2 Medium Term Budget Policy Statement (MTBPS) 2020**

The MTBPS is crucial in implementing the GRPBMEA Framework as it enables the planned interventions to be implemented effectively. The MTBPS 2020 is not highlighting the budget allocation for the priorities of WYPD. The MTBPS 2020 stated the expenditure amount for the DWYPD. In the MTBPS 2020, an amount of R12.6 billion is allocated for presidential employment interventions to address unemployment among the youth. (MTBPS, 2020, p. 39). Although the MTBPS make mention of the budget allocation to DWYPD, the MTBPS remain blind to the interests of women and persons with disabilities. It is worth noting that gender-responsive budget is not a separate budget for women but an allocation of budgetary resources with gender intelligence to translate policy commitments into gender-specific goals (Sodani and Sharma, 2008, p. 227). The MTBPS as a government policy statement is lacking the budgetary resources to address women empowerment, gender equality and realising the rights of persons with disabilities.

### **7.3 DPSA Public Service Women Management Week Report (PSWMW) 2019**

The PSWMW is a programme that was introduced in 2007 to monitor the implementation of the Head of Department's (HODs) 8-Principle Action Plan for Women's Empowerment and Gender Equality within the Public Service Workplace. The following were findings of the 2019 PSWMW report:

- The PSWMW is an institutionalised monitoring tool for the Public Service. However, nearly half (43%) of national departments do not use this tool to monitor and report progress on gender mainstreaming in the Public Service which is a concern since the theory of change for the PSWMW is premised (amongst others) on the fact that HODs use this as a monitoring tool.
- Inconsistencies in the reporting over the financial years which creates a challenge when conducting a comparative analysis.

- The fact that some of the departments still fail to develop gender indicators is a great concern. Those who did confirm that they developed gender indicators, mostly refer to indicators by managers responsible for corporate services.
- One of the main responsibilities of Gender Focal Points (GFPs) is to facilitate the mainstreaming of gender in all aspects of the departmental processes including policy development, yet many departments still reported that their GFPs do not play a role in this regard and this needs to be addressed. Furthermore, senior managers need to learn how to do gender-responsive budgeting and to consider gender in the planning of all their projects (which is only possible if disaggregated data is gathered).
- Several departments reported on good practices that will be followed up as part of monitoring and also to start developing case studies that will be shared throughout the Public Service, including reporting on them in regional, continental and international obligations that the country has ratified.

#### **7.4 Rapid Evaluation of Early Implementation**

The Rapid evaluation report on the implementation of the GRPBMEAF was developed in the 2019/20 financial year. As a rapid evaluation, it was aimed at documenting and reviewing the early implementation of the Framework in order to assess areas of progress, challenges and obstacles and lay the basis for improved implementation and performance going forward towards the goal of WEGE in South Africa. The report found that implementation is in its infancy since the framework was approved in 2019. Good progress at national level driven through centre of government departments such as DWYPD and DPME which provides a strong basis for further embedding GRPBMEAF at other levels of state machinery. Although implementation is slow at departmental/ institutional level in responding to the policies, there has been pockets of movement in relation to the implementation of GRPBMEAF in key areas with indications of plans to going forward. The report further highlighted that attention should be paid to communication, advocacy and training; obtaining further buy-in from public office bearers and top management across the state machinery; ensuring champions for implementation at a leadership level within every institution; and ensuring interventions from centre of government departments such as DWYPD, NT, DPME, DPSA and COGTA to sustain the impetus towards implementation and results.

#### **7.5 State of the Nation Address (SONA) 2021**

The 2021 SONA re-emphasised the WEGE commitments made in the previous SONA (2020). Emphasis was made on women's economic inclusion as well as GBVF.

The following are extracts from the speech in key areas (SONA 2021, p.26).

- Women's economic inclusion

“Last year, Cabinet approved a policy that 40% of public procurement should go to women-owned businesses. Several departments have started implementing this policy and are making progress”

- Gender-based violence and femicide

“To strengthen the criminal justice system to prevent women and children from being traumatised again, and to ensure that perpetrators face justice, three key pieces of legislation were introduced in Parliament last year to make the criminal justice system more effective in combatting gender-based violence”.

“Last week we also launched a ground breaking private sector-led GBVF Response Fund”. “Several South African companies and global philanthropies made pledges to the value of R128 million”.

## **7.6 Country Gender Indicator Framework (CGIF)**

The CGIF was first developed in 2018/19 by the DWYPD. The CGIF was seen as an important instrument in facilitating the implementation of the GRPBMEA. Its purpose is to develop a coherent set of priority gender indicators aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and other relevant global instruments as well as the African Union (AU), Southern African Development Community (SADC), National Development Plan (NDP) and other relevant national and sectoral instruments and policy frameworks.

It was intended that the CGIF would be used as a source for the integration of relevant indicators within the planning and monitoring instruments of the sixth administration, including the MTSF as well as institutional strategic plans and APPs. During 2019/20, the CGIF was further developed, aligning it with the 2019-2024 MTSF. The High Level Steering Committee (HLSC) on GRPBMEA was consulted on the framework and final adjustments are to be effected in line with the final MTSF.

## **7.7 The South African Economic Reconstruction and Recovery Plan (ERRP)**

According to the South African ERRP, the interventions that form part of the South African ERRP will be geared towards promoting greater participation by black people, women, youth and persons with disability at all economic levels. This will be done as part of transforming patterns of asset ownership and income distribution in our society. Government will ensure effective gender mainstreaming in all aspects of the Plan, through the participation and mobilisation of women at all levels. This includes such mechanisms as the 40% set aside for women in public procurement, legal remedies to close the gender pay gap, women’s participation in key economic sectors, access to assets such as land, and women’s financial inclusion and empowerment.

In the infrastructure built programme, South African companies and building materials will be used, as well as labour intensive construction methods; placing emphasis on skills transfer, the empowerment and inclusion of young people, women and persons

with disability. Small, Medium and Micro Enterprises (SMMEs), especially those run by the young people, women and persons with disability will play a significant role in the delivery of the infrastructure necessary to catalyse economic recovery and reconstruction.

Young people, women and persons with disabilities will be encouraged and supported to form cooperatives in key economic sectors such as retail, agriculture and agro processing, financial services (Cooperative Financial Institutions), manufacturing and infrastructure development. In addition, young people, women and persons with disability will be prioritised in accessing funding for initiatives that will drive the recovery and reconstruction effort.

As part of building the skills base required by changing economy, young people, women and persons with disability will be provided with tools and training to enable them to access online learning and economic opportunities. Linked to this will be the re-orientation and alignment of the skills strategy to be more demand led and responsive to the changing nature of work, including prioritising the up-skilling of women and girls with due regard to reversing the deterioration of the gender division of labour (South African economic reconstruction and recovery plan, p.23).

## **7.8 Analysis of Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans**

As part of the 2020/21 APPs deliverables, the Department (DWYPD) through the Chief Directorate: Monitoring and Evaluation (CD: M&E) did an assessment of SPs and APPs of twelve (12) national government departments. The main purpose of the assessment was to determine the extent to which government departments are responsive to the priorities of WYPD in line with the GRPBMEA Framework.

The assessment analysis consisted of thirteen (13) areas related to the responsiveness of the departmental plans to the priorities of WYPD. The assessment revealed that only three (3) plans (SPs and APPs) of the twelve (12) departments analysed have institutionalised WYPD responsive planning in line with the GRPBMEA Framework.

## **7.9 Self-assessment Monitoring**

A total of forty-two (42) national departments and nine (9) provincial Offices of the Premier were requested to provide responses in all the ten main areas of GRPBMEAF implementation through a self-assessment tool. Requests were sent to Departments on 22 December 2020, with requests for submission by 15 February 2021. Although continuous follow-ups were made, only fourteen (14) departments submitted their responses. These departments included: Department of Small Business Development (DSBD); Civilian Secretariat for Police (CSP); Department of Basic Education (DBE), Department of Sport, Department of Arts and Culture (DSAC); Public Service and Administration (DPSA), Independent Police Investigative Directorate (IPID) Department of Human Settlement (DHS), Department of Mineral Resources and

Energy (DMRE), Department of Tourism (DOT), Department of Social Development (DSD), Government Printing Works (GPW), South African Police Services (SAPS), Department of Telecommunications and Postal Services (DTPS)/Department of Communications and Digital Technologies (DCDT), Government Communication and Information System (GCIS), National Treasury (NT) as well as the South African Judiciary. Of these, two (2) are centre of government departments, namely DPSSA and NT submitted responses. In addition, three (03) Offices of the Premier submitted responses, these includes: Kwa-Zulu Natal Province, Mpumalanga Province and Western Cape Province.

Centre of government departments, including DPME, NT, COGTA and DPSSA, were requested to complete both Part 1 as COG departments to assess government-wide interventions and Part 2 as national departments to assess their internal planning and budgeting processes. Provincial Offices of the Premier were required to complete Part 3.

Some departments that were not aware of the GRPBMEA Framework and requested DWYPD to host a training session on the framework as well as self-assessment monitoring tool.

A quantitative and qualitative analysis of the Departments' self-assessments responses was conducted. Based on the data provided, the main findings are that most departments remain largely gender blind, with elements of gender-targeted and gender-responsive interventions.

Overall, the findings from the literature review indicate that some progress has been made in improving the gender-responsiveness of key policy and planning instruments and guidelines at a national level. The Rapid evaluation found that while gender blindness remains predominant, there are clear signs that new instruments and systems are more gender-inclusive. Further, it is encouraging that the GRPBMEA Framework has been included in Performance Agreements of Ministers to ensure implementation and accountability. However, it is a concern most departments have not institutionalised WYPD responsive planning in line with the GRPBMEA Framework as highlighted in the analysis of SPs and APPs. Overall, the findings place further impetus on the need for continuous monitoring and evaluation on the implementation of the GRPBMEA Framework.

## **8. Outputs, Deliverables, Timeline and Skills Transfer**

### **8.1 Outputs and Deliverables**

Deliverables expected from the evaluation:

- Inception report on the GRPBMEAF formative evaluation which should include a preliminary literature review; detailed evaluation design linked to the draft Theory of Change; detailed methodology and content structure of the final report;
- Detailed Literature Review; documentary review; international benchmarking;

- Data collection instruments and analysis plan as well as other tools;
- Other technical or process reports including Report on Theory of Change workshop;
- Case studies;
- Detailed Theory of Change in diagrammatic and narrative form;
- Draft evaluation report (full plus 1/5/25) and powerpoint presentation;
- Workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report;
- Final evaluation report (full plus 1/5/25) and powerpoint presentation;
- Final report to include revised Theory of Change and logframe;
- Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation, including interviews.

## 8.2. Timeframe for the Evaluation

| TASK                                                                                             | TIMELINE                     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>FINALISE DRAFT INCEPTION REPORT</b>                                                           |                              |
| • Initial documentary review and preparation                                                     | Dec. 2020 – 31 Jan. 2021     |
| • Draft inception report                                                                         | 17 Feb. 2021                 |
| • Present Draft inception report to ESC                                                          | 23 Feb. 2021                 |
| • Comments from ESC                                                                              | 01 Mar. 2021                 |
| • Final inception report                                                                         | 31 Mar. 2021                 |
| <b>APPOINTMENT OF SERVICE PROVIDER</b>                                                           |                              |
| • Invitation of proposals (Advertised)                                                           | 01 Apr. 2021                 |
| • Closing date for submission of proposals                                                       | 15 Apr. 2021                 |
| • Evaluation of proposals                                                                        | 17 Apr. 2021                 |
| • Appointment of the service provider                                                            | 20 Apr. 2021                 |
| <b>DATA COLLECTION</b>                                                                           |                              |
| • Development of data collection tools                                                           | 20 - 23 Apr. 2021            |
| • Approval of data collection tools                                                              | 23 Apr. 2021                 |
| • Secondary data collection and analysis                                                         | 26 Apr. – 14 May. 2021       |
| • Interviews (virtual)                                                                           | 17 May – 31 May 2021         |
| • Produce field work report every two (2) weeks to the Steering Committee                        | 30 Apr.; 14 May; 28 May 2021 |
| <b>DATA ANALYSIS</b>                                                                             |                              |
| • Aggregate data collected                                                                       | 01 Jun. – 11 Jun. 2021       |
| <b>THEORY OF CHANGE</b>                                                                          |                              |
| • Develop Theory of Change for the evaluation                                                    | 14 Jun. – 30 Jul. 2021       |
| • Facilitate workshop on the developed Theory of Change                                          | 13 Aug. 2021                 |
| • Produce report on TOC workshop                                                                 | 20 Aug. 2021                 |
| <b>REPORTING</b>                                                                                 |                              |
| • Draft evaluation report                                                                        | 06 Sep. 2021                 |
| • Present Draft evaluation report to the ESC                                                     | 13 Sep. 2021                 |
| • Comments from the ESC                                                                          | 20 Sep. 2021                 |
| • Draft evaluation report produced and submit to the ADDG: PSCKM                                 | 24 Sep. 2021                 |
| • Draft evaluation report produced and submit to the Office of the Director General for approval | 30 Sep. 2021                 |

| TASK                                                                                  | TIMELINE         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>FINAL REPORT</b>                                                                   |                  |
| • Management response                                                                 | 30 Oct. 2021     |
| • Approved Formative Evaluation Report and improvement plan produced                  | Nov. 2021        |
| • Evaluation Report tabled in various forums including DG clusters and cabinet system | Nov. – Dec. 2021 |

Table 3: Timeline for the evaluation

### 8.3. Capacity Building and Skills Transfer

In order to strengthen the processes of organisational learning in the area of evaluation, it is critical to ensure capacity building and skills transfer during the evaluation. Skills transfer may be in the form of training, mentoring, and coaching. Once the service provider has been appointed, they will be required to develop a detailed skills transfer plan to be applied during the evaluation. The following areas, amongst other, will be should be covered as part of capacity building and skills transfer:

- Conducting literature and documentary review
- Questionnaire design
- Data collection
- Data analysis
- Report writing for an evaluation
- Development of the Theory of Change for programmes

## 9. Ethical Consideration

The following ethical considerations will be considered during the formative evaluation:

- **Confidentiality** - Processes ensure the responsible use of personal and sensitive information and anonymity is honoured.
- **Respect** - Dignity and self-esteem is built amongst stakeholders and affected people and there is sensitive implementation of M&E processes.
- **Representation of competence** - Those engaged in monitoring and evaluation fairly represent their competence and the limitations of their reports.
- **Fair reporting competence** - Reporting provides a fair and balanced account of the findings.

## 10. Management Arrangements

As indicated above, the evaluation will be undertaken by an external service provider. Therefore the M&E unit perform an oversight role as follows:

- CD: M&E – Provide strategic and conceptual leadership.
- Director: Evaluations – Project coordinator, managing the evaluation as well as oversee ESC secretariat.

- Deputy Director: Evaluations – Assist in managing the evaluation and perform ESC secretariat functions.

## 11. Financial Implications

The cost implication of the evaluation is estimated at R 750 000.00 and the evaluation will be conducted in the 2021/22 financial years.

### Annexure A: Evaluation Steering Committee members

#### Internal (DWYPD) Members

| Name              | Designation     | Department/Organisation |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Ms Dineo Mmako    | Chief Director  | DWYPD                   |
| Mr Phumlani Tembe | Director        | DWYPD                   |
| Ms Phintia Koma   | Deputy Director | DWYPD                   |

#### External Members

| Name                     | Designation                                | Department/Organisation              |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Ms Fanani Manugu         | Director                                   | DPSA                                 |
| Ms Thokozile Masangu     | Chief Director                             | DPME                                 |
| Ms Desiree Jason         | Director                                   | DSD                                  |
| Ms Lindiwe Khonjelwayo   | Divisional Head                            | Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality |
| Ms Ntombikayise Zulu     | Chief Director                             | Gauteng OTP                          |
| Ms Prudence Cele         | Senior Policy Analyst                      | NT                                   |
| Ms Sixolile Ngcobo       | National Gender Missionary National Leader | Commission for Gender Equality       |
| Ms Babalwa Nyangintsimbi | Deputy Director                            | StatsSA                              |
| Ms Marylene Broderick    | Chief Director                             | Tourism                              |

## **Annexure B: Data sources used**

- Rapid Evaluation Report on the implementation of GRPBMEAF
- Medium Term Budget Policy Statement (MTBPS)
- Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTSF)
- Country Gender Indicator Framework (CGIF)
- Economic Reconstruction and Recovery Plan (ERRP)
- Strategic Plans (SPs) and Annual Performance Plans (APPs)
- Performance Agreements of Ministers
- Public Service Women Management Week report (PSWMW)
- State of Nation Address (SONA) 2021

## **Annexure C: Terms of Reference for the Formative Evaluation of the Gender-Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework**