

Q and A Sessions

The following question and answer session report is based on notes taken during these sessions and is not 100% accurate and verbatim although every attempt has been made to capture the sessions in their entirety.

Dr Tsakani Ngomane (Deputy Director-General, The Presidency) – Process of effecting refinements to Delivery Agreements, Outcome 7

Question 1:

Do we look at the relationship between the different outcomes before going into detail?
How do outcomes relate to each other?

Answer 1:

Raising issues around different outcomes and complimentary to outcome 7. We will have to look at outcomes in other commissions. At this stage it is not very clear across outcomes. We will need to put a matrix together across outcomes. For today in Output 3 – rural services – water, electricity, services etc. The departments relevant will give technical input into the process.

The cross-cutting targets at outcome level are documented.

Question 2:

Please provide clarity on the slide of non-changeables. You indicate that targets are non-changeables yet your examples slide indicates possible changes to targets.

Answer 2:

Regarding targets, key targets are outcome level cannot be changed. These are already contracted between the president and relevant minister. The sub-output targets can and should be reviewed.

Question 3:

With regard to non-changeables, you mentioned that some targets are set too low and were achieved within the first year of measurement and that some targets were set too high and will not be realistically met over a five year period. How did we arrive at these targets? Please provide clarity on policy intentions? What is the definition of key technology – a working definition?

Answer 3:

Definitions – we need to agree today on operational definitions of concepts.

Question 4:

What changes, if any, can we make? Cabinet says that our reports are green. They do not necessarily show the impact that we are making. In planning we have agreed that targets lead to outcomes. When reviewing our plans we need to question if our assumptions are correct in targeting. We need to ask what our assumptions are. We may require target changes.

Answer 4:

The rural development minister is trying to recognise or respond to a huge demand for rural services. It is the individual departments responsible for specific services that need



**rural development
& land reform**

Department:
Rural Development and Land Reform
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

to provide information on this. The department (DRDLR) ended up working with policy and implementation. We need to clarify assumptions. In the perfect set up the lead department for each output should play the co-ordinating role.

Assumptions in annexure 1 included in activities, these assumptions are based on activities. There are no overall assumptions. We need to review our activity specific assumptions, if you review an activity you need to review its assumptions.

Question 5:

Outcome 7 as it stands – will wholesale changes be made or has your department identified areas needing change? Are their guidelines/ areas from PDME?

Answer 5:

Constant changes – definitely not. This is a refinement process.

Question 6:

A suggestion – output 5, the process of moving it to another outcome, don't you think that it should not move in its entirety, but that rather aspects of it relevant to other outcomes with no relevant activities in outcome 7 should be moved and those not linked to others should remain in outcome 7?

Answer 6:

A suggestion – to not move output 5 we propose to do away with output 5 as standalone output. But as we deal with other outputs – output 5 is a cross-cutting output in other key outputs for outcome 7. There are institutional relations in all outputs, see where sub-outputs & activities address output 5.

Even jobs, they are an output of an output – job creation does not happen in a vacuum, it is linked to other outputs.

Question 7:

What are the roles and responsibilities in the refinement process once refined? Is there coordination of outputs at different departments – implementation is across different departments at province level – they see it as additional to their normal job – if a coordinator does not make sure outcomes are met and measured they will be ignored. The issue of protocol – you are bound to do ... in terms of outcome 7 – no need for coordination it is necessary not extra.

The involvement and participation of municipalities – they are not represented here – how far should what we do here inform their frameworks – IDP's – they need to implement all outcomes – how do we link this to the mandate of the municipalities?

Answer 7:

Seeing outcomes as additional at administration level, the next presentation will outline this issue clearly.



Dr Moshe Swartz (Deputy Director-General, DRDLR) – Briefing to Outcome 7 Forum: Comprehensive Rural Development Programme

Question 1:

The municipal systems act says that we have to engage with communities to what extent is this methodology being embraced at municipal level? This planning process has to find place in the IDPs.

Answer 1:

The Municipal Systems Act (MSA) – we are enhancing what municipalities are doing. At municipality level, DBSA, IDPs empowerment projects – process of building and enhancing IDP work. CRDP is based on the Khanye COPTA model.

Question 2:

NISIS profile community – are we able to get a poverty index from NISIS information, and measure the change over time – say 3 years, and compare across communities?

Answer 2:

NISIS poverty index – not a once off, suppose to give us baselines every 6 months – KZN has used it for a poverty index.

Question 3:

Implementation is there consultation across departments, budgets different budgets for different services?

Answer 3:

Cross department consultation – we are not succeeding in getting national departments in enhancing IDPs except with Social Development – they are good.

Question 4:

Comment – CRDP is implemented exactly like PPT

Answer 4:

Is CRDP being embraced? – Mpumalanga Province is testimony, ward counsellors like to be visible when we are engaging with the community as it gives them a physical presence in the communities they represent.

Question 5:

Comment – this approach, has it been reinforced or dwindled down? Needs analysis information is not available.

Community needs – but also basic services – where do we balance priorities of government verse community?

Answer 5:

There are dynamics in delivery. Communities will tell you what they want rather than you tell them what they need.

Question 6:



When the process begins, at what point do departments with no provincial presence get involved? Or is Rural Development doing all this and taking it to national departments and we plan around it?

Answer 6:

Departments that are not present at provincial levels are able to get involved. The Presidency for the last 24 months every Monday - got provincial departments to discuss how NISIS works, how the findings get referenced with the 22 national departments results published. Not a dedicated person to follow up each need – no way to have us deal with acting or referrals. Follow ups need to be managed.

Question 7:

Is the RECAP programme part of CRDP?

Answer 7:

Yes RECAP programme is part of CRDP. Irrigation scheme is in rural areas – RECAP has a land reform focus, but we expanded it, but not much regarding farming but rather irrigation schemes.

Question 8:

Comment (Dr Ngomane) – understanding the CRDP of rural development as one of their programmes that should be rolled out. CRDP is not what Outcome 7 is all about. CRDP contributes to Outcome 7 along with other programmes.

What are the cost implications in the pilot sites – the needs assessments have cost implications.

Answer 8:

Delivery agreement of Outcome 7 – not all about CRDP only CRDP is broader than outcome 7.



**rural development
& land reform**

Department:
Rural Development and Land Reform
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Mr Simon Meyer (Acting Deputy Director-General, DRDLR) – Taking outcome 7 forward: beyond reporting

Question 1:

The only way to get to outcomes is through embedding – is treasury here? The APP submission on outcome 7 deliverables – properly planned for and given money for next year – will resourcing address this. Where does treasury come in?

Answer 1:

Oversight bodies – DPSA, Treasury etc don't want to overburden departments with reporting requirements. There needs to be alignment of oversight bodies. As we revise APPs – due in December 2011. Already indicators (12) should be reflected in APPs – align indicators for outcome work – resource allocation needs to be aligned with treasury APPs.

Question 2:

Provincial challenges – coordinator report for outcome 7 – national department when we ask for your assistance please assist. How do others report to us as provincial departments? We need your support at provincial level.

Answer 2:

Question 3:

Drivers are critical – rural development – “shot” policy framework for rural development – green paper/ land reform past for rural development new mandate shared – we want to co-ordinate.

Joint planning – DAFF should always attend these meetings – they are not here. We need DAFF for joint planning.

Focus at national level – assumption at provincial level we have to do the same – need guidance in co-ordinating at provincial level

Definitions – small holder farmer – DAFF needs to lead in this definition.

Answer 3:

Drivers and policy – green paper on rural development is due for release shortly. Space will be provided for public debate. It is governments 1st clear integrated approach to rural development.

DAFF – the DAFF senior managers are away for a 2 day session and couldn't be here.

We were informed by DAFF that we should go ahead with this process and that they would try to send people. I take the point that DAFF plays a critical role in this process.

Support to provinces – national office is just getting going – this is our understanding – it is now clear for us and provinces - we will interact with provinces.

Coordinating at provincial level – we collectively need to apply our minds to this – we receive information from provinces, rural development and information from DAFF, we don't know if DAFF information includes provincial rural development or if national office has corresponding provincial office information. National office should consolidate the information of the 9 provincial offices and send it to the DG of Outcome 7. When rural development national office doesn't have provincial information we will get it from departmental national offices. With municipalities, not sure of the kinds of information we are getting from municipalities. Does municipalities or provincial departments report on this information – who reports what? Whoever funds it needs to report on it. But there are lots of ways of understanding and managing information criteria. Different provinces have



different processes for reporting. Some use MECS across municipalities. Different provinces will be different. Source of information and who will report is based on who funds it. There are no clear answers to this issue.

Comment 4:

This is helpful, provides opportunity to reflect and close gaps, one can't report on what you have not planned for – especially coordinators at provincial level. Caught between national reporting across departments at different levels, not at provincial. Baselines – targets are not being reviewed as there is no baseline to inform targets.

Question 5:

Comment - reporting is poor – result difficult to see impact, good work also not reported – good suggestions MoUs, signing off.

These are proposals when will they be put into effect by departments involved in outcome 7? Must be done.

Answer 5:

Moving forward with these proposals – cabinet endorses these proposals and there is no reason to wait. DAFF has started signing MoUs on Outcome 7 across departments. Our (DRDLR) MoU will be coordinating responsibilities not services. Each lead department will coordinate its relevant output.

Question 6:

Joint planning – outcome approach calls for partnerships. Agrarian and Land Reform in the Eastern Cape – had an opportunity to sit with the mayors. The mayors indicated that this is outside their IDP process, which then becomes a problem to prioritise. They do not have similar planning systems to the provinces. They are finalising their IDPs while we are reviewing, so joint planning is not happening. We will present this problem in feedback.

Answer 6:

IDP issues – municipalities planning process now to March – we shall have time to impact on that. We need to be clear on what we are able to deliver I our fellow departments, there needs to be synergy at provincial level before we go to municipalities to better engage with municipalities.



Mr Simon Meyer (Acting Deputy Director-General, DRDLR) – Process plans

Question 1:

Flow chart – from the provinces, what are we expected to do? DAs with our MECS – should we wait – some have started – do we wait?

Answer 1:

Provinces and their role – issues of kind of information we are expecting from provinces – national department DAFF with provincial department links need to consolidate up to national lead departments

This is a review process - not sure if it should be top down or bottom up.

Question 2:

Do we come up with projects? These are a lot.

Answer 2:

List of projects are vast. Need to say we cover this area with this kind of project so partners can see we are covering the areas that need to be covered.

If we understand where we stand we can see the needs and gaps – the modality needs to be worked out – but we have to look at what we are doing in relation to one another.

Question 3:

Continuity of the process - point of contact for this process, who is the contact in each department for each output for outcome 7? Can we circulate the list of contacts so that we know who to liaise with?

Answer 3:

Where is outcome 7 being coordinated from in each department – still not clear to us – we are tracking these representatives so we can build a database of who is responsible for what.

Question 4:

No process for output 4 – clarity in addressing it please?

Answer 4:

Output 4 & 5 – resolution – specific sub-outputs their by nature are fully implemented by rural development will retain as is. Don't cross/ duplicate by report outputs 4&5 that are reported under the outputs 1 -3. Same for output 5 some will remain as are.

Question 5:

Unclear – specific departments need to indicate which output they can respond to (ICTs etc) can Rural Development take lead to tell us what ICT services you require so I can decide what project I focus on, according to Rural Dev priorities.

Answer 5:

Rural develop tell us what needs to be done – often requested. Rd needs to build with you – joint planning can allow us to assess what is currently happening before we can look at what we can improve on. Out mistake is to have a one size fits all approach – it doesn't work – we need to understand what is happening where before we decide what needs to happen.

Comment 5:



First hand reality is that provincial coordinators cannot attract their own counterparts in the provinces to give them information. EIF meetings have gaps due to lack of information from departments at provincial level. People don't respect the importance of reporting if I cannot contact a department contact for Outcome 7 how can I get information from provinces as we are not getting TIF and EIF information. How does information flow from departments to coordinating departments at provincial level? We need an information flow diagram. How does it get to me at national?

Question 5.1: (follow up question) – clarity is needed – are we expected to provide information on output 1 our outcome 7?

Question 6:

Dr Tsakani please resolve our problems – I don't deal with drawing information from district to provincial to national, but I do give information to Treasury. Certain rules differ to our timelines that don't allow us to do what we need to do.

Answer 6:

Grappling with complex issues – the lead department (DRDLR) needs to revisit communication mechanism in place. DPMEs position – concern about quality and accuracy of information. At provincial level, lead department coordinator will get information related to the outcome throughout and send it – signed off – to the Office of the Premier and national office. Then national office needs to verify and send to coordinating department (DRDLR).

Challenges in timelines of deadlines for reporting and alignment – due to the timeline challenges the lead national department requested the information directly from provinces.

Question 7:

Challenges – not able to get information around basic services due to 30 day delay in our timeline. Where do we get that information? Do we contact the MEC or COGTA for the information for outputs? You indicate that MECs should account for outcome 7. Is this practical?

Answer 7:

We have received reports from national and provincial offices of the same departments. Which set do we use? Does one include the other? Consolidation on what each department is going to be sharing outside of that department. In house cleaning and sorting needs to take place so that no duplication of information occurs. You can make each national department responsible for collating provincial data or use no information from national but use MECs of rural development in provinces. Presupposes provinces are able to do so. At least reporting, the provincial reporting was weak (10%). We used national information for our last reports.

What is practical? – what could happen in future – MECs at provincial level use information at provincial level. At present there is a risk of quality and capacity issues. Simon (Meyer) provided two options – use national office or use MECs. Use coordinators to send information to Simon (DRDLR) across outputs – keep it simple – exec mayors and MECs who sit at Exec – they agree to district and provincial coordinators at provincial levels. The plea is to stick to their institutional agreements. Collect information at provincial level. Let disaggregate national information at district level. Should be bottom up but there are institutional challenges. We should get information from MECs and national.



Question 8:

Reporting – 10% from provinces and 80% from national – national gets its information from provinces so this statement does not make sense.

Answer 8:

We got information from only 2 provincial departments in our request for data for our report, not 10% from all departments, but 10% off all departments. The ideal is to receive consolidated provincial information. If you have it at provincial level please submit it to us, but we still need to use national government information. Provincial departments must report to the Office of the Premier and to their National Department.

Comment 9:

The template is difficult to report on that is why you are not getting the information you require.

Question 9:

Where is the POA template?

Question 9.1:

The reporting deadline is today 7th Oct. Please can you give us a new deadline?

Answer 9:

Reporting template challenges – POA is the template and we do not want to tamper with it. We don't want to chop & change templates. Don't worry about the summary version. We at national (DRDLR) will worry about the summary. It is online and will be refined to make reporting easier. We will train people in various departments to capture electronically directly later on after capacity in engaging with the POA electronically has been achieved. If you are able, update electronically if you have the capacity to. We will send you the template in PDF – to the mailing list of this workshop.

Answer 9.1:

The new reporting deadline to receive information from partners is the 14th October 2011.

Question 10:

Planning side – timing is off – Nov to Dec we are submitting plans already – timing of changing plans - timing of processes is problematic. Need guidance on reporting as well difficult to reporting on some indicators not delivery orientated.

Answer 10:

Question 11:

MoU signed by HODs – what happens at provincial level? MoUs are needed at provincial level.

Answer 11:

MoUs at provincial level are fine. Timeframes need to be contracted.

Comment 12:



Reporting on outcome 7 needs provincial M&E Forum – current no structure – piggy back – other programmes on outcome 7.
National office need to talk to provincial departments reporting on outcome 7. Not just piggy back.

Question 13:
Over-emphasise joint planning at provincial level

Answer 13:
Joint planning – can be complex. Treasury planning will kick in will be later not now at this stage. We are not ready to make big bold decisions about how departments are using resources etc. Get ready use joint planning to reflect on outcome 7 issues within our APPs. National treasury will check all APPs to seek information on outcome 7 targets; information etc. is reflected in APPs. See this as what it is – begin discussion. Then we will see similar thinking at provincial level. National needs to lead by example.



**rural development
& land reform**

Department:
Rural Development and Land Reform
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA