

Review
of the
Delivery Agreement
and
Programme of Action
for
Outcome 7
6 & 7 October 2011

Workshop Report

For



**rural development
& land reform**

Department:
Rural Development and Land Reform
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

1st Draft
12th October 2011

Prepared by
Christel Jacob
Principal Consultant
CJ Development Research Consulting

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Purpose of the Workshop	3
3. Background	4
4. Process	5
5. Outcome	8
6. Way Forward	8
7. Facilitators comments	9
7.1. Success factors	
7.2. Challenges	
7.3. Lessons	
7.4. Recommendations	
7.5. Conclusions	
8. Appendices	13
8.1. Workshop Programme	
8.2. Workshop Register	
8.3. PowerPoint presentations	
8.3.1. Ms Christel Jacob – Overall workshop	
8.3.2. Dr Tsakani Ngomane – Process of effecting refinements to Delivery Agreements, Outcome 7	
8.3.3. Dr Moshe Swartz – Briefing to Outcome 7 Forum: Comprehensive Rural Development Programme	
8.3.4. Mr Simon Meyer – Taking Outcome 7 forward: beyond reporting	
8.3.5. Mr Simon Meyer – Process plans	
8.4. Q & A sessions	
8.5. PowerPoint presentations of feedback sessions	
8.5.1. Output 1	
8.5.2. Output 2	
8.5.3. Output 3	

Introduction

This document presents the workshop report of the 1st annual review of the Delivery Agreement for Outcome 7 held on the 6th & 7th October 2011, at the Birchwood Conference Centre in Boksburg, Ekurhuleni, Gauteng. The workshop participants included Director-Generals and Executive Managers responsible for Outcome 7 in all departments at both national and provincial level. The workshop was coordinated by the national department of Rural Development and Land Reform, the lead coordinator of this Outcome.

The workshop report is written by Ms Christel Jacob of CJ Development Research Consulting, who was contracted to facilitate this workshop.

Purpose of the Workshop

“This Delivery Agreement will be reviewed annually in the light of learning by doing and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) findings. Accordingly it will be refined over time and become more inclusive of the relevant delivery partners.”
(Delivery Agreement – Outcome 7, pg 2)

In fulfilment of the above statement made in the delivery agreement of Outcome 7, a 1½ day workshop was held on the 6th & 7th October 2011 at the Birchwood Conference Centre in Boksburg, Ekurhuleni, Gauteng. The workshop participants included Director-Generals and Executive Managers responsible for Outcome 7 in all departments at both national and provincial level.

“In close consultation with The Presidency, one of the most important activities which need to take place before the 4th reporting cycle (end of October 2011) is the review of the Delivery-agreement and the Programme of Action (POA) for Outcome 7. This revision will require all mandated stakeholders of the Technical Implementation Forum (TIF) for Outcome 7 to attend and to deliberate on the required revisions. The meeting will be chaired by the national Department of Rural Development & Land Reform (DRDLR) where after Dr Tsakani Ngomane from The Presidency will address delegates on the process.

The review-meeting has the following objectives / deliverables:

- To amend the sub-Outputs and activities for Outcome 7 (important to note that the 5 Outputs can't be amended);
- To reduce the number of indicators for Outcome 7;
- To clarify milestones for each sub-Output and activity;
- To clarify measurement units;
- To clarify reporting formats & templates.”

(Invitation to the Outcome 7 Delivery Agreement review workshop, 23rd September 2011, DRDLR)

Background

“Government has agreed on 12 Outcomes as a key focus of work between now and 2014. Each Outcome has a limited number of measurable Outputs with targets. Each Output is linked to a set of activities that will help achieve the targets and contribute to the Outcome. Each of the 12 Outcomes has a delivery agreement which in most cases involves all spheres of government and a range of partners outside government. Combined, these agreements reflect government’s delivery and implementation plans for its foremost priorities.

This delivery agreement is a negotiated charter which reflects the commitment of the key partners involved in the direct delivery process to working together to undertake activities effectively and on time to produce the mutually agreed-upon Outputs which in turn will contribute to achieving Outcome 7.

The delivery agreement provides detail to the Outputs, targets, indicators and key activities to achieve Outcome 7, identifies required inputs and clarifies the roles and responsibilities of the various delivery partners. It spells out **who** will do **what**, by **when** and with **what** resources. The Outcomes apply to the whole of government and are long term. While the delivery agreement may contain longer term Outputs and targets, it also includes Outputs and associated targets that are achievable in the next 4 years.

The normal budgeting process will continue to determine the allocations to Departments. These Delivery Agreements will be an important input into the budgeting process for 2011/12 and the final budget allocations will affect the order of priorities and phasing of the implementation of this Delivery Agreement. For 2012/13 and subsequently, the annual revisions to the Delivery Agreement will be timed to link with the budget process so that the revised Delivery Agreement is signed off after the budget is signed off.”

It also considers other critical factors impacting on the achievement of Outcome 7 , such as the legislative and regulatory regime, the institutional environment and decision-making processes and rights, the resources needed and re-allocation of resources where appropriate.

This Delivery Agreement will be reviewed annually in the light of learning by doing and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) findings. Accordingly it will be refined over time and become more inclusive of the relevant delivery partners.”

(Delivery Agreement – Outcome 7, pg 2)

“Public agencies will form the core of the Implementation Forum which will drive achievement of this Outcome, supported by strategic civil society partners. The Implementation Forum will consist of the coordination department (DRDLR), co-chair (DAFF) and other core departments. Supporting departments and stakeholders will form task teams per Output. The task teams will include other departments and stakeholders from other Outcome forums as and when necessary.”

Table 1. Implementation Forum

Coordinating Department	Co-chair	Core Departments	Key stakeholders
DRDLR	DAFF	COGTA, DPW, DWA, dti, DSD, Energy, EDD, DHET, DOT, DPSA, DST Provincial sector Departments, MINMEC"s with the rural development function	DEA, DST, EDD, DoH, DBE, DHET, DOT, DAC, SRSA, DoL, DOC, DMR, DHS, Local Government, SETA, Provincial Sector Departments, State-Owned Enterprises, Public Entities, SALGA, ARC, HSRC, CSIR, Municipal Demarcation Board, NGOs, water services providers, farmers organisations, Perishable Products Control Board, Traditional Institutions, Councils of Stakeholders

(Delivery Agreement – Outcome 7, pg 5)

Process

The workshop began in a presentation format with three presentations orienting the participants to the purpose, process and intended outcome of the review process.

Dr Tsakani Ngomane, Deputy Director-General in the National Department of Performance Monitoring & Evaluation, in the Presidency and Outcome Facilitator for Rural Development gave a presentation on “The process for effecting refinements to delivery agreements for Outcome 7.”

In this presentation Dr Ngomane gave a brief background to the development of the delivery agreements for Outcome 7. She explained the need for its refinement and highlighted the need to maintain a balance between keeping to the overall agreement and refining it to enhance its utility. Dr Ngomane also took participants through the process of evaluating the delivery agreements providing examples of what constituted a legitimate refinement and what did not. She then took the participants through the annual review /consultation process and the role that this forum TIF (technical implementing forum) plays in that process. Dr Ngomane provided a template for commissions to use during the refinement process in order to align the different Output groups feedback and finally, she explained the supportive role of the department of performance monitoring & evaluation in the refinement process.

Dr Moshe Swartz, Deputy Director-General in the National Department of Rural Development and Land Reform gave a presentation on “The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP).”

In his presentation Dr Swartz outlined the CRDPs vision, mission and goal and highlighted the linkages between the CRDP and Outcome 7. He then outlined the Recapitalisation and development programme of DRDLR. Dr Swartz further explained the CRDP programme in terms of its concept implementation and management system. The data collection processes undertaken within the CRDP was explained in terms of its empowerment and participatory nature. The NISIS, household profiling system and process were outlined. Dr Swartz finally provided photographic evidence of this system in action.

Mr Simon Meyer, Acting Deputy Director-General in the National Department of Rural Development and Land Reform gave a presentation on “Taking Outcome 7 forward: beyond reporting.”

Mr Meyer’s presentation addressed issues following the successful review and refinement of the Delivery Agreement for Outcome 7. He highlighted the change in approach from process to outcomes. Mr Meyer then reflected on the delivery agreement over the past year highlighting the challenges including a focus on reporting; difficulty in validating evidence as well as navigating shared mandates across departments. He also addressed the challenge of integration of the Outcome at all levels of delivery and reporting and that departments and municipalities saw reporting on Outcome 7 as additional to their mandate rather than integrated into it. Isolated planning and information gaps were also raised as integration challenges by Mr Meyer. Mr Meyer indicated that Outcome 7 required a clear and shared vision in order to build partnerships relating to its implementation and reporting. He emphasised joint planning and private sector inclusion as a key element of success. Mr Meyer indicated that an embedded, outcome based approach needed to be adopted involving synergy between monitoring, evaluation, reporting and planning. He further noted that there needed to be a link between delivery and performance agreements and that MoUs needed to be entered into at provincial level and national level and that Cabinet had endorsed this. Finally, Mr Meyer pointed out that institutional mechanisms needed to be further developed and utilised in order to fulfil the delivery of Outcome 7.

The next stage of the workshop involved two breakaway sessions in which participants broke into three groups in order to refine the Delivery Agreement for Outcome 7 according to the 1st three of the 5 Outputs. Output 4 & 5 were intended to be covered as cross-cutting Outputs within the 1st three key Outputs of Outcome 7.

The first breakaway session allowed one hour for each group to refine the sub-Outputs for each of the three key Outputs.

The second breakaway session allowed one hour for each group to refine the activities for each sub-Output of the three key Outputs.

The mandate for this exercise was

“ To amend the sub-Outputs and activities for Outcome 7 (important to note that the

- 5 Outputs can't be amended);
- To reduce the number of indicators for Outcome 7;
- To clarify milestones for each sub-Output and activity;
- To clarify measurement units;
- To clarify reporting formats & templates.”

(Invitation to the Outcome 7 Delivery Agreement review workshop, 23rd September 2011, DRDLR)

In her presentation, Dr Ngomane further pointed out that...

“There has to be legitimacy for the refinement and rationalising of the sub-Outputs and subsequent activities” (slide 11).

“What does NOT constitute a legitimate change

- A. Changes that bring the delivery agreement into conflict with the original prescripts in the performance agreement regarding
 1. content,
 2. policy intention,
 3. targets,
 4. responsibility or omission there-of.
- B. Changes without evidence and motivation” (slide 14).

In the question and answer session Dr Ngomane further noted that it was important for participants to operationally define each concept and make sure that no sub-Outputs were duplicated across or within Outputs.

The template provided for by Dr Tsakani Ngomane in her presentation was intended to be used as the report back tool.

“Template for the refinement process

Type of change	Current	Proposed amendment	Reason for the change / evidence of the need for change	Consequential changes (i.e. to indicators, activities)
Target	50 000 new smallholder farmers producing for sale	100 000 new commercial farmers Improve measurement (%)	Target already achieved Indicator	????
Sub Output				
Indicator				
Activities				

(Dr Tsakani Ngomane’s presentation: “The process for effecting refinements to delivery agreements for Outcome 7”; slide 18; 6th October 2011)

Following the breakaway sessions was a one hour feedback session in which all three groups were required to feedback on their refinement exercises for both sub-Outputs and activities.

After the feedback session **Mr Simon Meyer, Acting Deputy Director-General in the national department of Rural Development and Land Reform gave a presentation on “Process Plans for Outcome 7.”**

In this presentation Mr Meyer outlined the way forward once the refinement workshop had ended. Mr Meyer highlighted that fact that there were three distinct processes that would run concurrently and contribute to improving implementation and reporting in relation to Outcome 7. He then took the participants through a detailed timeline of deliverables and deadlines involved in the three processes namely:

- Reporting Process for 4th cycle reporting
- Delivery Agreement Review Process and the
- Improvement Process

Outcome

The key outcome of reviewing and refining the Delivery Agreement for Outcome 7 was partially met. The review process could not be successfully completed within the time allocated to each task. The absence of DAFF, the co-chair of the TIF as well as other departments including health, basic education, and social development, amongst others also posed a significant challenge in meeting the objectives of this workshop. The outcome of clarifying reporting formats and templates was sufficiently addressed by Mr Meyer in his presentation on “Process Plans for Outcome 7”.

Way Forward

The way forward is outlined in Mr Meyer’s final presentation titled “Process Plans for Outcome 7”. The key slides are represented here.

“Delivery Agreement Review Process

Activity	Due by...	Responsible
Consolidation of Proposed improvements to DA and workshop report development	14 Oct	DRDLR
Workshop report and proposed amendments to DA sent to partners	14 Oct	DRDLR
Inputs to be received from partners	24 Oct	Partners
Update DA with inputs received	26 Oct	DRDLR
Submit to DPME for inputs	28 Oct	DRDLR
Presentation to TIF	4 Nov	DRDLR
Presentation to EIF	8 Nov	DRDLR
Presentation for endorsement to Cabinet	23 Nov	DRDLR

(Slide 4)

Process for reporting (1 July 2011 – 30 Sept 2011)

Activity	Due by...	Responsible
Submit reports to output leaders	7 Oct	Provincial Coordinators
Submit output reports to compilers	14 Oct	Output Leaders
Generation of POA report (electronic)	21 Oct	DRDLR
Production of summary progress reports based on the implementation of activities per sub output.	24 Oct	DRDLR
Technical implementation Forum (TIF) reviews summary progress report for submission to the Executive Implementation Forum	4 Nov	DRDLR
Executive Implementation Forum	8 Nov	DRDLR
Coordinating Ministers consider the report and indicate changes required before submission to the Cabinet Committee		Cluster coordination
Full Ministers' cluster consider the report and indicate changes required before submission to the Cabinet Committee	10 Nov	Cluster coordination
Submission of reports to Cabinet Committees	16 Nov	Cluster Coordination
Cabinet considers the reports for all outcomes	23 Nov	

(Slide 3)

Improvement Process

Activity	Due by...	Responsible
Circulate DG to DG MOU t partners	10 Oct	DRDLR
Comments on DG – DG MOU received from partners	28 Oct	Partners
Update MOU with comments received	2 Nov	DRDLR
Presentation to TIF	4 Nov	DRDLR
Presentation to EIF	8 Nov	DRLDR
Work session for all partners to share information on projects linked to Outcome 7	Between 8 – 23 Nov	DRDLR and partners
Submission of progress report on remedial measures to Cabinet	23 Nov	DRDLR

(Slide 5)

(Mr Simon Meyer, Process Plans for Outcome 7; 7 October 2011)

Facilitator's comments

The facilitation style adopted in this workshop was unobtrusive and allowing the participants to take ownership of the refinement process in a participatory manner that best suited them. As a result each breakaway Output group tackled each refinement process with their own approach although exercise objectives, guidelines and limits were provided for by Dr Tsakani Ngomane. The key tasks facing the facilitator were to manage the time allocation effectively; facilitator question and answer time; and summarise the various stages of the workshop.

Successes

Representation

The response of TIF in the form of 62 participants from 9 national departments and 14 provincial departments who attended this workshop proved invaluable to the process. Consulting, research and academic organisations were also represented at the workshop.

Presentations

The presentations successfully oriented the participants to the task at hand as well as what was required going forward.

Discussion

The TIF workshop offered a spectrum of departments and key role players within and across departments the opportunity to engage on common experiences, concerns, as well as challenges regarding the implementation and reporting of Outcome 7. This was evident by the amount of interaction between participants over the course of the workshop.

Question & answer session

The question and answer sessions provided a useful forum for participants to gain clarity on key issues, processes, challenges and opportunities regarding the refinement as well as the implementation and reporting on Outcome 7. Addressing these issues with the TIF resulted in a common understanding of matters raised.

Breakaway refinement sessions

The sessions in commissions provided an invaluable opportunity for the participants to engage with the Delivery Agreement in an analytical manner.

Challenges

Time

The time allocated to each of the refinement sessions was significantly insufficient to enable each breakaway Output group to adequately complete the refinement process for each of the three key Outputs of the Delivery Agreement. Some groups only had time to address the sub-Outputs component and did not look at activities at all. Each of the groups were supposed to incorporate Output 4 and 5 into their Output refinement process, but again due to time were unable to do so. Overall, the intended objectives were not all met as a result of time constraints.

Timing

The timing of the review process does not align well with other reporting mechanisms within the government reporting system and needs to be reviewed. This also applies to the quarterly TIF meetings.

Process

Although a mandate was provided, one of the breakaway Output groups experienced challenges navigating the process through which to achieve the objectives. Although each group was left to manage this process on its own in order to encourage ownership of the process this caused delay in getting to unpack the Delivery Agreement itself. Due

to the already tight timeframe this posed a further challenge to adequately completing the refinement process.

Representation

The noticeable absence of DAFF, the co-chair of the TIF, posed a significant challenge in meeting the objectives of this workshop. The absence of other departments including health, basic education, and social development, amongst others was also unfortunate.

Breakaway refinement sessions

The refinement process highlighted the various interpretations of various aspects of the Delivery Agreement including definitions and the challenges associated with operationalising them. Participants also experienced challenges associated with reviewing targets without sufficient credible baseline information.

Lessons

Time – not providing sufficient time within the workshop schedule to refine the Delivery Agreement for Outcome 7 results in the process being short-changed and objectives not being fully achieved.

Timing – the timing of the refinement process, as well as reporting cycle for Outcome 7 needs to link into other government reporting cycles in order to be effectively utilised. The clashes in deadlines (municipal and departmental planning, reporting to treasury etc) have implications for achieving the full benefit of implementing Outcome 7.

Representation – having the refinement workshop without the presence of key department representatives significantly hampers the ability of those present to fulfil the objectives of the refinement process.

Process – not having a process facilitator in each breakaway Output group with photocopies of the refinement objectives available to all participants may result in an inefficient use of time.

Recommendations

Time

It is highly recommended that the annual refinement workshop be run over a longer period of time and a month earlier (September) in the year in order to facilitate the ease of meeting deadlines following the workshop. It is recommended that the Delivery Agreement refinement workshop be run over a full four day period with the first day being dedicated to orientation presentations; the entire second being dedicated to reviewing sub-Outputs; the entire third day being dedicated to reviewing activities; and the first half of day four being dedicated to feedback on the previous two days refinement process. This would leave the second half of the final day for address issues regarding the way forward.

Representation

It is recommended that TIF meetings be made a priority to TIF members and that all member departments and other relevant department leads for Outcome 7 make it a point of attending all TIF meetings. Meetings should not be scheduled when key departments

are unavailable and sufficient notice should be provided by all parties when this is the case to enable successful rescheduling of TIF meetings.

Process

Based on some of the process challenges faced by some participants it is recommended that each breakaway Output group be allocated a process facilitator (monitoring & evaluation specialist) from either within or outside of government to manage each groups' process in refining the Delivery Agreement. All facilitators would need to be briefed on the facilitation of the breakaway Output groups prior to the workshop to ensure consistency in process within and across groups. It is also recommended that each participant be given photocopies of the goals and objectives (mandate) of the refinement process to reflect on throughout the refinement process. These recommendations would facilitate the completion of the task.

Conclusions

Overall the workshop was considered to be an effective exercise in gaining clarity on the processes involved in refining, implementing and reporting on the Delivery Agreement for Outcome 7. The presentations sufficiently oriented the participants to these objectives and the discussion and question and answer sessions provided a sufficient opportunity for the participants to engage with the process. The breakaway Output sessions were highly interactive and participatory in nature and allowed participants to take ownership of the refinement process although the time allocation was insufficient to allow for the successful completion of the task. The absence of DAFF posed a challenge to effectively meeting the intended objectives of the refinement process.

Appendices

Workshop Programme

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Final Programme
6&7 Oct '11.pdf

Workshop Register

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Attendance Register
6&7 Oct '11.pdf

PowerPoint presentations

Ms Christel Jacob – Overall workshop

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Overview
Slides 6&7 Oct '11.pdf

Dr Tsakani Ngomane – Process of effecting refinements to Delivery Agreements,
Outcome 7

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Dr Tsakani
Ngomane slides 6&7 Oct '11.pdf

Dr Moshe Swartz – Briefing to Outcome 7 Forum: Comprehensive Rural
Development Programme

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Dr Moshe
Swartz slides 6&7 Oct '11.pdf

Mr Simon Meyer – Taking Outcome 7 forward: beyond reporting

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Mr Simon
Meyer slides 6&7 Oct '11.pdf

Mr Simon Meyer – Process plans

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Mr Simon
Meyer process plans slides 6&7 Oct '11.pdf

Q & A sessions

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Q&A sessions 6&7
Oct '11.pdf

PowerPoint presentations of feedback sessions

Output 1: Reviewing sub-Outputs

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Output 1
review 6&7 Oct '11.pdf

Output 2: Reviewing sub-Outputs & Activities

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Output 2
review 6&7 Oct '11.pdf

Output 3: Reviewing sub-Outputs & Activities

Attachment titled: DRDLR Outcome 7 DA Review Workshop Output 3
review 6&7 Oct '11.pdf