

**Evaluation of public policies in South Africa:
Governance, Independence and Credibility**

Issues Paper presented at the UNDP Conference on National Evaluation Capacity,
Casablanca, Morocco: 15-17 December 2009

Angela Bester¹

Introduction

Monitoring and evaluation practice in the South African government is at an interesting point in its evolution. Ten years ago M&E was a term known only to a handful of government officials who had been exposed to the practice through donor agencies and through exposure to M&E in other countries. There were trailblazers such as the Department of Land Affairs who as early as 1995 established the M&E Directorate for land reform. Today the South African government boasts an M&E architecture that is beginning to approximate those of more developed countries. Many national government departments have a dedicated M&E Unit headed by an official from the Senior Management Service and the Government Wide Monitoring & Evaluation Framework (GWM&E) is gradually being institutionalised. South Africa also has a Public Service Commission with a constitutional mandate to monitor and evaluate public administration. The establishment of the Ministry for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency following the 2009 general elections, has catapulted M&E to greater prominence.

What are the implications for evaluation of public policies in South Africa? This brief issues paper explores this question from the perspective of governance, independence and credibility of evaluation practice.

Independence and credibility of evaluations - Why they matter

Evaluation of public policies is an important tool for promoting accountability of elected officials and public servants, improving or changing policies, and promoting learning within public sector organisations. For the recommendations of evaluations to be used, it is essential that the evaluation is credible. The credibility of an evaluation is influenced by the competence of the evaluation team and their personal credibility, the quality of the evaluation, and importantly, by the extent to which the evaluation meets the requirements of independence. Evaluation independence, quality and credibility can be considered to be complementary facets of evaluation excellence.²

¹ Angela Bester is a Director of Deloitte & Touche (Southern Africa). The views presented in this paper are her personal views and do not represent the views of Deloitte & Touche.

² Piccioto, Roberto, *Evaluation independence at DFID: An independent assessment prepared for IADCI*, 29 August 2009

Independence lies at the core of the credibility of an evaluation. The commonly used definition of independence is that of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD as set out in the *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. According to the DAC definition, an evaluation is deemed to be independent when “carried out by entities and persons free of control of those responsible for the design and implementation of the development intervention.”³ The DAC definition also suggests that the independence of an evaluation is characterised by evaluators being able to carry out their task *without political influence or pressure from within the organisation*, that evaluators are given *full access to all relevant information* required for the evaluation, and that they have *full autonomy in conducting and reporting their findings*.

The principle of independence refers not only to behavioural dimensions. The structural arrangements such as the location of an evaluation unit in a particular organisation and the rules that govern the organisation also have an impact on the independence of evaluations.

Independence and credibility form part of the approved Norms and Standards of the UN Evaluation Group and other international agencies such as IFAD and the Asian Development Bank.⁴

The Monitoring and Evaluation System in South Africa: How it works

The Monitoring and Evaluation system in South Africa is not a single system, but a collection of different systems that have evolved at different paces over time. The major components of the Monitoring and Evaluation System are discussed in the order of their evolution.

Public Service Commission (PSC)

The Public Service Commission is established under Chapter 10 of the Constitution that deals with public administration. The PSC is constitutionally mandated to investigate, monitor and evaluate the organisation, administration and personnel practices of the public service. It is also empowered to advise national and provincial organs of state, and to promote a high standard of professional ethics in the Public Service. As a body established under the Constitution and reporting to Parliament, the PSC is an independent body. Though independent in its actions, the PSC cannot afford to be distant as it has to engage with government departments in its advisory role.

Since its establishment as the ‘new’ PSC in 1999, the PSC has conducted a large number of evaluations on a broad spectrum of issues in the public service. These range from evaluation of service delivery of a particular sector to evaluation of policy initiatives such as poverty reduction programmes. One of its signature evaluations is the annual State of the Public Service Report (SOPS). Covering a different theme each year, the SOPS Report is organised around 9 values and principles of good public administration⁵. The release of the SOPS Report to Parliament is usually followed by a round-table discussion with stakeholders who debate the issues arising from the SOPS Report and propose improvements to the format and processes for the SOPS Report.

³ OECD, DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation, *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*, 2002

⁴ United Nations Development Group, *Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*, April 2005

⁵ The latest SOPS Report focused on the readiness of the public service for the Soccer World Cup 2010

An equally important output of the PSC is the *Consolidated Public Service Monitoring and Evaluation Report* which evaluates the performance of individual departments against the 9 values and principles of public administration. The evaluation is done against explicit performance indicators. The PSC believes that these evaluations contribute to good governance and improvement in service delivery.⁶

The PSC has published a document on *Basic Concepts in Monitoring and Evaluation* aimed at supporting M&E practitioners, senior managers in the public service and managers of service delivery units who produce performance information and statistics. The document aims to clarify concepts and the various frameworks, hoping to provide guidance and contribute to a better understanding of M&E.⁷

The PSC uses its own staff as well as external consultants to conduct the evaluations. The use of external consultants is usually to complement the PSC's own internal capacity.

The PSC commissioned an independent assessment of its work yielding valuable insights that can assist in improving its performance. The main findings indicate that the PSC is seen to produce sound quality research and evaluation that are of use to policy-makers, decision-makers and other oversight bodies such as the legislatures. The PSC is seen to behave independently, firmly and fairly. The findings also highlight limitations such as the lack of power of the PSC to compel the changes it recommends, its limited resources and its lack of attention to using its reports more strategically to influence change.⁸

Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System

In the first 5 years of the new democratic government in South Africa, very few departments engaged in any systematic monitoring and evaluation of their policies and programmes. The late 1990s saw early attempts by government to introduce government-wide monitoring and evaluation. These attempts were not successful and in 2004 there was a renewed effort at government-wide monitoring and evaluation.

The 2004 Election Manifesto of the Ruling Party identified monitoring and evaluation as a priority - "We will improve the system of monitoring and evaluation to improve the implementation of all these programmes, through stronger monitoring and evaluation units at national, provincial and local levels....."⁹. In 2005 the Cabinet approved a plan to develop the Government-wide monitoring and evaluation system (GWM&E) across government. The Presidency was given the task of leading the effort, with other key role players, namely, the National Treasury, the Department of Public Service and Administration, the Department of Provincial and Local Government, the South African Management Development Institute, the Public Service Commission and Statistics South Africa.

⁶ Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa, *Third Consolidated Public Service Monitoring and Evaluation Report, Research Cycle 2005/2006*, March 2007

⁷ Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa, *Basic Concepts in Monitoring and Evaluation*, February 2008

⁸ Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa, *An Assessment of the Impact of the Work of the Public Service Commission on Public Policy and Practice in South Africa*, May 2009

⁹ Election Manifesto of the African National Congress, 2004

The aims of the GWM&E System are:

- To serve as an integrated and encompassing framework of M&E principles, practices and standards for use in all spheres of Government; and
- To serve as an apex-level information system that draws on component systems.¹⁰

The GWM&E System comprises three components or frameworks, namely:

- A *Programme Performance Information Framework* that clarifies standards for performance information.
- *Social, economic and demographic statistics* collected by Statistics South Africa through the census and surveys, as well as statistics collected by other government institutions.
- An *Evaluations Framework* intended to guide the planning and conduct of evaluations.

The policy framework for the GWM&E System was approved in 2007 and provides much needed clarity about the scope and purpose of the GWM&E System. Initial confusion reigned when the GWM&E was thought to be an information technology system. Roles and responsibilities were also clarified as there were inevitably issues of boundaries and overlaps between the different role players.

The policy framework of the GWM&E System outlines 7 principles for M&E and these include aspects of credibility (sound methodology, ethical conduct of evaluations, and utilisation focus). The principle of independence does not appear amongst the list, although it had been identified as a guiding principle of evaluation in an earlier draft document on principles and standards for M&E.¹¹

Since its inception, the GWM&E System has spearheaded the National Development Indicators project. The government has released an annual publication on 76 development indicators linked to the development priorities of government and in some instances to the Millennium Development Goals. The Programme Performance Information Framework is in use by government departments, though the extent of usage is variable. This is likely to change over the next year as the Auditor-General will be expressing an audit opinion on performance information. The Evaluation Framework is yet to be finalised.

Monitoring and Evaluation by individual government departments

An effective M&E system comprises a number of critical elements including:

- Tools, methods, data and information systems
- An annual or rolling plan of evaluations to be conducted
- Rules governing how M&E is to be conducted and managed; how and when stakeholders are to be consulted; dealing with issues of independence and conflict of interests
- Standards for reporting evaluations and monitoring
- Resources: staff qualification and skills requirements; budgets
- Roles, responsibilities and accountability for M&E

¹⁰ The Presidency, Republic of South Africa, *Policy Framework for the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System*, 2007

¹¹ The Presidency, Republic of South Africa, *Draft National guiding principles & standards for Monitoring and Evaluation of public policies and programmes in South Africa*, June 2006

Other than mandatory legislative and policy reporting requirements such as annual reporting, the South African Government does not prescribe these elements to departments. As a result there is a great deal of variation of M&E systems in government departments. The evaluation study conducted by the PSC in 2007 attests to this.¹² The PSC study also found that only a few provincial departments had M&E units with adequate staff and budgets.

Due to capacity constraints, a number of government departments engage external consultants to conduct evaluations. This is particularly the case in large evaluations. Departments also use external consultants where they need an independent evaluation of policy. The trend amongst government departments is to build their internal M&E units to focus on monitoring the department's implementation of policies and programmes, and managing external or independent consultants conducting evaluations.

The approach adopted by the government is to provide an enabling environment for M&E in departments, rather than prescribe the details of the M&E system. Departments do however need some basic ground rules, which one expects would be contained in the Evaluation Framework being developed by the Presidency. Given the capacity constraints with regard to M&E functions in a number of departments, it is likely that they are operating in the absence of a well-defined departmental framework, especially with regard to governance (rules) for evaluation. The independence and credibility of evaluations conducted or managed by departments could be compromised.

It would be instructive for government to conduct an assessment of the readiness of departmental M&E systems to respond to the new approach to monitoring and evaluation proposed by the Ministry for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation.

Ministry for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation

The Ministry was established in 2009 in the Presidency following the general elections and is intended to complement the newly established planning ministry in the Presidency, namely, the National Planning Commission. While the latter is charged with developing the strategic vision for the country, the Ministry is responsible for driving the improvement in government performance through a focus on outcomes.

In September 2009 the Ministry issued a Green Paper: *Improving Government Performance: Our Approach*. The three focus areas of the Ministry are:

- Management of outcomes through Ministerial accountability for improving delivery performance. Ministers are to be held accountable through performance agreements that commit them to achieving selected outcomes.
- Institutionalising the GWM&E System through a renewed focus on improving measures of inputs, outputs and outcomes.
- Unblocking service delivery through the establishment of a Delivery Unit to help turnaround blockages and non-delivery.¹³

¹² Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa, Report on the Audit of Reporting Requirements and Departmental Monitoring and Evaluation Systems within National and Provincial Government, June 2007

¹³ The Presidency, Republic of South Africa, *Improving Government Performance: Our Approach*, September 2009

It is the intention of the Ministry to effect a step-change in the approach to M&E. The Green Paper describes an envisaged *Outcomes Performance Management System*. This approach uses a few politically determined outcomes as the starting point, working backwards to identify a few output measures that could indicate if outcomes are being achieved. The emphasis is on the outcomes for the whole of government. Ministers will be required to report on these outcomes via the specific output indicators. In an effort to promote transparency and accountability, the Government has committed to making the results of the assessments available to members of the public.¹⁴ It is also envisaged that focus on outcomes will assist Parliament in its monitoring and oversight role.

According to the Green Paper, the Outcomes Performance Management System is intended to complement the GWM&E System. The policy anticipates that although the emphasis is on monitoring, there will be a need for evaluation of outcomes and impact. It also recognises that there is place for other forms of evaluations such as process evaluations.

Some governance challenges to preserving independence and credibility

The establishment of the Ministry for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation represents a shift in the overall M&E system in the South African public sector. While it is too early to judge the extent of the shift, the notion of the President holding Ministers accountable has appeal to citizens who are dispirited by poor service delivery. The elevation of M&E to Cabinet Ministerial status undoubtedly sends a clear message about the importance of M&E to the Government. This elevated status of M&E does however present challenges.

Is the balance between monitoring and evaluation appropriate?

The GWM&E System is explicit about focusing its initial efforts on monitoring, with emphasis on developing indicators and improving the overall quality of the information used. The rationale is that the institutional capacity first has to be built for sound monitoring systems and processes that can serve as a foundation for effective evaluations. This prioritisation of monitoring over evaluation is carried through into the new Outcomes Performance Management System.

There are risks to continuing with this imbalance between monitoring performance and evaluating implementation and effectiveness of public policies.

- The Outcomes Performance Management System assumes that the output indicators selected are the critical ones that contribute to the achievement of a particular outcome. Experience shows that the link between outputs and outcomes is seldom clear cut and that evaluation studies are needed to test the causal links. If evaluation continues to be downplayed, there is a risk that government continues to monitor less useful indicators and draw incorrect conclusions about the achievement of outcomes.
- Government officials are likely to spend significant amounts of time collating information for the Minister's scorecard. Given the existing capacity constraints in departmental M&E units especially those in provincial government, this could divert resources and

¹⁴ Honourable Collins Chabane, Minister for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation, Republic of South Africa, Address on the Budget Vote for the Presidency for the 2009/2010 financial year, 24 June 2009

attention from evaluations. This could short-circuit the feedback loop between evaluation and monitoring.

- There is an attempt on the part of the Ministry for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation to limit the number of indicators to be tracked, and current indications are that 30 to 40 indicators will be monitored. Experience in other countries show that it is not easy to stick to a small number of indicators. There is a reasonable probability that the number of indicators could increase. This could see a perpetuation of the balance in favour of monitoring performance rather than evaluation of public policy.

There is no doubt that if Ministers are required to report on their performance every six months to the President against predetermined indicators, their attention will be fixed on those indicators. A keen focus on the key outcomes and indicators is good, provided other important issues that fall outside the performance agreement are not neglected.

The emphasis of the Outcomes Performance Management System and the GWM&E on the monitoring aspect of M&E also presents opportunity. Ministers and senior government officials might see merit in requesting an evaluation of a particular aspect of policy or its implementation, in order to understand and explain why a particular output target has not been met. It would however be preferable to have an appropriate balance between monitoring and evaluation. The regular monitoring of outputs and outcomes cannot be a substitute for comprehensive evaluation of public policies.

The challenge of potential imbalance could be overcome through the PSC focusing its evaluations on the outcomes identified by the Presidency. This can be done without compromising the independence of the PSC to determine what it will evaluate and how it will conduct the evaluation. This does not mean that the PSC ignores other areas for evaluation, but rather that it focuses on one or two outcomes as major evaluations in a given year.

Independence of evaluations is not on the agenda

With the exception of the PSC, independence of evaluations is not on the agenda. This is perhaps a reflection of the emphasis on monitoring. As stated earlier, independence is not reflected as a principle of M&E in the government's policy framework.

The location of the M&E unit is ultimately the decision of the head of department as there are no prescriptions made by central government. M&E units in departments do not enjoy the same independence status as internal audit units that report directly to the head of department and have audit committees of external individuals playing an oversight role. There is however an endeavour to ensure that M&E units are not in the reporting line of those responsible for the design and implementation of policies and programmes.

The Outcomes Performance Management System will to a large extent rely on information supplied by government departments and it is likely that M&E units in these departments will play an important role in the provision of information. As these M&E units exist largely on the basis of preference by the Minister or head of department, their independence is not assured. Information will flow from the M&E unit to the Minister without the protection or

mediation of an equivalent of an audit committee. There is a risk that officials might downplay negative information and exaggerate positive results.¹⁵

The Green Paper stipulates that independent processes and moderators or experts will be used where it is feasible to do so in order to enhance the integrity of the process. How this will work in practice has not been made explicit in the document.

A number of departments commission external consultants to conduct evaluations. These evaluations are not necessarily independent evaluations, but rather serve to extend the limited capacity within departments to do the work themselves. In some instances, departments use reference groups to provide technical guidance to evaluations or steering committees to provide strategic direction to the evaluation. Where these committees have members who are external to the department, this can provide a check against undue influence by the commissioning department over the evaluation results.

Constrained capacity in M&E units is a threat to credibility of evaluations

Although many departments are making an effort to establish fully functioning M&E units with skilled staff, a number of departments still have capacity constraints. M&E as a discipline is relatively new to the South African public service and government through its management development institute and universities have introduced short courses in M&E. The PSC provides guidance through its *Basic Concepts in Monitoring and Evaluation* document. There is also an M&E forum or learning network in government. Organisations such as the South African Monitoring & Evaluation Association and local evaluation networks also contribute to building a community of practice for M&E.

The capacity gap, particularly in provincial government departments is still large enough to impact negatively on the credibility of evaluations. There is limited understanding of how to establish an M&E unit – how the unit should ideally be structured, what knowledge and skills are required for M&E practitioners, what policies and procedures need to be put in place, and how to plan a programme of evaluations. Departments are increasingly commissioning evaluations to be conducted by external consultants, but this does not necessarily guarantee credibility of the evaluations. Terms of reference for commissioned evaluations are seldom clear, and the key evaluation questions are not well articulated. M&E practitioners do not always have the experience or expertise to manage commissioned evaluations. This results in evaluations that are of limited value and a waste of government resources. The Evaluation Framework of the GWM&E is supposed to provide guidance on these issues, but has not yet been completed.

Legislation for M&E?

The government's Green Paper states that it may consider introducing legislation. It is not clear what the aim of such legislation would be. There are already Acts, regulations and policies that require government departments to account for their use of resources and for their performance. Specific legislation to enforce monitoring and evaluation practices will not necessarily improve M&E. An agreed Evaluation Framework with explicit norms and

¹⁵ This type of behaviour also occurs in countries with well-developed M&E systems. Refer to Schiavo-Campo, Salvatore, *Building Country Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation in the Public Sector: Selected Lessons of International Experience*, Economic Capacity Development Working Paper Series No.13: June 2006

standards, and guidance could be more effective. Legislation could have the unintended effect of getting people to focus on minimal compliance.

Good practices in addressing challenges

The fact that M&E is a relatively new discipline in the South African public sector does provide space for innovation and introducing good practices based on lessons learned by others. There are a number of ways in which the independence and credibility of evaluations of public policies in South Africa can be enhanced.

Use of peer review panels

Departments, whether they conduct their own evaluations or use external consultants, can greatly enhance the quality and hence the credibility of evaluations by using peer review panels. Peer review is a standard practice in research and could apply equally to evaluation. The selection of panel members is important for the credibility of the evaluation and panel members should therefore be selected on the basis of their technical and professional expertise. Any potential conflict of interests needs to be cleared up front. The terms of reference of the peer review panel also needs to be made explicit from the outset. The Ministry for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation should consider introducing peer review or expert panels as a matter of course.

Use of advisory committees

Advisory committees can enhance the credibility and independence of evaluations provided they have clear terms of reference and members who will add value to the evaluation. The benefit of advisory committees is that if involved throughout the evaluation, any concerns and issues can be dealt with during the evaluation rather than at the end of the process. Government departments use advisory committees comprising external stakeholders where it is important to involve particular constituencies. There are risks to using advisory committees. They sometimes assume that they have decision-making powers, they often represent a particular constituency and so will take a political position on matters and the evaluations are delayed when advisory committee meetings are cancelled. Government officials do not always provide the necessary leadership in the evaluation and allow the advisory committee to act outside their mandate. External consultants conducting the evaluation find themselves caught between the advisory committee and the client department.

Evaluating the evaluators

It is essential that entities conducting evaluations are themselves subjected to independent scrutiny from time-to-time. Independent assessment of evaluation bodies can serve to enhance the credibility of these bodies. This is no different to auditing firms that are subjected to auditing of their practices. Independent assessment also serves to improve the quality of evaluations. The independent assessment commissioned by the PSC on its impact on public policy is a step in the right direction. The assessment could have been enhanced by the use of a peer review panel.

The PSC could evaluate independence of M&E units in government departments. For such an evaluation to be thorough and meaningful, it would have to be done against explicit

criteria such as those described in the DAC Glossary, and indicators. The study on Evaluation independence at DFID provides a useful template for such an evaluation.¹⁶

The credibility of M&E units and the quality of their work can also be enhanced through a regular 'health check'. Such a health check can identify capacity gaps and pinpoint areas for training and development, as well as areas where the PSC, the Presidency, National Treasury and other central government departments need to provide further guidance.

Use of joint evaluations

The South African Government and the UN jointly commissioned an evaluation of the role and contribution of the UN System in South Africa in 2008¹⁷. It was essential that the evaluation be independent of the UN on the one hand and credible to the South African Government on the other hand. The terms of reference were agreed to by both parties and the evaluation was managed jointly. An independent team conducted the evaluation and subjected their work to peer review by an external panel. This model could be adapted for evaluation of government policies and programmes, particular large programmes or controversial policies that require independent and credible evaluations. For example, an evaluation could be managed jointly by government and an industry group on a particular issue such as health care.

Remaining challenges

There are still remaining challenges in the M&E system in South Africa that need attention.

Creating a demand for and an understanding of M&E in the legislatures

The legislatures in South Africa in the national and provincial spheres of government are required by the Constitution to exercise oversight over the Executive. M&E reports can be of great assistance to them in exercising their oversight function. Parliamentarians are not always aware of the existence of these M&E reports unless brought to their attention by the department or a diligent parliamentary researcher. There has been a large intake of new public representatives in the national and provincial legislatures since the 2009 elections and they will need to be made aware of the potential value of M&E reports. The Green Paper of government envisages that parliamentarians will monitor the progress made on the priority outcomes of the Government. In order for them to play their oversight role effectively, they will need to be educated about how the Outcomes Performance Management System works, how the indicators were developed and collected, and the meaning of the indicators.

Developing M&E capacity in government: an ongoing challenge

Developing M&E capacity in government is an ongoing challenge that could persist for some time unless more creative solutions are introduced. The Government's primary management and leadership institute (Public Administration Leadership and Management Academy) provides basic training in M&E, and courses are also available at selected universities. The number of technically proficient M&E practitioners in government is still not sufficient to meet the increasing demand for M&E. The problem is more acute in provincial government

¹⁶ Piccioto, Roberto, *Op cit.*

¹⁷ United Nations and the Republic of South Africa, Joint Evaluation of the Role and Contribution of the United Nations System in the Republic of South Africa, 2009

departments. Departments in provinces compete for the small pool of professionals willing to work in the provinces. A possible solution to the shortage is to develop a shared service for M&E in those provinces. A shared services arrangement not only spreads scarce resources more effectively across a number of departments. They also allow M&E practitioners to develop in-depth understanding of more than one department. This in turn can foster the integration of action that often eludes government departments who operate in silos.

Conclusion

As stated in the introduction to this paper, M&E in South Africa is at an interesting point in its evolution. The heightened awareness of M&E by those not directly involved in M&E bodes well for the practice in South Africa. There is space for introducing innovative solutions to challenges. A cautionary note: The lack of attention to independence of evaluations and the emphasis on monitoring could see a weakening of evaluation practice.

References

- African National Congress, *Election Manifesto of the African National Congress*, 2004.
- OECD, DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation, *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*, 2002.
- Piccioto, Roberto, *Evaluation independence at DFID: An independent assessment prepared for IADCI*, 29 August 2009.
- The Presidency, Republic of South Africa, *Draft National guiding principles & standards for Monitoring and Evaluation of public policies and programmes in South Africa*, June 2006.
- The Presidency, Honourable Collins Chabane, Minister for Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation, Republic of South Africa, Address on the Budget Vote for the Presidency for the 2009/2010 financial year, 24 June 2009.
- The Presidency, Republic of South Africa, *Improving Government Performance: Our Approach*, September 2009.
- Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa, *Third Consolidated Public Service Monitoring and Evaluation Report, Research Cycle 2005/2006*, March 2007.
- Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa, *Report on the Audit of Reporting Requirements and Departmental Monitoring and Evaluation Systems within Central Provincial Government*, June 2007.
- Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa, *Basic Concepts in Monitoring and Evaluation*, February 2008.
- Public Service Commission, Republic of South Africa, *An Assessment of the Impact of the Work of the Public Service Commission on Public Policy and Practice in South Africa*, May 2009.
- Schiavo-Campo, Salvatore, *Building Country Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation in the Public Sector: Selected Lessons of International Experience*, Economic Capacity Development Working Paper Series No.13: June 2006.
- United Nations Development Group, *Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*, April 2005.
- United Nations and the Government of the Republic of South Africa, *Joint Evaluation of the Role and Contribution of the United Nations System in the Republic of South Africa*, 2009