

# Monitoring and Evaluation Commission

Members of the commission:

- Facilitator: David Mashaba – M&E, National Department of Public Work – Head Office (Pretoria)
- Scribber: Nonela Philile Mxokozeli, cidb Provincial Manager, EC
- Lebogang Khumalo, Project Manager, GCD – cidb Head Office
- Bobby Maudane: National Department of Public Works, Pretoria
- Thulani D. Kale: Tshwane Public Works
- Sidney Mogotlane – Public Works, Pretoria
- Rambau Mashudu: Limpopo Department of Education
- Kate Roper: IDIP Limpopo Department of Education

# Case Study: Coega's SMME Programme: 2006 (Baseline Study Report)

- CDC's objective: create job opportunities for SMME's within the Industrial Development Zone (Port Elizabeth)
- Recruitment of 300 SMME's: as businesses but NOT contractors.
- Work opportunities became available for contractors, NOT ALL because opps were for certain cidb classes of work eg CE contractors.
- Partnerships forged for training opportunities, COMSECC
- CDC have a CD model through which SMME programme was measured against.
- Available reporting templates to measure performance on site and capacity built on how to be better businesses.

# Was it a successful Contractor development programme: No

- Had elements of contractor development but Not ALL.
- Not structured to service contractor development but rather SMME development. Continuous review of the model “Six Pillars”, against set objectives.
- Not all contractors had job opportunities – recession and continuity of work in the Industrial Development Zone.
- Recruitment against available projects; Not all grow in cidb grades.
- Opportunity to utilise programme as Case Study for refinements

# 2008 NCDP Framework.. CDC

- Setting Provincial Forum to gather information on CD programmes in Provinces.
- Based on NCDP framework – Modifications/ Review could be done.
  - Reporting on contractors' growth path with the cidb.
  - Training opportunities and measures in place – NQF levels.
  - Compliance with regulatory structures, SARS; cidb etc.
  - NCDP also guides clients so as to eliminate duplication (target groups and cidb grades)...Ongoing debate how to effectively implement.

# What is Monitoring and Evaluation?

**Monitoring** is the systematic collection and analysis of information as a project progresses

**Evaluation** is the comparison of actual project impacts against the agreed strategic plans

- **Monitoring involves**

- Establishing indicators of efficiency, effectiveness and impact;
- Setting up systems to collect information relating to these indicators;
- Collecting and recording the information;
- Analysing the information;
- Using the information to inform day-to-day management.

Monitoring is an internal function in any project or organization

- **Evaluation involves:**

- Looking at what the project or organisation intended to achieve
- Assessing progress towards the targets
- Evaluating the strategy of the project or organization
- Evaluating efficient use of resources?
- Checking the sustainability of the project or organisation
- Determining the implications for the various stakeholders in the way the organisation works

Evaluation can be both external and internal

# Who must do monitoring ?

- Owners of project (client departments) must do monitoring.
  - Contractors – monitor cash flow; plans vs projections.
  - Consultants – If contractor meeting quality standards; time and budget (cost).

# Why Monitoring and Evaluation

1. Review Progress on set targets, objectives:
2. Identify gaps in planning and implementation.
3. Make adjustments in next intake.
4. Determine Success and or Failures of Contractor Development programmes (inline with client's CDP objectives aligned to NCDP framework)

# When should monitoring be done?

Monitoring must be done from the time that the client department complete the CD plan and continues when the contractor is captured into the client's Contractor Development programme.

# CD Objectives vs Indicators (Pg23 of Guidelines documents)

OBJECTIVES	INDICATORS	COMMENTS
Contractor Growth	Upgrading with cidb	
	No. of graduations	
	Projects awarded	
	Value of projects Budget	
Empowerment	BBBEE scorecard, equity and ownership increased etc. EPWP/ learnerships	Swooped Equity and Ownership as Indicator
Sustainability	Projects awarded Loans	Requires to be defined clearly. Access to loans? Ability to repay?. What about exited contractors?
	Budget	

# Additional CD objectives vs Indicators

OBJECTIVES	INDICATORS	COMMENTS
Value for money	Cost	
	Efficiency?	Need to be added
	Effectiveness?	Need to be added
Incentives for participation in CD programmes	Cost sharing towards CD programme	What is this measuring? Why should incentives be given to other programmes whilst in CD expectation is cost sharing?
	Exit	Need to be clearly defined as and indicator.

# Cidb's M&E Template: Critique

- Should be aligned with M&E government strategy.
- Interpretation – there should be standard approach to implementation of M&E tool.
- Is the tool accommodative of client's objectives?

# Who is monitoring who?: Current 1/4 Reporting – Case Study (EC Prov)

Report by	Submitted to	On What	Comments
IDT	Cidb/ IDT HO	Contracts Awarded, Budget spent on training	Implementing agent for DOE and DOH
CDC	Cidb/ CDC Mngmnt	Contracts Awarded	Implementing agent.
DRPW	Cidb/ HOD & MEC	Contracts Awarded	
ECDC	Cidb/ DEDEA	Finance and mentorship provided	No project custodian.
CHDM	Cidb/ Council/ DPW	EPWP programme, job creation and projects awarded	
SCI	Cidb/ SCI HO.	Growth path	NQF level and cidb grades

# Conclusions/ Discussions...

- Is the CIDB sufficiently playing the role data verification or only do the consolidation and reporting to Ministry?
- Are clients sending same reports to all recipients? How reliable is the data?
- Who provides quality assurance/control to reports that CIDB send National DPW, MINMEC and HOD's in Provinces?
- How accurate is data received at Portfolio Committee level? Who should verify it?

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- Split Monitoring guidelines from Evaluation guidelines/ toolkit
- Evaluation of existing Monitoring model if any (Don't re-invent)
- The Monitoring tool should enable CIDB to monitor individuals (contractors) within the programme (exited and still active in the programme)
- The monitoring indicators should be clear on HDI groupings (women; youth and disabled)
- Monitoring should include both qualitative and quantitative data)
- In in-depth evaluation study is required to determine the impact of Indirect (Preferential Procurement system) and Direct (Programme focus) targeting: clients to be encourage to follow the most suitable based on the research results
- Clients to submit programme plans for effective monitoring
- A need to develop a centralised protected electronic data/ reporting tool for implementing agents/ infrastructure clients.
- The indicators should go beyond monitoring the performance of contractors but also measure CIDB contribution to the other Government strategies
- Target Setting