



Western Cape
Government

5 >LM#KG 9I > ! >I 9KMf >GMHf @K<NEMK<

Management Improvement Plan

Rural Development Evaluations

2HGBX9b9
* 9R 2018

TITLE: RURAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION(S)

MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

This management improvement plan is geared toward enhancing the design and the approach/ model to Rural Development, specifically coordination, as initially adopted by Cabinet in 2009. It should therefore be noted that two evaluations were conducted namely; the Implementation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme in Dysseisdorp by Impact Economix and concluded in 2015, followed by another evaluation focused on the Rural Development Model Design and implementation concluded by the University of the Western Cape in 2017.

This Management Improvement plan will therefore consider the recommendations of both these evaluations as they intersect in the same rural development model space and would add significant value in consolidating the findings to improve the design and implementation of Rural Development by the WCDoA as coordinator.

1. MANAGEMENT RESPONSE ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT MODEL EVALUATION 2017 REPORT

SECTION A

	Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
1	Provincial departments and municipalities should develop a menu of feasible projects for which funding is ring-fenced and pre-approved based on a national budget.	Agreed Partially. Departments should be encouraged in the budget planning phase of each financial year via the district/regional RD coordination structures to communicate the specific project types which will take priority within their programmes so as to facilitate access to such resources within the 16 prioritised rural development nodes in the province. In addition Departments should be requested to identify and communicate the means by which specific 'non-mainstream' projects could be accommodated in the budget planning phases to allow for responsiveness to specific initiatives such as the Agri-worker Household Census (AWHHC) can be used as a decision making tool.	
2	Present the menu of feasible projects to local communities and CoS. Communities then select a few priority projects from a	Agreed Partially. This 'menu' must not be seen as a prescription and communities must be given an opportunity to debate on projects presented. The process has to be	

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
<p>pre-determined list of projects from fundable projects rather than draw up a wish list or continue of a long list of projects. This modified RDM approach, based on a community choice approach (CCA) does not ignore the uniqueness of the bottom-up input. This will still be reflected in the combination of projects communities select to bring to the ISC. Any additional projects that might come from the private sector or micro-projects arising out of the CoS at a later stage should be regarded as a bonus.</p>	<p>democratic and inclusive. Co-funding can be adopted through private sector participation. Specific responsive projects will also need to find a process to be considered.</p>	
<p>3 The CCA requires structured community participation and involvement based on extensive workshopping of choices and tradeoffs, so that the CoS and community are fully aware of the implications and other benefits (such a jobs, training etc.) attached to each choice that will be made in a specified planning cycle.</p>	<p>Agreed. This allows for communities to own the projects as well as make comparisons in terms of benefits. The planning process will need to be one encouraging participation at all levels</p>	
<p>4 Once communities have made choices from the set menu known to the ISC, they would then have to subject these choices to a selection process that considers provincial wide priorities and budgets. On the first round, they may not get everything because all 16 nodal choices need to be evaluated by specific departments, municipalities and the province.</p>	<p>Agreed partially. The projects that departments are focussed on should not be seen as a menu to choose from but rather a start on what the entry point for delivery on mainstream projects could be to address real needs in the communities.</p>	
<p>5 Departments are held accountable because they have pre-approved projects which are reflected in subsequent signed SLA agreements with their partners (The WC provincial</p>	<p>Agreed partially. Through district and provincial structures the commitment of the various stakeholders will need to be recorded in the Plan of Action for each financial year and</p>	

	Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	government, WCDoA, municipality, the CoS and ISC) and these are entered into the APPs and budgets.	Municipalities will be urged to formalise the commitments with Departments through the JPI and IDP processes. Project information is hardly ever reflected in department's APPs hence the focus on delivery in the 16 rural development nodes will need to be captured in such strategic planning documents, where possible as it is captured in the Provincial Strategic Plan.	
6	All departmental Annual Performance Plans (APPs) must include a section on the Rural Development and on the programme in particular.	Agreed partially. Rural development within the 16 rural development nodes will need to be linked in strategic planning processes towards achieving NO7 and will be supported through improved coordination at provincial level. A provincial Rural development Coordination Workgroup will need to be established to support this process.	
7	Developing shared ways of seeing rural development is a key step in renewed rural development planning. As part of building an "all of government culture" in the RDM, an "actor network approach" should be also adopted in the model in order to erode departmentalism in government and to generate and share new knowledge about transversal government.	Agreed. This will be linked to the Whole Society Approach (WOSA) adopted by the WCG in March 2018.	
8	It is suggested that this could happen through a "learning network" which constructs its own "community of practice" in rural development at the local level. For example, organising RD roundtables, information sharing via internet or conference with CoS members from different areas to share successes.	Agreed. This concept has already started by convening such gatherings and furthering this approach will be explored with experts in community development field.	
9	The WCDoA should	Agreed partially. The CRDP is	

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	<p>Incrementally establish a link between the RDM and next phase of the CRDP namely Agri-parks, given that Agri-parks have national impetus and the province is still committed to the RDM.</p>	<p>Inherently linked to delivery of all rural development programmes at all spheres of government. Agriparks cannot and should not be viewed as a separate programme but rather as part of the rural development mission to foster a sense of continuity and build confidence at community level. Communication approaches will need to be carefully steered. The WCDoA will promote the notion of continuity through the structures it convenes.</p>
10	<p>Provide more staff for WCDoA (RD) to assist with the up-scaled activity and the time consuming demands entailed in facilitating community participation and building interdepartmental cooperation.</p>	<p>Agreed partially. Capacity in terms of human resources requires differentiation in the Rural development programme. There is a very clear social and operational focus and then a more strategic focus on coordination across stakeholders. Currently the programme has three directorates and all Director positions are vacant and two unfunded. Careful planning will be required with support from Organisational Development to decide on how this programme is resourced.</p> <p>This will increase efficiency and improve rural development coordination.</p>
11	<p>Flowing from the revised model, the CoS should play a key role in facilitating the CC process by aligning community needs with what local and provincial government has seen as feasible, pre-approved projects such as social upliftment, training, infrastructure and economic development.</p>	<p>Agreed partially. The CoS will require capacity building to engage meaningfully with public and private stakeholders towards planning community lead rural development. Provincial government departments do have set approved projects to offer communities however projects that form part of their mainstream delivery programmes could be accessed by rural communities. Through the WOSA, government officials will also need support to enhance their facilitation skills to include a more participatory approach to service delivery. The WCDoA's RD programme will engage the leads on WOSA in the province to explore filtering this through to the RD coordination</p>

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	structures.	
12	Agreed.	
13	Disagree	The WCDoA's experience has shown that providing financial support has been more of a hinderance than an asset. The focus will be on building capacity however financial support via the DRDLR will be explored as no such support of CoSs has been received since the inception of the CRDP.
14	Agreed. However, this is an issue that requires ongoing attention and management within a service delivery environment where state spending and good governance is paramount. The WOSA will promote openness to complexity systems thinking which should bring greater awareness of feedback loops amongst influencers within the rural development network.	
15	Agreed partially. There have been similar opportunities but a focussed platform for CoSs to engage on such learning within the WOSA will be useful considering the receptiveness of WCG to looking at alternatives with the recent adoption of this WOSA in the province.	

Recommendation		Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	relationships and lessons learned over the past few years.		
16	A CoS team should do presentations to the provincial legislature on rural development challenges. This should elevate the status of CoS in the province and allow for better communication, more trust and improved actor networks.	Disagree.	The CoSs require assistance in building their own capacity in order to become truly representative fora in their communities, together with Ward committees. This will strengthen their standing and influence within development processes. Ward committees are the legislated structures at community level and this matter regarding the establishment of CoSs as part of the CRDP Virtuous Cycle in the midst of Ward Committees require urgent attention by the DRDLR.
17	CoS should be allocated meeting space in the municipal building (also recommended in the Impact Economix, Dysselsdorp report, 2015). CoS should also be formally recognised, and supported by the Mayor and the Speaker (who is usually in charge of public participation) on the understanding that they are complementing the ward committee system.	Partially Disagree. As a community forum established as part of the CRDP Virtuous Cycle, CoCs should be allowed to request use of municipal facilities depending on availability.	Ward committees are the legislated structures at community level and this matter regarding the establishment of CoSs as part of the CRDP Virtuous Cycle in the midst of Ward Committees require urgent attention by the DRDLR.
18	A concerted effort must be made to ensure that agri-workers are included in CoS meetings. Agri-workers can be assisted in obtaining services (referrals) via CoS, municipalities and a local agri-workers support unit. In addition, women and small business should also be encouraged to participate.	Agreed. This forms part of agri-worker empowerment. It also enhances the accessibility of the FWD sub-programme through information flow. The WCDoA's FWD directorate will ensure that representatives serve on ISCs.	
19	CoS reports, meetings and public events could be published in the local	Agreed. This will be encouraged via the district coordination structures.	

	Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	newspaper, through a municipal newsletter or by pamphlet.		
20	The main purpose of ISC should be to coordinate a few strategic projects selected through the CCA process (and listed on the IDP).	Agreed.	
21	The ISC should be streamlined and narrowly constituted only of government and community entities and work groups necessary to execute a discrete set of CCA priority projects for a specific ward for a specific period. Time-frame need to be put in place and lead departments held to account	Agreed.	
22	Government should meet independently of CoS to deal with internal coordination issues based on the discrete set of projects. A coherent approach between relevant players in dealing with CoS would make for a smoother, more accountable, and more fruitful process in the ISC meetings.	Agreed. This will clear all the disparities before engaging with the communities.	
23	The municipal presence in ISC should be boosted since they are fundamental players in the process of rural development. It is recommended that together with WCDoA, a senior municipal official co-chairs the ISC meeting (for example, taking charge of agreed agenda items, possibly providing logistical and infrastructural support to CoS and taking greater ownership	Agreed. It allows for responsibility and accountability. The ToR if the ISC is required as a result of a recent consultative process with all ISCs and this recommendation will be explored.	
24	ISC meetings should occasionally be held with mayors as well and in council chambers to reinforce the RDM-IDP connectedness. ISC meetings should also be held in the community, as has been the practice, since this has helped to bring discussions around development closer to	Disagree.	Mayors are political heads and their presence in the ISC meetings can create some discomfort to some rural development stakeholders. However connectedness to the municipalities is

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
these communities and for government to see what the rural communities are experiencing.		necessary.

SECTION B: MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION, IN DYSELSDORP, 2015 REPORT

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
<p>1</p> <p>In order to develop a shared understanding amongst the key governmental and private and private sector leadership of priority economic opportunities and practical actions, resources, roles responsibilities required to unlock these, a facilitated rapid action planning process (using a methodology called Participatory Appraisal of Competitive Advantage or PACA and which has been successful; implemented in a number of other Western Cape communities) should be initiated and funded by the WCG.</p>	Disagree	Disagree. This approach has yielded resulted however the WOSA which has been recently adopted will offer the opportunity to explore fresh perspective allowing for capacity building at official level as well.
<p>2</p> <p>The WCDoA should develop a TOR and establish an Eden District public-private sector CRDP task team for each of the 6 districts. This should be a forum to ensure the coordinated implementation of private sector initiatives and streamline government/private sector support. If desirable this should be linked to the Economic Development partnership's facilitation role at a District level and WCDoA should investigate this (with DEDAT).</p>	Disagree.	This will be a duplication of structures. The ISC allows for representation from public and private sectors across the three spheres of government and other relevant role players, and encourages collaboration across existing platforms. Hence, no need to establish another structure. Streamlining of RD coordination structures is a current

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
<p>3</p> <p>Given the size, complexity and strategic importance, the planning and implementation of the Dysseisdorp Solar Project must be coordinated and supported by dedicated task team comprising relevant government role players (all 3 spheres) and the private sector. The WCDoA and DRDLR can take the leading role in developing a TOR and facilitating the establishment and operation of this task team. Its mandate should also be to clarify and agree on the institutional and government arrangements for the initiative, including the steel factory.</p>	<p>Agreed. This will be taken up at ISC level.</p>	<p>focus.</p>
<p>4</p> <p>A dedicated task team to fast track and resolve land ownership issues in the industrial area (and possibly the broader sub-region) should be established (possibly to be coordinated by the Municipality, DRDLR, or WCDoA).</p>	<p>Agree. This matter needs to be discussed at the ISC to establish who should drive the process.</p>	
<p>5</p> <p>A Municipal Incentive policy must be developed by the local Municipality to address the issue of municipality incentives for the disadvantaged communities like Dysseisdorp. The incentives policy could e.g. provide for rates and electricity holidays. WCDoA and the Municipality should approach WCG DEDAT to request funding for the development of incentives policy if necessary.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p>	<p>This municipality has been placed under administration a number of times and there are broader issues that require immediate attention.</p>
<p>6</p> <p>The results of this evaluation should be shared with the private sector partners who have an interest in starting</p>	<p>Agreed partially. This was always the intension of the CRDP and the matter will be taken up by the ISC in due course.</p>	

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
up developmental projects in Dysselsdorp. This could take place as a workshop or as part of the recommended PACA process above.		
7 There is need to develop a stronger project management and monitoring system to improve both the allocation of government funds to projects as well ensure that completion targets for projects are achieved. Possible components of this system are further detailed under Recommendation 30. The recommended monitoring system needs to integrate the project job reporting processes of the three spheres.	Agreed. This can be improved and will be supported in terms of accountability through a provincial RD Coordination Workgroup.	
8 DRDLR, WCDoA, DTPW and other relevant departments should ensure that there is adequate consultation with the local municipality before implementing infrastructure projects to ensure alignment and that the necessary maintenance plan and funds are in place.	Agreed. This will address issues such as land availability, quality assurance, etc.	
9 Clear capacity development plans need to be put in place for cooperatives that have been assessed to have potential including the required business capabilities.	Agreed. This has already happened.	
10 The community should be encouraged and allowed to form cooperatives with people they trust to reduce internal conflicts.	Agreed partially. This should be encouraged however the formation of too many cooperatives is also problematic as there is not sufficient market opportunities which are accessible to them. Setting them up with establishment support without secured markets is setting them up to fail.	
11 As part of the Oudtshoorn chamber linkages, the possibility of partnerships	Agreed. This can be explored when private sector partners are drawn in through the ISC.	

Recommendation		Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	with businesses outside of Dysseisdorp should be explored, including the possibility of external private sector mentors to local cooperatives (to complement the Casidra mentorship programme).		
12	The COS needs to move offices to the Municipality offices so that the COS is located in a neutral venue.	Agreed. The location of the CoS should be a neutral location however the Cos is a legal entity in its own right and should be free to decide on their location.	
13	The DRDLR and DoA need to strengthen joint coordination and communication so that Provincial and National government is able to speak with one voice to the community wherever possible.	Agreed. This needs to be improved. A provincial RD coordination Workgroup should improve this.	
14	To strengthen community empowerment: There is a need to link community training programmes to specifically identified opportunities so that these are demand-driven (or informed) wherever possible.	Agreed. This can be improved. Training initiatives should be discussed under the projects item on the ISC agenda.	
15	To strengthen social transformation: DOE and the Department of Social Development should increase or strengthen programmes that reduce school dropouts. This will allow more children to complete their full years of education. Support initiatives to parents regarding their roles in supporting their children's education could be strengthened by schools, churches, and/or. This will allow more children to complete their full years of education.	Agreed. The AWHHC has highlighted the plight of rural youths and this is being communicated with all provincial departments to address the key pressure points.	
16	The Department of Social Development and the social work stream on the ISC should extend crime	Agreed. The revision of the ISC ToR will address the workstream functionality.	

Recommendation		Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	prevention crime prevention programmes to be identified could include sporting and music extra-curricular community activities for children/learners and adults. This will ensure that the rehabilitated young people come back into crime free homes.		
17	The Local Municipality should prioritise the maintenance of Sandbag houses.	Disagree.	The DRDLR initiated this project in a very short timeframe with very little planning and consultation with stakeholders. This is an issue which has had some intervention however further efforts are needed to address this from DRDLRs side together with all stakeholders involved.
18	Food security: The WCGs Food security programme needs to be refined to include a more comprehensive approach over and above food gardens and should include a Theory of Change which shows the logic and relationship between different components of food security/ system.	Agreed. The WCDoA's Food Security Evaluation findings have lead into a Management Improvement Plan which should address more meaningful impact in a complex food system where production is not the primary challenge.	
19	There is a need to obtain community buy-in before establishing community gardens. For instance, community gardens in schools failed to take off due to misunderstandings between the schools/DBE and the WCDoA.	Agreed. There is a need for a more participatory and consultative process in planning and implementing food security initiatives to ensure sustainability. The WCDoA's Food security directorate will be engaged to address this in the World Food Day programme roll-out across the 16 rural development nodes.	
20	Stakeholders need to discuss whether community food gardens at schools should be re-established, and if so, develop a clear action plan which outlines the specific roles and	Agreed. There is a need for a more participatory and consultative process in planning and implementing food security initiatives to ensure sustainability. The WCDoA's Food security directorate will be engaged to	

Recommendation		Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	responsibilities of all involved role-players to ensure their successful establishment and operations.	address this in the World Food Day programme roll-out across the 16 rural development nodes.	
21	There is a need to provide further community training in how to establish and run food gardens.	Agreed. There is a need for a more participatory and consultative process in planning and implementing food security initiatives to ensure sustainability. The WCDoA's Food security directorate will be engaged to address this in the World Food Day programme roll-out across the 16 rural development nodes.	
22	Meeting management issues: There is a need to develop a CoS capacity development plan and adequately capacitate the COS so that it can become a more effective community development vehicle which is able to raise and manage funds from a variety of sources to address community needs.	Agreed. WCDoA facilitated a workshop to capacitate CoS developing their implementation plans.	
23	The CoSs must ensure it convene quarterly meetings where the three spheres of government can provide feedback on progress.	Agreed. The CoSs are legal entities in their own right and should be supported but also allowed to function as they see fit even if this leads to deregistration with DSD.	
24	Roles and responsibility of the COS: There is need to continuously raise awareness of the role of the COS in community so that conflicts of interest do not arise. The WCDoA and the National DRDLR need to assist to ensure that COS roles and responsibilities are clarified.	Agreed partially. WCDoA have had regular meetings with COS regarding their role and responsibility, as per signed SLA with Casidra. The SLA only has bearing while funding is made available to Cos. This project has since expired. Only capacity building and organisational support is delivered by the RD programme currently.	
25	In addition to a stipend that if being given to the COS members, there is, need to consider an allowance for all active members. This will enhance participation of members on the structure.	Disagree.	As an NPO, CoS should apply for funding to implement projects for which they will be paid or generation of funding should be part of their operational plan.
26	There is a need for COS governance and election	Disagree.	WCDoA have on numerous occasions

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
		tried to offer support to the CoSs with their AGM process according to the NPO act. They should be allowed as legal entities in their own right, to function as they see fit.
27	Disagree.	WCDoA have on numerous occasions tried to offer support to the CoSs with their AGM process according to the NPO act. They should be allowed as legal entities in their own right, to function as they see fit.
28	Agreed. This is a matter which will hopefully follow appointment of members to the provincial RD coordination workgroup and the ISCs after the revision of the ToR.	
29	Agreed. There is a need to align the ISC project list to that captured in the IDP. Improved coordination and linkages between the provincial coordination with the JPI and IDP processes will assist in achieving alignment.	
30	Agreed. The revision of the ISC ToR will address this.	
31	Agreed. Ongoing engagement with DRDLR will be explored. Monthly top management meetings have been agreed upon and the Provincial Joint Operations Centre engagements are being attended by the WCDoA.	

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
<p>relevant government department (Provincial or National) can play a role in supporting the CRDP implementation in order to enhance their commitments to funding rural development projects (Ideally a 1 summary report).</p>		
<p>31 b) The national DRDLR needs to demonstrate its commitment to playing a more active role in enforcing the commitment of other national departments working on the CRDP- especially following up on pledged funds- given that DRDLR has recently expanded its HR capacity to support this.</p>	<p>Agreed. Ongoing engagement with DRDLR will be explored. Monthly top management meetings have been agreed upon and the Provincial Joint Operations Centre engagements are being attended by the WCDoA.</p>	
<p>31 c) WCDoA to clarify with DRDLR status of +-R30 million initially committed in 2010 by DRDLR to assist the WCG with CRDP operational funding.</p>	<p>Disagreed.</p>	<p>No feedback on this matter has been received from DRDLR to date.</p>
<p>31 d) Strengthening the CRDP project management and monitoring system to improve both the allocation of government funds to projects as well ensure that completion targets for projects are achieved. The CRDP monitoring system, including the Implementation Framework Document funding process and project reporting process, needs to be integrated and aligned with both national and provincial departmental funding processes as well as departmental performance management processes. The IDP project prioritisation process should form basis for the Dysseisdorp CRDP Nodal project list as this will ensure that provincial departments have a formal agreement</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	

Recommendation		Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	to commit resources to specific nodes. Heads of Department (HOD) signoff on such commitments on an annual basis will enable a higher rate of actual implementation of planned projects.		
31	e) Strengthening the WCDoA and DRDLR staff capacity per "node".	Disagree	While role clarification and differentiation of functionality is important, current fiscal pressures will not allow for additional staff recruitment. The WOSA process adopted by the province might enhance the way that current officials approach collaboration and ultimately the effectiveness of the programmes.
31	f) Strengthening mandates and roles of CRDP workgroup coordinators to coordinate with all relevant role-players and report on progress using a standardised monitoring system.	Agreed. The Revision of the ISC ToR will address how this might be improved upon. Collaboration with the DLG on the IPSS towards achieving NO7 will also enhance reporting and monitoring.	
32	The monitoring system for the Dysseisdorp node needs to be formalised and documented in the form of a monitoring manual which confirms the key indicators (including outcome indicators) to be monitored, the data sources, the roles and responsibilities, and the reporting processes. This system should include targeting the same households over time to create panel datasets and to measure trends in development. In addition, the system should integrate project data from all three spheres of government so that job and training	Agreed partially. The initial household profiling process was not to the desired standard. This is a matter that requires follow up via the ISC with DRDLR in order to track household benefit and change.	

Recommendation	Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
<p>opportunities are consolidated and monitored and reported in an integrated manner. The 2010 Dysseisdorp Household Survey database needs to be handed over by DRDLR to the WCDoA for this purpose.</p>		
<p>33 To improve coordination, it is essential that relevant CRDP DRDLR (WC Service Centre) and DoA Management hold a formal meeting approximately every quarter to address planning, budgeting, and implementation issues in the CRDP nodes. Ideally the improved monitoring system can support this management structure in the form of relevant progress reports which are designed to inform and support management decision-making.</p>	<p>Agreed. Ongoing engagement with DRDLR will be explored. Monthly top management meetings have been agreed upon and the Provincial Joint Operations Centre engagements are being attended by the WCDoA.</p>	
<p>34 The DRDLR must intervene to improve the relationship between the WCDoA and the CoS so that coordination is strengthened.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p>	<p>The relationship is already strengthened as WCDoA frequently engages the CoS.</p>
<p>35 a) The overall time-frame for focused government support should be extended from 3 years to 5 years or more in order for the impacts (especially economic development) of the CRDP on the community to be fully realised.</p>	<p>Agreed. However, holistic development cannot be time-bound as much as governance systems require this. Specific projects can and should be time-bound though. The WOSA will provide further learning in dealing with development in a complex system.</p>	
<p>35 b) The efficiency and effectiveness of the CRDP model and process can be improved by ensuring that the economic development phase begins in phase 2 in parallel to the social development phase. This will ensure that economic development opportunities are identified early on in the process and inform the</p>	<p>Agreed. In the WCDoA's experience, while the RD model initially was designed to follow its course in phases, in fact all development happens simultaneously. This needs to be considered in coordination at all levels as this is not a linear process.</p>	

Recommendation		Record of agreement or disagreement	Reasons for disagreement
	Identification of Infrastructure projects which are needed to support these economic opportunities. This will allow government to start budgeting as early as possible in the process and allow for the quicker implementation of economic development projects.		
35	c) Once needs, opportunities and Infrastructure projects are identified; more emphasis is needed on aligning these with existing programmes and funds from the whole-of-government (Incl. IDP, EPWP, CWP etc. etc.).	Agreed. The revision of the ISC ToR and establishment of the provincial RD coordination Workgroup will steer how best to take this forward practically.	
35	d) The private sector needs to be more strongly involved from the beginning of the process (e.g. the local chamber of commerce or a new public-private sector task team as described in Recommendation 2).	Agreed. However, the various stakeholders already involved need to reach a point of improved capability to engage on content which can lead to meaningful negotiation. Hence, capacity building of CoSs and the WOSA will strengthen this.	
35	e) The process to establish a community-based NPO should be strengthened with clear guidelines and support provided for both the NPO election and registration processes.	Disagreed, partially.	WCDoA have on numerous occasions tried to offer support to the CoSs with their AGM process according to the NPO act. They should be allowed as legal entities in their own right, to function as they see fit.

2. IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVES

SECTION A 1. RURAL DEVELOPMENT MODEL DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION 2017

Recommendation 1	Provincial departments and municipalities should develop a menu of feasible projects for which funding is ring-fenced and pre-approved based on a national budget.
Recommendation 2	Present the menu of feasible projects to local communities and CoS. Communities then select a few priority projects from a pre-determined list of projects from fundable projects rather than draw up a wish list or continue of a long list of projects. This modified RDM approach, based on a community choice approach (CCA) does

	not ignore the uniqueness of the bottom-up input. This will still be reflected in the combination of projects communities select to bring to the ISC. Any additional projects that might come from the private sector or micro-projects arising out of the CoS at a later stage should be regarded as a bonus.
Recommendation 3	The CCA requires structured community participation and involvement based on extensive work shopping of choices and tradeoffs, so that the CoS and community are fully aware of the implications and other benefits (such a jobs, training etc.) attached to each choice that will be made in a specified planning cycle.
Recommendation 4	Once communities have made choices from the set menu known to the ISC, they would then have to subject these choices to a selection process that considers provincial wide priorities and budgets.
Improvement Objective 1:	Creation of an enhanced funding model for selected projects through transparent and inclusive processes.

Recommendation 5	Departments are held accountable because they have pre-approved projects which are reflected in subsequent signed SLA agreements with their partners (The WC provincial government, WCDoA, municipality, the CoS and ISC) and these are entered into the APPs and budgets.
Recommendation 6	All departmental Annual Performance Plans (APPs) must include a section on the Rural Development and on the programme in particular.
Improvement Objective 2:	Enhance performance through use of APPs as tools for performance measurement and accountability.

Recommendation 7	Developing shared ways of seeing rural development is a key step in renewed rural development planning. As part of building an "all of government culture" in the RDM, an "actor network approach" should be also adopted in the model in order to erode departmentalism in government and to generate and share new knowledge about transversal government.
Recommendation 8	It is suggested that this could happen n through a "learning network" which constructs its own "community of practice" in rural development at the local level. For example, organising RD roundtables, information sharing via internet, or conference with CoS members from different areas to share successes.
Recommendation 9	The WCDoA should incrementally establish a link between the RDM and next phase of the CRDP namely Agri-parks, given that Agri-parks have national impetus and the province is still committed to the RDM.
Improvement Objective 3:	To promote integration across all the spheres of government and civil society.

Recommendation 10	Provide more staff for WCDoA (RD) to assist with the up-scaled activity and the time consuming demands entailed in facilitating community participation and building interdepartmental cooperation.
Improvement Objective 4:	Promote effective human resource development through transparent recruitment and selection process, and to enhance effective and efficient rural development.

CoS RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 11	Flowing from the revised model, the CoS should play a key role in facilitating the CCA process by aligning community needs with what local and provincial government has set as feasible, pre-approved projects such as social upliftment, training, infrastructure and economic development.
Recommendation 12	The CoS is essential to ensure that communities remain informed about new projects and that these are delivered in an equitable and sustainable way not only to serve the broader community, but also to ensure that facilities are well maintained and utilised by the community.
Improvement Objective 5:	Capacity building of CoS and creation of a favourable environment for them to lead and, hence promoting ownership of projects by communities.

Recommendation 14	A political analysis should be conducted by the WCDoA to understand dynamics, hierarchies and conflicts of interest within a ward and between wards in order to better coordinate an informed approach to community upliftment, and an inclusive approach to rural development. This is especially important given the deep historical inequalities in rural areas.
Recommendation 15	A secondary recommendation (stemming from CoS FG) is for WCDoA to call a 'summit' of all CoS leaders in the 16 nodes to increase comparative learning across municipalities (and elements of this evaluation shared with CoS). DRDLR should be invited to assist in clarifying the role of the CoS in the context of intergovernmental relationships and lessons learnt over the past few years
Recommendation 18	A concerted effort must be made to ensure that agri-workers are included in CoS meetings. Agri-workers can be assisted in obtaining services (referrals) via CoS, municipalities and a local agri-workers support unit. In addition, women and small business should also be encouraged to participate
Recommendation 19	CoS reports, meetings and public events could be published in the local newspaper, through a municipal newsletter or by pamphlet (as occasionally seems to have occurred in Swellendam).
Improvement Objective 6:	To promote information sharing, inclusivity, open channel communication and recognition of the CoS.

ISC RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 20	The main purpose of ISC should be to coordinate a few strategic projects selected through the CCA process (and listed on the IDP).
Recommendation 21	The ISC should be streamlined and narrowly constituted only of government and community entities and work groups necessary to execute a discrete set of CCA priority projects for a specific ward for a specific period. Time-frames need to be put in place and lead departments held to account.
Recommendation 22	It should meet independently of CoS to deal with internal coordination issues based on the discrete set of projects. A coherent approach between relevant players in dealing with CoS would make for a smoother, more accountable, and more fruitful process in

	the ISC meetings.
Recommendation 23	The municipal presence in ISC should be boosted since they are fundamental players in the process of rural development. It is recommended that together with WCDa, a senior municipal official co-chairs the ISC meeting (for example, taking charge of agreed agenda items, possibly providing logistical and infrastructural support to CoS and taking greater ownership).
Improvement Objective 7:	Promotion of effective, smoother and more accountable rural development structure.

SECTION B: COMPREHENSIVE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION, IN DYSELSDORP, 2015

Recommendation 3	Given the size, complexity and strategic importance, the planning and implementation of the Dysselsdorp Solar Project must be coordinated and supported by dedicated task team comprising relevant government role players (all 3 spheres) and the private sector. The WCDa and DRDLR can take the leading role in developing a TOR and facilitating the establishment and operation of this task team. Its mandate should also be to clarify and agree on the institutional and government arrangements for the initiative, including the steel factory.
Recommendation 8	DRDLR, WCDa, DTPW and other relevant departments should ensure that there is adequate consultation with the local municipality before implementing infrastructure projects to ensure alignment and that the necessary maintenance plan and funds are in place.
Recommendation 9	Clear capacity development plans need to be put in place for cooperatives that have been assessed to have potential including the required business capabilities.
Recommendation 10	The community should be encouraged and allowed to form cooperatives with people they trust to reduce internal conflicts.
Recommendation 11	As part of the Oudtshoorn chamber linkages, the possibility of partnerships with businesses outside of Dysselsdorp should be explored, including the possibility of external private sector mentors to local cooperatives (to complement the Casidra mentorship programme).
Recommendation 14	There is a need to link community training programmes to specifically identified opportunities so that these are demand-driven (or informed) wherever possible.
Recommendation 16	The Department of Social Development and the social work stream on the ISC should extend crime prevention programmes to be identified could include sporting and music extra-curricular community activities for children/learners and adults. This will ensure that the rehabilitated young people come back into crime free homes.
Recommendation 18	The WCGs Food security programme needs to be refined to include a more comprehensive approach over and above food gardens and should include a Theory of Change which shows the logic and relationship between different components of food security.
Recommendation 19	There is a need to obtain community buy in before establishing community gardens. For instance, community gardens in schools failed to take off due to misunderstandings between the schools/DBE and the WCDa.
Recommendation 20	Stakeholders need to discuss whether community food gardens at schools should be re-established, and if so, develop a clear action

	plan which outlines the specific roles and responsibilities of all involved role-players to ensure their successful establishment and operations.
Recommendation 21	There is a need to provide further community training in how to establish and run food gardens.
Recommendation 31, 32,33,34 & 35	Refer to Section B Recommendations
Improvement Objective 1:	Improve the institutionalisation and coordination amongst government departments regarding social and economic development.

Recommendation 12	The COS needs to move offices to the Municipality offices so that the COS is located in a neutral venue.
Recommendation 13	The DRDLR and DoA need to strengthen joint coordination and communication so that Provincial and National government is able to speak with one voice to the community wherever possible.
Recommendation 22	There is a need to develop a COS capacity development plan and adequately capacitate the COS so that it can become a more effective community development vehicle which is able to raise and manage funds from a variety of sources to address community needs.
Recommendation 23	The Cos must ensure it convene quarterly meetings where the three spheres of government can provide feedback on progress.
Recommendation 24	There is need to continuously raise awareness of the role of the COS in community so that conflicts of interest do not arise. The WCDoA and the National DRDLR need to assist to ensure that COS roles and responsibilities are clarified.
Improvement Objective 2:	Improve the role and function of the COS

Recommendation 4	A dedicated task team to fast track and resolve land ownership issues in the industrial area (and possibly the broader sub-region) should be established (possibly to be coordinated by the Municipality, DRDLR, or WCDoA).
Recommendation 6	The results of this evaluation should be shared with the private sector partners who have an interest in starting up developmental projects in Dysselsdorp. This could take place as a workshop or as part of the recommended PACA process above.
Recommendation 7	There is need to develop a stronger project management and monitoring system to improve both the allocation of government funds to projects as well ensure that completion targets for projects are achieved. The recommended monitoring system needs to integrate the project job reporting processes of the three spheres.
Improvement Objective 3:	Development of an economic development plan

3. IMPROVEMENT PLAN

SECTION A: RURAL DEVELOPMENT MODEL DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION 2017

Creation of an enhanced funding model for selected projects through transparent and inclusive processes								
Improvement Objective 1:	Output	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress
1.1	development of a menu of feasible and fundable projects- Not menu but clarity on mainstream project funding	HIGH	1.1.1 Engage government departments on the proposed project funding model	Attendance and participation of government departments at project planning meetings. A list of fundable projects.	RD Programme Manager	Continuous	RD Budget to convene coordination structures	Start process with First RD Coordination Provincial Workgroup In Quarter 1 of 2018/19
1.2	Presentation of feasible mainstream projects to CoS	MEDIUM	1.2.1 Engage CoS with regards to the mainstream projects	ISC attendance and participation by the CoS.	RD Deputy Directors	Continuous	RD Budget	Will commence once the ToR of the ISC is convened and consensus is reached on functionality.
1.3	Selection of priority projects by CoS	MEDIUM	1.3.1 Apply the Community choice approach whereby communities select priority projects in a transparent and inclusive manner.	Attendance and participation of CoS and communities in selecting priority projects. A list of selected projects.	RD Deputy Directors	Continuous	RD Budget to convene coordination structures	Will be a discussion point on the first set of ISC meetings' agenda for 2018/19.

1.4	Presentation of selected projects to the ISC	MEDIUM	1.4.1	Engagement of rural development stakeholders at an ISC meeting.	Benefits and implications of these choices have to be discussed	ISC meeting attendance and participation by rural development	RD Deputy Directors	Continuous	RD Budget	On-going
-----	--	--------	-------	---	---	---	---------------------	------------	-----------	----------

Enhance performance through use of APPs as tools for performance measurement and accountability										
Improvement Objective 2:		Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress		
2.1	All government departments' APPs must include a section on Rural development	HIGH	2.1.1	Engage all government department on the inclusion of rural development section in the APPs	Workshop attendance. Minutes and an action list highlighting resolutions made.	RD Programme Manager	Continuous	RD Budget	Not started.	

To promote integration across all the spheres of government and civil society.								
Improvement Objective	Output	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress
3:	3.1	HIGH	3.1.1	Engage government departments on the importance of integration and the disadvantages of working in silos. This helps to understand the complexity of the rural development space. Whole society approach (WOSA) has to be embraced during discussions.	Workshop attendance and participation by government departments and civil society.	RD Programme Manager	RD Budget	
	3.2	HIGH	3.2.1	Create online social networks such as WhatsApp groups and Facebook pages on which CoS can share information.	Functional WhatsApp group and CoS Facebook page on Rural development	RD Deputy Directors and CoS	RD Budget	Already happening and will be expanded
	3.3	HIGH	3.3.1	The WCDoA will promote the	WCDoA to include	RD DDs	RD Budget	Start process with First RD Coordination

To promote integration across all the spheres of government and civil society.							
Improvement Objective	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress
3: Output incrementally establish a link between the RDM and next phase of the CRDP namely Agri-parks, given that Agri-parks have national impetus and the province is still committed to the RDM.			notion of continuity of CRDP supported programmes through the structures it convenes.	Agriparks and other RD related programmes on the coordination structures' agendas to ensure that all stakeholders experience the connectedness.			Provincial Workgroup in Quarter 1 of 2018/19

Improvement Objective 4:		Promote effective human resource development through transparent recruitment and selection process to enhance effective and efficient rural development.						
Output	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress	
4.1	HIGH	4.1.1	Rural Development programme has a very clear social and operational focus and will work with organisational development to ensure that appropriate jobs are filled to support strategic differentiation.	Rural development programme supported with OD expertise to evaluate key jobs and critical roles to be funded on the establishment.	Antonia Xaba and DotP CSC	2018/19 financial year	RD Budget	Job evaluation processes commenced in 2017.

Improvement Objective 5:		Capacity building of CoS and creation of a favourable environment for them to lead and, hence promoting ownership of projects by communities.						
Output	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress	
5.1	HIGH	5.1.1	Vibrant and capacitated members of the CoS.	RD Deputy Directors and Appointed service providers	On-going	RD Budget	Training has been provided to the CoS and is ongoing.	
5.2	HIGH	5.2.1	Secure commitment from the departments and municipalities via the coordination structures to drive implementation	Private and Public sector partners and civil society	On-going	Collaborative funding	On-going process which will be taken up at the provincial and district coordination structures.	
			Train members of the CoS through workshops and provision of manuals.					
			Identify with all relevant departments which mainstream projects could be aligned to the needs identified in the 16 Rural development nodes which could be resourced in the medium term.					

Improvement Objective 6:		To promote information sharing, inclusivity, open channel communication and recognition of the CoS.						
Output	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress	
6.1	MEDIUM	Rural development programme to work with experts to identify the best platform to share rural development lessons through a complexity systems lens. 6.1.1	Provide CoSs an opportunity to share learning together with Government through a RD summit linked to the WOSA.	RD Deputy Directors	2018/19 financial year.	RD Budget	The recent adoption of the WOSA will provide a springboard for such a reflective initiative.	
6.2	HIGH	Arrange for a slot in the Agriprobe and develop fact sheets for municipalities, departments and private sector and civil society to reflect on achievements and lessons and tools for review. 6.2.1	Agriprobe coverage on Civil Society initiatives and projects in the 16 rural development nodes and fact sheets covering the relevant areas.	RD Deputy Directors	On-going	RD budget	Fact sheets are currently being drafted.	

Improvement Objective 7:		Promotion of effective, smoother and more accountable rural development structure.					
Output	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress
7.1 Rural development coordination through ISCs	HIGH	7.1.1 Co-ordinate rural development strategic projects	Attendance and participation at ISC meetings. Engagements with various rural development stakeholders	RD Deputy Directors	Ongoing	RD Budget	The Revision of the ISC ToR and establishment of the RD Coordination provincial structure will assist.
7.2 Municipal presence and participation at ISC meetings.	HIGH	Engage municipalities with regards to the importance of their role in rural development	A written acknowledgement on attendance and participation at ISC meetings. Municipality participation at ISC meetings.	RD Programme Manager and Deputy Directors	On-going	RD Budget	The Rural Development programme manager has engaged most ISCs and follow-up engagements are planned with the municipalities which are presenting poor participation

SECTION B IMPROVEMENT PLAN: COMPREHENSIVE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION, IN DYSELDRP, 2015

Improvement Objective: 1		Improve the institutionalisation and coordination amongst government departments regarding social and economic development					
Output	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person/s	Deadline	Budget available	Progress
1.1	HIGH	1.1.1	<p>Raise the need for representation at the Inter-governmental steering committee and work group meetings and for improved collaboration amongst stakeholders for social and economic initiatives.</p> <p>Update the ISC list to verify the departments that are not attending the ISC and related meetings.</p>	RD Programme Manager and Deputy Directors	Ongoing	RD Budget	The Rural Development programme manager has engaged most ISCs and follow-up engagements are planned with the municipalities which are presenting poor participation
1.2	HIGH	1.2.1	<p>Ensure the nodal initiatives are recognised as IDP projects with secured funding linking to JPI processes.</p> <p>Improve coordination amongst various departments for economic and social initiatives.</p>	RD Deputy Directors and Chief Director	Ongoing.	RD Budget.	Start process with First RD Coordination Provincial Workgroup in Quarter 1 of 2018/19

Improvement Objective		Improve the role and function of the Council of Stakeholders.						
Output	Priority	Activity	Deliverable	Person	Deadline	Budget available	Progress	
2.1 Support to Civil Society to build capacity and enhance independent operations (Recommendation s 4, 5,6,7 & 8)	HIGH	2.1.1	Support the COS in drafting their implementation plan and adhering to it.	The RD Programme will support COS and government to arrange sector meetings and community meetings to inform them of feedback given at ISC and other work group/ workstream outcomes.	RD Deputy Directors	Ongoing	RD Budget	WCDoA is continuously encouraging and supporting the COS.
		2.2	2.2.1	Support the COS organisational support capacity building towards them being operational and financially compliant.	An NPO compliance workshop was conducted. The content will be shared with on an ongoing basis.	RD Deputy Directors	On-going	RD Budget

4. COMMUNICATION PLAN

Target audience	Message	Media vehicle	Deadline	Person	Budget available	Progress
Decision makers (HOD, DDG)	Results of the Rural Development evaluation and its implications	Internal reports	April 2018	RD Programme Manager	N/A	MIP circulation as final document to round off internal communication
People in the Department	Presentations - on the results	Power point presentations	Done in 2017	RD Programme Manager	N/A	Done
Stakeholder clients (RD Think Tank, Provincial RD Coordination Structure members, ISC members, etc)	Evaluation recommendations supported and actions to drive forward.	Coordination structures, i.e. ISC members and CoS	June 2018	RD Deputy Directors	N/A	MIP to be presented at the various forums and many actions are already aligned to the recommendations captured through recent consultations within these fora.
Other departments	Results and implications	Reports and presentations	Quarter 2 2018/19	RD Programme Manager	N/A	Actions will manifest through the establishment of the RD provincial coordination structure.
General public	Results and implications	Agriprobe article	Quarter 2 2018/19 via Eisenburg website	RD Programme Team	N/A	The MIP will be available online as of the second quarter of the 2018/19 year.
Academic environment	Results and implications	Academic journals.	Quarter 2 2018/19	Academics	N/A	Engagements with UWC is planned to take some of the recommendations forward as it will be pioneering work linked to WOSA.

It is recommended that this Management Improvement Plan be implemented



Ms A XABA

CHIEF DIRECTOR: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

22/05/2018

DATE

RECOMMENDED / ~~NOT RECOMMENDED~~



Mr D JACOBS

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL :

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT SERVICES

24/5/2018

DATE

APPROVED / NOT APPROVED



MS JS ISAACS

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

24/5/18

DATE

