

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
VIENNA

INDEPENDENT PROJECT EVALUATION of

XAMT15

SUPPORT to SOUTH AFRICA'S VICTIM EMPOWERMENT PROGRAMME

South Africa

INDEPENDENT EVALUATION UNIT

March 2012



This evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of three experts : **Mr Hamid Chaudhry, Lead Evaluator and Senior Consultant, Mr Kennedy Chibvongodze, Programme Management Consultant and Ms Fatma Nil Ayhan, Capacity Development Consultant,** in cooperation with the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

The Independent Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime can be contacted at:

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 500
1400 Vienna, Austria
Telephone: (+43-1) 26060-0
Email: ieu@unodc.org
Website: www.unodc.org

Disclaimer

Independent Project Evaluations are scheduled and managed by the project managers and conducted by external independent evaluators. The role of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process , but IEU does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IEU to respond to the commitment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in professionalizing the evaluation function and promoting a culture of evaluation within UNODC for the purposes of accountability and continuous learning and improvement.

Due to the disbandment of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) and the shortage of resources following its reinstitution, the IEU has been limited in its capacity to perform these functions for independent project evaluations to the degree anticipated. As a result, some independent evaluation reports posted may not be in full compliance with all IEU or UNEG guidelines. However, in order to support a transparent and learning environment, all evaluations received during this period have been posted and as an on-going process, IEU has begun re-implementing quality assurance processes and instituting guidelines for independent project evaluations as of January 2011.

© United Nations, March 2012 . All rights reserved.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication has not been formally edited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgment.....	i
<i>Acronyms and Abbreviations</i>	iiiv
Summary Matrix of Findings, Supporting Evidence and Recommendations	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. The Programme and context.....	1
B. Evaluation methodology.....	4
C. Limitations to the evaluation.....	5
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS	6
A. Programme Design.....	6
B. Relevance	6
C. Efficiency	7
D. Partnerships and cooperation.....	10
E. Effectiveness	10
F. Impact.....	15
G. Sustainability	16
III. CONCLUSIONS	17
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	18
V. LESSONS LEARNED	19
VI. ANNEXES	21
ANNEX A: ToR for Final Independent Evaluation	20
ANNEX B. List of persons contacted during the interview	29
ANNEX C. Review of progress made towards attainment of output	31
ANNEX D: Key Questions for data collection for Evaluation	36
ANNEX E: Desk review list.....	39
ANNEX F: Management Response	41

Acknowledgment

Many people contributed to the preparation of this evaluation report; their names are listed in Annex B with heartfelt thanks. The Evaluation Team also wishes to express its sincere thanks to Mr. Mandiaye Niang, Regional Representative, Regional Office for Southern Africa (ROSAF), UNODC for his valuable comments and his staff for extending their support in conducting this evaluation. Special thanks also go to Ms. Carla Ciavarella, Senior Criminal Justice Expert UNODC - ROSAF for her enthusiastic backstopping support and rational comments that enabled the team to present a useful evaluation report. Mr. Gaspard Ostrowski, Associate Expert UNODC, Vienna is greatly appreciated for providing very useful feedback on the evaluation report.

The cooperation extended by the Department of Social Development and implementing partners during this evaluation was of great help and is gratefully acknowledged. The completion of this evaluation became possible only because of the freely given time and consideration of the VEP Final Evaluation Workshop participants; particularly the Provincial Coordinators, representing civil society organisations and target groups.

In accordance with normal practice, any errors in this report remain the responsibility of the authors.

Evaluation Team

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women
CSOs	Civil society organisations
DE	Department of Education
DSD	Department of Social Development
EU	European Union
EU HQs	European Union Headquarters
FAFA	Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement
GoSA	Government of South Africa
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GIS	Generic Indicators System
IR	Inception Report
KPI	Key Performance Indicators
KZN	KwaZulu Natal
LGBTI	Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, Trans-gender and Inter-sexual
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid-term review
NCPS	National Crime Prevention Strategy
NICDAM	National Institute for Community Development and Management
OSCs	One-stop-centres
PC	Provincial Coordinator
PCM	Programme Coordination Meeting
PMU	Programme Management Unit
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
ROSAF	Regional Office for Southern Africa
SAQA	South African Qualification Authority
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound
TPR	Tripartite Reviews
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crimes
VEP	Victim Empowerment Programme

Summary Matrix of Findings, Supporting Evidence and Recommendations

Findings ¹ : problems and issues identified	Supporting evidences (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ²
Well-articulated Programme document but the Logical Framework has some weaknesses which obscures a fair assessment of achievement made by the Programme	There is inconsistent presentation of outcomes and outputs between the Programme document (Pr); most indicators are not SMART; Log frame. This was assessed through review of Prodoc.	The LF should be a living document that is updated for new baseline information that becomes available during Programme implementation
The management design initially had all Programme staff located within UNODC. This caused problems of insufficient communication and understanding leading to delayed start of Programme activities.	First interruption occurred between February and April 2009 (2 months) and the second interruption between 19 December 2009 and 12 April 2010 (4 months). This was assessed through desk review of progress reports, documents, minutes of the meetings, EU reports and discussions.	At the outset all stakeholders, particularly UNODC and DSD, may hold extensive discussions and clearly spell out their roles, responsibilities and rights. This should be made possible through signing the MOUs or joint memos.
There is progress towards achieving of the outputs. However, due to the short timeframe, the Programme could not meet some of its targets.	A few activities were still outstanding; establishment of One-Stop-Centres, VE strategy and legislation; and complete roll-out of the Everyday Heroes campaign among others. This was evident from desk review of reports, interviews, and focus group discussions in the VEP Final Evaluation Workshop.	Programme of this magnitude with a heavy portfolio needs a longer and sufficient time for implementation of its interventions. Parties to an agreement should cultivate an environment of trust and transparency. Parties should sign a binding MoU detailing terms of their engagement including roles and responsibilities.
Mid-term review (MTR) originally planned in the Programme Document was not carried out due to limited budget allocation for Evaluation. Instead EU decided to use this budget to conduct a Results-Oriented Monitoring within the EU monitoring framework.	This was evident from review of progress reports, minutes of the PSC meetings, discussions with UNODC and VEP staff.	As an effective tool for independent evaluation of the Programme, MTR could have helped the senior management with informed decision-making leading to smooth implementation of the VEP.
Significant progress has been made in enhancing awareness on VE. However, there are concerns on the geographical coverage of outputs produced under the outcome which has lessened the Programme's effectiveness.	Some of the advocacy material produced did not address the cultural and language variations in SA. This was assessed through desk review, discussions, focus group discussions, field visits and VEP Final Evaluation Workshop.	DSD should afford provincial departments the opportunity to customise the materials to suit their environs, taking into account cultural values and languages.
The Programme strengthened coordination between government departments and CSOs. However, other relevant departments have not been fully involved.	National and provincial VE forums were conducted as scheduled. The Department of Education did not actively participate in VE activities whilst Departments of Housing and Home Affairs were not involved. This was evident from desk review of reports, interviews, and focus group discussions in the VEP Final Evaluation Workshop.	DSD should facilitate finalisation of the VE Legislation to have a tool that binds all departments to the VE coordination and implementation structures. Also DSD should engage with relevant departments to be part of the VEP.
Training provided enhanced human capacity to effectively implement and/or oversee the VE Programme. However, the length of the training	This was evaluated through reports on training activities, interviews with stakeholders, observations and focus group discussions in the VEP Final	The developed curricula should be rendered modular and integrated into the training programs of VE departments, provided as on-going training for VE staff.

¹ A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement

² Recommendations are proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality or efficiency of a project programme; at redesigning the objectives: and/or at the reallocation of resources. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions.

Findings ¹ : problems and issues identified	Supporting evidences (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations ²
was perceived to be long.	Evaluation Workshop.	Prospects of including VE topics in the tertiary curricula should be investigated.
The interventions planned to produce the output are of paramount important for setting standards, improving the provision of ongoing services and introducing new service models and establishing an M&E system for National VEP. The outcome could not be fully produced to the level anticipated.	This was evident from desk review of reports, interviews, and focus group discussions in the VEP Final Evaluation Workshop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Piloting of GIS and DSD Funding Strategy should continue, one-stop-centre should be closely monitored for effectiveness for at least a year. - Victim satisfaction surveys should be rendered an integral part of the M&E system to allow continuous flow of available data, which will provide valuable feedback for policy decisions.
Support provided to CBOs enhanced service delivery, strengthened CBOs' institutional capacities, networks with other CSOs and ties with the communities. However the achievements of individual organisations are not well documented to allow replication and/or scaling up.	This was assessed through reports on training activities, interviews with stakeholders, observations and focus group discussions in the VEP Final Evaluation Workshop.	M&E and reporting system should be developed for funding/grant schemes to facilitate the documentation of best practices that can be replicated, multiplied or scaled up.
Political sustainability is strong on the part of DSD. However, financial sustainability is under threat due to unavailability of funds for the continuation of on-going activities. The evaluation found no evidence of an exit strategy for the VEP. DSD indicated that Treasury was unable to close the VEP funding gap for the 2012/13 fiscal year. At the time of the evaluation, there was no indication of whether alternative funding sources could be realised.	<p>At the time of the evaluation, there was no financial provision for the continuation of Programme activities during the 2012/13 financial year. The Programme management team was, until the final month of implementation hoping to get another Programme extension from EU which was unfortunately not accepted. There is also room for improvement in the levels of commitment from other VE departments, through an MoU. DSD expresses the will to sustain the achievements made through the re-activation of VE forums.</p> <p>This was assessed through desk review of documents, interviews and focus group discussions in the VEP Final Evaluation Workshop.</p>	<p>In order to sustain VEP initiatives, UNODC should develop an effective and comprehensive Programme exit strategy clearly articulating the procedures, roles and responsibilities of DSD and other stakeholders.</p> <p>UNODC may provide support to DSD in seeking funding alternatives to lessen the implementation gap.</p>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report encompasses the findings of the independent final evaluation of the "Support to the Government of South Africa's Victims Empowerment Programme" (VEP). The evaluation was conducted in March 2012, the principal objective of which was to identify and analyse issues, and provide findings and recommendations to different aspects of the Programme's implementation. The evaluation focused on Programme design, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, lessons learnt and gender mainstreaming.

Programme introduction and background

The European Union (EU) funded "Support to the Government of South Africa's Victims Empowerment Programme" (VEP), implemented by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the Department of Social Development (DSD) aims to address the high rates of criminal victimisation in South Africa (SA) by strengthening the country's Victim Empowerment Programme. The total approved budget provided by EU was US\$ 27,433,627 million. The Programme, initially designed for 36 months, due to certain delays and interruptions, was extended until 31st March 2012. The Programme was implemented through a Programme Management Unit (PMU) that was housed in UNODC, Pretoria, supported by 9 Provincial Coordinators (PCs)- one in each province. The strategy, planning and implementation of the Programme were guided by a Programme Steering Committee (PSC). A Programme Coordination Meeting (PCM) was set up and met on a monthly basis to review Programme implementation status in detail. The overall objective of the Programme was: the Victim Empowerment Programme has contributed to building safe and peaceful communities, strengthening a human rights culture and provides more effective, multi-sectoral, coordinated responses to victims of crime and trauma, particularly children³. The objective was achieved through 5 major outcomes that addressed issues related to awareness on victim empowerment policies, coordination among the line government departments, and strengthening the capacity of DSD and civil society organisations (SCSOs).

Major findings of evaluation

Design and relevance

In general, the Programme design and outputs of the five outcomes are relevant. The design addresses weak areas of the GoSA VEP. Ownership by DSD and a well-focused approach while targeting a range of stakeholders are design strengths. There are shortcomings in the preparation of the Logical Framework (LF); expected outputs in the Logical Framework are different from the ones in the Programme Document. The Programme directly supports the Government's long-term VEP. There has been a conscious decision to link the objective with the wider national VE strategy. Interventions are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements and Civil Society Organisations' (CSOs) needs. The Programme interventions are also in line with the EU strategic priorities of security, crime reduction and gender mainstreaming.

Efficiency

VEP focussed on a results-based approach to its activities. The Programme ensured a wide geographical coverage through delivering assistance in all the nine provinces. The Programme was officially launched in December 2007 with substantive activities beginning to roll out in June 2008. There were delays in implementation, in particular due to interruptions over issues of execution modalities and accountability of PMU. Due to this reason, coupled with a 50% reduction of staff, the Programme lagged behind and some of the targets could not be achieved even within the extended period. As of 31st December 2011 total expenditures on the Programme activities were estimated at US\$ 21,757, 349 million or 79% of the total budget of US\$ 27,433,627 million allocated to the Programme. As of 25th March 2012 an unspent amount was estimated at US\$ 3 million. The Programme did not have a functional M&E system to allow a timely assessment of progress, manage risks and ensure timely readjustments. Another major challenge was to establish a mutual understanding regarding the obligations to act within the rules and procedures of the donor agency which in this case was delegated to UNDP as well as the provisions of the Paris Declaration.

Effectiveness

³ VEP Programme Document

Despite certain delays, VEP has achieved most of its outcomes and some outcomes have been surpassed. Most stakeholders were fully engaged and showed a great sense of ownership. Programme has improved awareness of VE policies and Victims' rights among policy makers and the public at large. Social workers are now better equipped with knowledge and are more confident in performing their duties. Some progress has been made towards adopting a new funding strategy by DSD. The programme made significant progress in building the capacity of CSOs, especially emerging organisations. This has resulted in increased geographical coverage of VE services as most of these emerging CSOs are in marginalized rural communities. The programme has been effective in improving coordination among VE service providers. The national VE forum was strengthened whilst defunct provincial forums were re-invigorated. Limited participation of the Department of Education and non-involvement of the Departments of Housing and Home Affairs was observed.

Impact

The Programme has contributed to elevating the VEP within the DSD, both at national and provincial levels. The VEP has now extended coverage to other previously uncovered groups like men and LGBTIs. There are noticeable changes amongst men who are generally perceived as "traditional" perpetrators of GBV. The central role of CSOs in implementing government policies has improved, resulting in improved service delivery to victims. The evaluation noted evidence of improved multi-sectoral coordinated responses to victims of crime. More integrated plans and joint projects have been developed at provincial levels. Reports of normalisation in the number of reported cases of violence against women and children in the provinces could be taken to imply a marginal decline in the number of new crimes being committed. In this regard, the programme is showing early signs of its contribution towards addressing the high rates of criminal victimisation and in building safe and peaceful communities in South Africa.

Sustainability

Without additional budgetary support to CSOs, most awareness-raising activities will be discontinued, along with services that they have been implementing with UNODC's support. The absence of a viable financial sustainability plan after four years of implementation is a point of concern. At the time of the evaluation, there were already some indications of previously supported CSOs cutting down on their activities. Information dissemination through already produced documentation will continue until the material is finished unless DSD is going to support further production. Provincial VE forums, already flagging warning signs in most provinces may not be able to sustain without financial support, especially to organize meetings and activities. There is however hope for continuation of district and local forums as they have previously thrived without funding. The evaluation found no evidence of concrete policy direction with regards to the VEP. The failure to secure funding to sustain and even replicate the project achievements, raises questions surrounding the Programme management team's commitment despite the fact that the policies are in place.

Conclusions

The Programme Document was well written and highly relevant to government priorities. However, the design was ambitious given its expected scope of reach. The Logical Framework had inconsistencies with the Programme document. The management design initially had all Programme staff located within UNODC. This caused problems of insufficient communication and understanding that were largely resolved with a change in UNODC management and placement of core staff within DSD. The awareness campaigns resulted in increased knowledge of VE policies and victims' rights among policy makers, CSOs and the public. However, the content of the awareness-raising instruments, mainly printed materials, were centrally produced with strict control over their launch and/or release at province and district levels. The Programme strengthened coordination between government departments and CSOs, notwithstanding the lack of commitment and/or ownership by some VE departments. VEP enhanced the capacity and knowledge base that laid the ground for stakeholder buy-in, at least at the service level. However, the structure of the Integrated Trauma Counseling and Coaching in Victim Empowerment Programme as a block training package has posed challenges in terms of logistics and participation. Notwithstanding the quality of the training content and methodology, at least some groups of training participants indicated that a decentralized and or a modular approach to allow flexibilities to complete the courses could have relieved the civil servants who also had to tackle with their routine work load. 5-10 days of training away from their workplace was reported to impair participation, especially of higher level staff with administrative responsibilities.. Outcome 4 could not be fully produced to the level anticipated. Support provided to CBOs enhanced service delivery, strengthened CBOs' institutional capacities, networks with other

CSOs and ties with the communities. However the achievements of individual organisations were not well documented to allow replication and/or scaling up.

Recommendations

The Logical Framework must be detailed, showing the full results chain and updated for new information that becomes available during Programme implementation. At the outset all stakeholders, particularly UNODC and DSD, may hold extensive discussions and clearly spell out their roles, responsibilities and rights. This could be made possible by signing MOUs or joint memos. Forward or pre-implementation planning is crucial for the timely start of Programme to minimise the risk of delays in approvals, procurement and recruitment of staff. An unspent amount of about US\$ 3 million could have been spent on priority activities by better planning. The communication strategy for an awareness campaign could make balanced use of different media and maximum use of local resources and electronic media to disseminate the basic messages while minimising costs. DSD may afford provincial departments the opportunity to customise the materials to suit their environs, taking into account the diversity of cultural values and languages to ensure maximum impact within the target audience.

DSD should make efforts to affect an MoU to ensure full participation and commitment of relevant VE departments, including allocation of funds and other resources as a concrete indicator of collaboration. DSD should engage other government departments and organisations. Considering the similarities in the content of the tailored programmes, DSD should ensure that the training package for VE service providers is broken down into modules that are provided in stages so as to allow their integration to pre-, in-, on-the job training programmes of the departments and also to allow trainees to focus on their other duties while ensuring a continuous process of capacity building. Piloting of GIS and DSD Funding Strategy should continue, one-stop-centres should be closely monitored for effectiveness for at least a year. Rendering victim satisfaction surveys an integral part of the M&E system to allow continuous flow of data available, which will provide valuable feedback for policy decisions. DSD should develop an M&E and reporting system for the funding/grant schemes to facilitate the documentation of best practices that can be replicated, multiplied or scaled up. There is also a need to improve donor coordination at national and international levels to promote and support VEP-related interventions with a view to facilitating financial planning of CSOs.

Main Lessons learned

Establishing trust is an effective management tool that works through a series of meetings and soft dialogues among stakeholders and facilitates the resolution of differences; for example, many issues that emerged due to miscommunication between UNODC and DSD were eventually resolved through this process.

A degree of flexibility is desirable, for example, in order for activities to achieve their maximum impact, and to ensure optimum utilisation of available resources.

Qualitative assessments through desk review of regular reports, minutes of inter-sectoral meetings, field reports as well as interim evaluations provide opportunities to replicate, scale-up and mainstream good practices while presenting strong arguments for future planning in terms of increased collaboration and/or increased resources.

Large scale awareness-raising campaigns are highly effective in drawing the attention of the community as a whole, for example, Programme has improved awareness on VE policies and victims' rights among policy makers and public at large.

Facilitating a culture of mutual understanding and collaboration among stakeholders at different levels through genuine participatory processes requires persistent and systematic approach, good leadership skills and dedication, for example through National and provincial forums.

An effective transfer of skills is the most important component for the sustainability of the learning achievement of trained staff, for example, the Programme made significant progress in building the capacity of CSOs, especially the emerging organisations.

Funding schemes based on a comprehensive needs assessment and tailored to match the capacities of targeted beneficiaries, matched with intensive technical support can produce a significant impact in terms of individual,

institutional and community development. UNODC grant scheme has created an added value, for example, CSOs' enhanced financial capacity has improved their service delivery for victims of crime.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Programme and context⁴

The European Union funded project, "Support to the Government of South Africa's Victim Empowerment Programme", implemented by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the Department of Social Development (DSD) aims to address the high rates of criminal victimisation in South Africa by strengthening the country's Victim Empowerment Programme (VEP). The project, which is an integral part of the wider Government of South Africa Victim Empowerment Programme, has a specific purpose of "improving the implementation of victim empowerment policies in South Africa by building capacity, improving coordination, strengthening relations between the government and civil society organisations (CSOs) and thereby improving services to victims, especially women and vulnerable children". VE has been identified as one of the Government's priority programs in the 1996 National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS). According to the NCPS, the main purpose of the VEP is to facilitate the establishment and integration of interdepartmental/inter-sectoral Programmes and policies for the support, protection and empowerment of victims of crime and violence with a special focus on women and children. The development of this Programme follows the stipulations contained in the revised EU finance agreement "rider" with the Government of South Africa (Programme of Assistance to the Victim Empowerment Programme of the Department of Social Development in the South African Government" Addendum No. 1 to Finance Agreement – SA/21.031700-05-02) which states in section 3.2. Organisational and implementation procedures:

"The Programme will be implemented under centralised management. A contribution agreement will be signed with UNODC Regional Office for Southern Africa. UNODC shall be liable to the Commission for the satisfactory execution of the activities covered by the Programme. UNODC will be responsible for the management of all funds allocated to it and for providing audited accounts thereof. According to the terms of the contribution agreement used by the Commission, the UNODC shall be able to use its own procedures for the management of this Programme in conformity with United Nations standards as outlined in the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) between the EC and the UN."

Following approval of the rider by the EU HQs in Brussels, the EU Delegation in Pretoria entered into a Contribution Agreement with UNODC on 19 December 2007 through which funding of this Programme were provided.

The Programme is fully funded by the European Union through the European Delegation Office based in South Africa – Pretoria and was initially designed to be for 36 months. Although the Contribution Agreement between UNODC and the European Union came into force in December 2007, initial activity was restricted to identifying and recruiting staff until the second half of 2008. This was the time when the Programme Management Unit (PMU) staff and project coordinators based in the nine provinces of South Africa took their respective positions.

As a consequence, during the course of project implementation it was realised that significant activities would not be completed by the end of December 2010; hence due to availability of funds, a request of programme extension period was made by the Government and authorised by the donor. The amendments introduced by the revision have been approved by the EU and incorporated in an amended Contribution Agreement. The programme was extended until the end of March 2012 (51 months in total). UNODC was the implementing agency, while DSD was the main Government counterpart. Partnership modalities

⁴ *Victim Empowerment Programme Document, UNODC, South Africa*

between UNODC and DSD have been outlined in their Letter of Agreement which stipulated the procurement rules and regulations.

UNODC signed a contribution agreement with the European Community (EC) in December 2007 and subsequently received a grant to manage the Programme. According to the terms of the contribution agreement, UNODC was entitled to use its own procedures for the management of this Programme in conformity with United Nations standards as outlined in the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) between the EU and the United Nations.

This Programme was specifically designed for the DSD as the lead agency on Victim Empowerment in South Africa and the main government counterpart. The Programme was initially implemented through PMU, housed in UNODC Pretoria. The strategy, planning and implementation of the project has been guided by a Programme Steering Committee (PSC) comprising of UNODC, mandated representatives at the Director General (DG) or Deputy Director General (DDG) level from the National DSD, other relevant government departments and provincial governments as well as representatives from CSOs, the South African Human Rights Commission, the Commission on Gender Equality and independent experts. The EU delegation has had an *observer status* at the Project Steering Committee. The PSC has been established in order to facilitate synergies between the different project components, and review outcomes and advice on realignment of outputs and activities as necessary. Members of PSC met twice annually at key milestones during the implementation of the project. A Programme Coordination Meeting (PCM) comprising the Representative of UNODC, two representatives from the National DSD, and a UNODC Programme Manager and Financial Administrator was set up and met on a monthly basis to review Programme implementation progress in detail vis-à-vis the Programme work-plan.

The overall objective of Programme is formulated as: *“The Victim Empowerment Programme has contributed to building safe and peaceful communities, strengthening a human rights culture and provides more effective, multi-sectoral, coordinated responses to victims of crime and trauma, particularly children”*.

The Programme Document elaborated a series of interventions in five complementary outcomes given as below:

Outcome 1: Implementation plan on Victim Empowerment Policies including the Victims Charter, Anti-Rape Strategy, Minimum Standards and Integrated Victim Empowerment Policy are disseminated to service providers and the public.

Concrete Outputs⁵:

- Implementation plans for Victim Empowerment policies developed in consultation with CSO's and provincial government departments.
- Victim Empowerment Policies and related Implementation Plans printed and disseminated.
- Mass awareness on Victim Empowerment policies created through a) awareness campaigns at provincial level; b) national conferences; and c) media campaigns.

Outcome 2: Improved coordination between relevant victim empowerment government departments both vertically and horizontally and with CSOs.

Concrete Outputs:

- Fully functioning Victim Empowerment project offices established in each province.

⁵ These outputs are as listed in the Logical Framework. These are the ones reported in the Programme's institutional reports.

- Victim Empowerment Forums comprising government departments and CSOs established and/or strengthened in each province.

Outcome 3: The capacity of government staff to implement policies and comply with minimum standards in all relevant Government departments is strengthened.

Concrete Outputs:

- Training needs among VE government departments assessed.
- Tailored training manuals, material and training plans developed as per specific needs of VE government departments.
- Training implemented as per agreed training plan and per SAQA unit standards where possible.
- A core group of Master trainers established to sustain continued training after the end of the project

Outcome 4: The capacity of the National and Provincial Departments of Social Development and Victim Empowerment Coordinators of other government agencies to manage, coordinate and lead the government's VEP is strengthened.

Concrete Outputs:

- Capacity of national and provincial DSD staff to lead, coordinate and manage VE projects assessed.
- On the basis of assessment (4.1) training programme, training material and training plan to strengthen capacity of DSD VE staff developed and training implemented.
- Application of Minimum Standards as KPI across Government management systems promoted and facilitated.
- DSD funding strategy and procedures to support DSD service providers strengthened.
- Mechanisms for the recording and monitoring of complaints by victims of crime developed and support to its implementation provided.
- Four one-stop centres to counter violence against women and children established.
- Monitoring and evaluation framework for VE policy implementation developed.

Outcome 5: Improving the capacity of CSO's in delivering services to victims of crime.

Concrete Output: Grant Management System including eligibility criteria for CSOs set up and implemented.

Purpose and scope of the Final Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the VEP's relevance, design, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and Programme coordination and management. It aims to analyse the extent to which best practices have been developed within the context of Southern Africa UNODC regional strategy to support and to empower the victims of crime, in particular women and children. The evaluation findings will serve as a baseline for DSD to develop and consolidate further policy and strategy on VEP at national and provincial levels. The findings and recommendations as outcomes of this evaluation will be useful also to the EU in its donor capacity, in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the financial support provided through the Programme to the South Africa Government.

The final evaluation has addressed among others, the following:

- The evaluation has covered the entire period of Programme implementation from January 2008 to March 2012;
- Programme concept and design (including the ways in which problems and priorities are determined), strategy, implementation results and outputs;

- Measure performance outcomes, impact and sustainability of the benefits of the Programmes;
- Efficiency of Programme planning and implementation (this includes Programme structures, managerial arrangements, co-ordination mechanisms, logical framework, work plan, etc.);
- Assess whether results have been achieved, if not why. Determine if progress has been made towards their achievement;
- The Programme's contribution to human and institutional capacity development and whether this capacity is creating conditions for sustainability;
- Determine the sustainability of results and benefits beyond UNODC funding/support.
- Geographically, the evaluation geographically covered South Africa; in particular it assessed the development and capacity-building progress made by the DSD at national and provincial level on Victim Empowerment policy, strategy and programmes. In this respect four provinces were visited to conduct field missions during the evaluation period.

B. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation was conducted by a team of Independent Consultants from 1st to 25th March 2012. The mission began on 1st March with a desk review of relevant documents. The field visit of 3 provinces was undertaken on the 8th and from 11th to 13th March. Data for the remaining provinces was collected during a VEP Final Evaluation workshop organised from the 14th to the 16th of March. For this evaluation the team used the "Standard format and Guidelines of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime for Evaluation Reports". The team has also followed ethical principles as expressed in the UN Evaluation Group ethical guidelines^{6,7} to set the framework for analysis. In conducting evaluations a client-oriented process consistent with UN's rules and regulations was adopted. While collecting information the Evaluation Team respected the dignity, diversity, confidentiality and privacy of evaluation participants in accordance with UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The questions for the collection of information were developed on the basis of key evaluation criteria – relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and issues of gender equality, rights-based principles, and human development. The list of questions is given as Annex C.1.

B.1. Data collection

The evaluation is based on two main sources of information, i.e. primary and secondary sources (refer to Annex E for list of documents reviewed). Triangulation of data and sources was used to minimise possibility of errors and discrepancy. Reliability and quality of information/data was ensured through critical review and analysis, cross checks and probation of the respondent while collecting the information on Programme performance. Impartiality and independence was strictly observed in the selection of respondents for interviews. This approach is an established evaluation methodology and aims to capture all stakeholders' comprehensive views. It is an effective analytical tool as it permits interlocking themes and areas of concern to be investigated and analysed as the basis for deriving a synthesis of findings. In addition to desk review of selected documents, the following classified sampling allowed the incorporation of a large spectrum of stakeholders, including but not limited to:

1. Relevant Institutions – UNODC, DSD, EU – purposive sampling
2. Key staff of UNODC and DSD; VEP Coordinators who played key roles in the implementation and management of VEP activities
3. VEP partner CSOs in the 4 provinces that actively participated in Programme activities
4. VEP beneficiaries (trainees, volunteers, grant beneficiaries, end beneficiaries, victims)
5. VEP Final Evaluation Workshop – 14 to 16 March, 2012

⁶Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, United Nations Evaluation Group, 29 April, 2005.

⁷UNEG, 'Code of Conduct', June 2008.

B.2. Geographical coverage of Evaluation

While the evaluation covers the whole geographical area that VEP has served, Limpopo, Eastern Cape, Gauteng and Northern West provinces have been selected for field visit according to the availability of the contacts i.e. VEP Coordinators and focal points, One-stop-Centres, etc. Time constraint was a factor in selecting only 4 provinces for field visits. The selection was also made for practical reasons of access. The participation of the Evaluation Team in the VEP Final Evaluation workshop held at Johannesburg from 14th to 16th March supplemented data collection efforts. Information on the remaining provinces was collected during this workshop through individual interviews and focus group discussions.

B.3. Data collection instruments

Keeping in view time limitations, the evaluation used the following simple data collection tools:

- Desk review of the documents (the list of documents reviewed is given as Annex E)
- In-depth interviews with implementing institutions
- One-on-one interviews and consultations with key informants
- Structured and semi-structured Questionnaires
- Rapid appraisals
- Focus group discussions
- Participant observations during field visits

C. Limitations to the evaluation

The following were limitations to the evaluation:

- 1) Non-availability of government staff due to their preoccupation in annual budget preparation, which also limited the planning for site visits.
- 2) The Programme was of great magnitude and had country-wide coverage. The time constraint did not allow the evaluation team to assess the impact and multiplier prospects, especially at field level.
- 3) There was a lack of outcome-oriented consolidated reports to allow a comprehensive assessment especially in capacity-building and grant scheme implementation.
- 4) The implementation approach to handle and report on capacity building activities under outputs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1 and 4.2 rendered it difficult to differentiate the efficiency, effectiveness as well as the prospects of impact and sustainability of individual training programmes.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

A. Programme Design

In general, the design and outputs of the five outcomes are relevant. Interventions correspond to outputs and are consistent with stakeholders, beneficiaries' requirements, needs of the target groups and final beneficiaries, human development priorities and UNODC and EU policies in contributing to the victim and community empowerment with strengthened capacities of public support institutions. There has been a conscious decision to link the objective with the wider UNODC goals and the national VE strategy.

The Programme document is well written and demonstrates a sound understanding of the on-the-ground situational analysis and critical needs of the GoSA in the area of victim empowerment. In this respect, the Programme and its constituent components were a comprehensive response to the weaknesses identified in the implementation of the GoSA VEP. The Programme provided for the flexibility which has allowed the Programme to pursue different options according to the needs of its beneficiaries (provinces, partner groups, victim communities) and the willingness of donors to fund particular elements of the Programme consistent with their own objectives. Design strengths include strong ownership by DSD and a pragmatic, well focussed approach while targeting a full range of stakeholders. However, the design weakness was the ambitious nation-wide scope. The Programme would have given better results had it been piloted before nation-wide coverage.

The Evaluation team commends the Programme Management Team's initiative to revise the Programme Document and Logical Framework. However, there are indications that the revision left room for improvement as there are some inconsistencies in the presentation of outcome statements and expected outputs between the two documents. Most Key Performance Indicators (KPI) did not meet the standard Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART) criteria. As examples, Outcome 1 is presented differently in the Programme Document and Logical Framework (LF); one of the indicators under the same outcome; "enhanced awareness by policy makers and public at large on ..." presents itself as an outcome statement. This situation presents difficulties in measuring progress made under the outcome.

The evaluation found that baseline studies were undertaken in all the provinces participating in the Programme. However, the LF was not updated accordingly and there were no targets for achievement, a situation which poses difficulties in judging Programme performance.

B. Relevance

Relevance of the Programme to the Government and UN priorities was strong. The VEP relates to long-term and high-level priorities of the Government of South Africa (GoSA) by addressing the prevalent culture of violence particularly as it affects women and children. The 1996 NCPS prioritised the VEP as a strategy to address the high rates of criminal victimisation in South Africa. The Programme is fully in line with EU key strategic priorities; i.e. security, crime reduction and gender issues. The objective of ensuring "improved implementation of VE government policies ..." directly addressed limitations of the existing VEP⁹. Discussions with various evaluation participants confirmed that victims of crime had limited awareness on their rights and the types of services available to them. CSOs and Government officials concurred that prior to UNODC support to VEP, there was limited dissemination and awareness of

⁸ Programme Document and Logical Framework

⁹ Refer to ToRs for a list of these limitations

available legislation and policies¹⁰ on VE. The Programme's awareness component provided a platform for creating awareness and implementation of policies. Lack of coordination among VE service providers was highlighted as one of the limitations of the VEP. Hence, the Programme's thrust to improve coordination between DSD and other relevant victim empowerment government departments and with CSOs was relevant to the VEP context.

Within the framework of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2007-2010, the VEP contributed to the GoSA's priority area of strengthening the Government's efforts to promote justice, peace, safety and security. The VEP directly contributed to the outcome "Enhanced structures for prevention and response to address violence against women and children". Also, VEP supports GoSA's efforts in achieving the MDGs gender equality goal. Although there was no clear strategy and evidence for adhering to the gender mainstreaming and rights-based principles, the majority of the beneficiaries (victims) were females.

C. Efficiency

VEP was highly focused on a results-based approach to its activities. The Programme ensured a wide geographical coverage by delivering assistance in all nine provinces. The Programme was officially launched in December 2007 with substantive activities beginning to roll out in June 2008. After that it faced several delays in implementation, in particular due to interruptions over issues of execution modalities and accountability of the PMU. Initially, there was a two-month interruption in implementation between February and April 2009 and a four-month suspension of Programme activities by national DSD, between 19 December 2009 and 12 April 2010. Recognising the delays in implementation, a no-cost extension was granted until March 2012 to enable completion of outstanding activities. The Programme scope was also reduced, e.g. one-stop-centres were reduced from four to two and staffing was reduced by around 50%¹¹.

Whilst a lot of progress has been made during the extension period¹², there were still some outstanding activities at the time of the evaluation. For instance, all provinces had just rolled out the "Everyday Heroes" campaign, a major awareness-raising activity which unfortunately will be completed beyond the Programme's lifespan. Similarly, the DSD Funding Strategies were under preparation, and Piloting of GIS was not fully implemented for all indicator groups. A One-Stop Centre set for the KwaZulu-Natal province had not been established.

i) Institutional and management arrangements

The Programme was managed by an International Programme Coordinator leading the PMU, constituted of three international expert specialists situated within UNODC. The PMU underwent a number of changes since the inception of the Programme, a situation which led to some delays in Programme implementation and to a loss of institutional memory. The management design initially had all Programme staff located within UNODC. This caused problems of insufficient communication and understanding that were only partially resolved with a change in UNODC management and placement of two experts to be appointed for transfer of skills within DSD. However the core team of PMU still remained in the UNODC for the duration of the programme implementation and this created problems in implementing the project, leading to a lesson for future programme implementation wherein Government of SA will not agree or support

¹⁰ *Victim's Charter, Domestic Violence Act, VE Policy Guidelines, Criminal Law (Sexual Offences and Related Matters) Amendment Act, Policy Framework and Strategy for Shelters for Victims of Domestic Violence, Minimum Standards for service delivery in VE and Strategy for Engagement of Men and Boys in Prevention of GBV*

¹¹ *Information obtained from discussions with UNODC VEP staff interviews*

¹² *Achievements are detailed in the effectiveness section.*

such arrangement again. The management support received from UNODC-ROSAF was instrumental in cushioning the Programme against the effects of staff attrition.

The Programme management arrangement was such that UNODC and national DSD would constitute a PCM to review Programme implementation progress and provide advice to PMU. However, communication gap between PMU and national DSD constrained productive deliberations during meetings. Discussions with both PMU and national DSD points to a lack of trust between the two parties, resulting in ineffective collaborations and delays in the approval of key Programme activities. With the exception of the Free State province, the other eight provinces enjoyed a cordial working relationship between UNODC Provincial Coordinators and DSD counterparts.

Transparency in recruitment of Programme staff was evidenced as this process was done jointly by UNODC and DSD, who reached consensus in almost all provinces with the exception of the Free State, where they failed to establish a functional office for the Provincial Coordinator. This impacted negatively on the Programme as the provincial DSD could not own up to the Programme's activities. The evaluation found that even after the staff concerned had left the position, DSD's involvement was still limited. The Gauteng Provincial Coordinator provided backstopping support to the Free State province whilst the Grant Associate within UNODC followed up on grant management issues. From the discussions with CSOs, the Evaluation team concluded that more could have been achieved had there been a dedicated person overseeing Programme activities in the Province.

The programme management team adopted UNODC and UNDP standards and operational procedures in the recruitment of staff and procurement. UNDP/UNODC procedures, especially with regards to procurement, are time consuming and have been cited as a major contribution towards delays in implementation as they did not harmonise with Government deadlines. Evaluation found that there was a strong culture of participation within the VEP and a display of transparency by management in its operational procedures. Interventions were planned in a systematic and detailed way, and extensive documentation was produced on Programme outputs. From the comments offered by the persons met and interviewed, the evaluation has drawn the conclusion that the team established good overall working relations with CSOs and beneficiaries. However, relations with DSD remained strained on various accounts.

ii) Funding Arrangements

The total approved budget was US\$ 27,433,627 for a 36-month period which was to be disbursed in four instalments. Due to slow and lagging implementation of Programme activities, fund disbursement did not follow the initially agreed schedule. Financial figures provided to the Evaluation team indicate that the Programme's yearly disbursements were lower than funds allocated¹³. In the disbursements of funds, the Programme followed the accounting procedures and practices set by UNODC. An amount of US\$ 2,874,700 (10%) was realised in Year 1 (2008). Expenditure on Programme activities as of 31st December 2011 totaled US\$ 21,757, 349 (79% of the total budget). Expenditures of US\$ 1,007,291 were planned for 2012¹⁴. Allocation of funds was made against specific activities which defined target beneficiaries. Table 1 shows expenditures against the planned budget.

Table 1 - Financial Inputs - as of 29 February 2012 (US\$)

Planned Expenditures/Year	Year 1 \$2,874,700	Year 2 \$6,673,300	Year 3 \$6,650,300	Year 4 \$1,026,900	Total \$27,433,600
Disbursed/Year	(2008) \$2,874,967	(2009) \$2,009,254	(2010) \$2,090,779	(2011) \$2,810,964	21,679,958

¹³ See Table 1.

¹⁴ Figures reported by UNODC

Source: UNODC VEP, February 2012.

Allocation of funds was made against specific activities which defined the target beneficiaries. There has been a deliberate policy of avoiding hypothecating funds to specific provinces or to target a specific amount to particular beneficiary groups. Discussions with PMU revealed that about US\$ 3 million will remain unspent at the end of the Programme. Procurement processes and awarding of contracts followed UNODC procedures. However, the bureaucratic nature of UNODC's procurement system became a point of contention with the DSD. The DSD perceived the PMU as rigid in their approach and unyielding to suggestions meant to improve the Programme. The Evaluation team is convinced that this perception might have contributed to mounting tensions between the two parties resulting in stalemates.

iii) Staffing inputs

An experienced and well-motivated team was assembled for the Programme. The evaluation found staff to be performing their duties conscientiously and with determined interest. Management displayed UNODC standards, procedures and transparency in recruitment of staff, operational procedures and selection of CSOs.

Up until the end of March 2012, there were a total of 901 person-months of inputs by Programme staff; 761 person-months for national and 140 person-months for international staff. Expenditures on staff represented US\$ 8,783,797 representing 86% of funds allocated to staff and 40% of the total spent on the Programme¹⁵. Given that the Programme operated under the Direct Execution (DEX) modalities of the UNODC, this use of staff resources is considered consistent with the scope of activities.

iv) Monitoring and Evaluation

Extensive documentation was produced on Programme outputs (annual work plans, progress reports, donor progress report, study reports, manuals and guidebooks, workshop proceedings, advocacy material and brochures). Provincial coordinators were responsible for the implementation and monitoring of all Programme components in their respective provinces. They produced quarterly reports that were shared with the PMU. However, most of the reports tended to focus on activities and outputs with little attempt to report on outcomes. Introduction and implementation of the GIS could have provided some information on outcomes. Post assistance monitoring exercises could have given an indication of the short- to medium-term benefits accruing from the assistance.

Mid-term review (MTR) originally planned in the Programme Document was not carried out due to limited budget allocation for Evaluation. Instead, the EU proposed to use the limited budget allocated for MTR for the Final Evaluation and use Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) tool within the EU monitoring framework to serve as a mid-term review since they were carried out using the same criteria, i.e. Programme design and relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact prospects and potential sustainability, and the final evaluation of the Programme. Two monitoring missions were held through the life cycle of the project positively appraised the Programme. The first mission made some recommendations which, if followed could have enhanced the Programme's efficiency and effectiveness. These are; a) the PMU should promote an update of the Logical Framework, to be done in a participative way, and include risk analysis, risk management strategy, and phasing out strategy and b) PMU/DSD should implement joint action plans in the provinces, with clear definition of responsibilities, to minimise duplications and maximise synergies¹⁶. As highlighted in the design section, the Logical Framework remained defective until the end of the Programme. Implementation of joint plans left room for improvement as most provinces reported

¹⁵ Information received from UNODC VEP staff

¹⁶ EU Monitoring Mission Report, 2009.

that the plans were prepared but could not be fully implemented. However, few provinces like North West and Northern Cape implemented their joint plans. The Evaluation team could not establish specific reasons for non-implementation of EU's recommendations due to unavailability of institutional memory within the PMU. The Evaluation team feels that these monitoring missions, whilst providing useful recommendations, cannot be an alternative to the MTR.

Provincial UNODC Coordinators in most provinces undertook joint monitoring visits with their DSD counterparts at provincial and district levels. However, the DSD focal persons had other responsibilities in addition to the VEP and hence were not always available for VEP activities. The mentorship programme provided a good platform for established CSOs to monitor the work of other emerging CSOs.

D. Partnerships and cooperation

The PSC was instrumental in bringing together UNODC, national and provincial DSD, representatives from CSOs, SA Human Rights Commission, the Commission on Gender Equality and independent experts. The PSC meetings were scheduled to be conducted twice a year. There is evidence of these meetings taking place as planned until August 2011, except for when implementation had not begun or had been suspended. There are reports that misunderstandings and communication gaps between PMU and DSD would often spill from the PCM to the PSC, rendering it ineffective¹⁷.

The Programme strengthened VE Forums which brought together government departments with a mandate on victim empowerment and CSOs working in the field. VE Forums meetings were held every quarter at national and provincial level to strengthen inter-sectoral collaboration. Provinces used the forums as a platform to develop joint implementation plans, review progress and challenges met during implementation. Execution of joint plans varied across provinces due to varying commitments by stakeholders and constraints regarding the availability of funds. For instance, whilst provinces like Northern Cape, Free State and Western Cape reported successful implementation of jointly agreed plans, the other provinces reported limited involvement of other government departments, especially the Department of Education (DE). Within the provinces, district and local/community VE Forums were also established to enhance collaboration at the local level. Although not prioritised and not directly funded by VEP, local VE Forums were reported to have been more coordinated with close collaboration between CSOs and government departments. Contrary to complaints about the insufficient involvement of DE at the national and provincial level, CSOs report cases of cooperation with education institutions at the community level.

As discussed in the Relevance section, VEP contributed to the UNDAF (2007-2010) priority area of “strengthening the Government’s efforts to promote justice, peace, safety and security” and to the outcome of “Enhanced structures for prevention and response to address violence against women and children”. Support towards VEP also addresses cross-cutting issues of gender, human rights and HIV and AIDS¹⁸. However, there are no coherent structures at the UN level for the involvement of other agencies whose mandates intertwine with VE. The Evaluation team visited a VEP One-Stop Centre in Limpopo province which at the time of the evaluation was hosting a group of illegal immigrants from Zimbabwe. Within the UN system, the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) has the mandate on migration (including illegal immigrants). Hence, it would have been more appropriate for IOM to take a lead in addressing the issue.

E. Effectiveness

¹⁷ Information obtained from interviews.

¹⁸ Joint Evaluation on the role of the UN system in South Africa

In spite of some delays and interruptions at various stages of its implementation, VEP succeeded in achieving most of its targets. The Programme implemented its activities in all nine provinces across the country. Strong Programme effectiveness was evident as all the relevant stakeholders were fully involved with some outcomes even being surpassed. Evaluation also witnessed a sense of ownership on the part of most target groups. The detail on each targeted outcome is given below:

Outcome 1: Implementation plan on Victim Empowerment Policies including the Victims Charter, Anti-Rape Strategy, Minimum Standards and Integrated Victim Empowerment Policy are disseminated to service providers and the public.

Prior to the UNODC Programme of Support, joint implementation plans for VEP implementation were produced at national and provincial levels. However, these plans were never integrated or implemented since service providers were working in silos. Some of these plans include: the 2004-2006 Strategic Plans, Regional Integrated VEP workshop in 2004/5 and the Draft Integrated Provincial VEP Policy in 2006/7¹⁹. The evaluation found that the Programme under review also supported the development of provincial work plans through funding workshops in all provinces and through the VE forums. However, evaluation participants indicated that in the majority of provinces, these work plans were not effectively implemented as there were problems with stakeholder coordination at that level.

Prior to the UNODC Programme of Support, the level of awareness of VE policies and victims' rights was rated low among national and provincial policy makers and very low for the public²⁰. The UNODC Programme assisted the GoSA in reproducing and multiplying the available policies and guidelines on VE as well as other awareness-raising materials. A number of conferences and awareness campaigns were held at national and provincial levels. Awareness campaigns were often linked to specific events such as Human Rights Day; Women's Month and 16 Days of Activism, among others. The Evaluation team commends the Programme management and implementation team for realising and taking advantage of the power of the electronic media in information dissemination, especially community radio stations. Discussions with staff from a community radio station in Limpopo province pointed towards growing interest by the locals on VE sessions aired on radio. There was an increase in the number of people calling the station to seek clarifications and contacts for service providers. Funding of CSOs running call centres also assisted in instant provision of assistance, especially with regard to information to victims of crime.

There was a general consensus among evaluation participants that the awareness-raising initiatives have indeed led to "enhanced awareness by policy makers and public at large on VE policies and victims' rights". Almost all provinces reported increases in the number of reported cases of crime and in the number of victims visiting VE service providers for assistance. Some "old" cases, especially on human trafficking and sexual assault, were reported following the campaigns held in provinces. CSOs that participated in the evaluation noted that some cases which would traditionally have been resolved at family level were now being reported and in some instances, neighbours would come forward to report on cases of abuse in their neighbourhood.

Whilst the Programme attempted to have awareness-raising materials in all major languages in South Africa, there was laxity in following up on geographical distribution. For instance, North West reported that they received awareness-materials in English, a situation which was never addressed. There were also concerns on the suitability of awareness-raising materials to the whole of South Africa, considering ethnic variations. Provinces also raised concern that in some instances, awareness-raising materials did not filter through from the national to the provincial and regional levels.

¹⁹ National Consolidated Baseline report 2009

²⁰ National Consolidated Baseline Report, August 2009

Outcome 2: Improved coordination between relevant victim empowerment government departments both vertically and horizontally and with CSOs.

Programme Coordination offices were established in all nine provinces but remained functional in eight provinces. There were disagreements between UNODC and DSD over the choice of a Provincial Coordinator for Free State. The Provincial DSD could not accommodate the Coordinator as was the case in other provinces. The post was discontinued after a year and was never filled. Programme activities in the province were managed by Gauteng project staff in support of the DSD VE Coordinator. Grant-related work was undertaken by the UNODC Grant Associate based in the Pretoria office. The presence and support of the provincial coordinators in the provinces was crucial for implementing VE initiatives, dedicated activities and coordination with the other institutions.

Prior to the UNODC Programme of support, there was weak coordination between government departments and with CSOs. Although the policy guidelines stipulating roles of the different VE stakeholders were already in place, some departments did not understand their responsibilities²¹. The Programme strengthened the National VE Forum and re-invigorated defunct provincial forums ensuring the involvement of CSOs and relevant government departments. ToRs were developed and the VEP forum meetings were held every quarter at national and provincial levels up until December 2010. As of January 2011, only a few provinces continued to convene quarterly meetings. Funding, especially for catering services was highlighted as one of the major constraints that hampered the smooth continuation of forum meetings. Nonetheless, the provincial forums are credited for strengthening inter-sectoral stakeholder collaboration at both national and provincial level. Consultations with Evaluation Workshop participants revealed that forums were effective in clarifying responsibilities of the different stakeholders, reviewing progress, identifying shortcomings in implementation, develop joint plans and prioritise of Programme activities. Progress of the work of the VE Forums was reviewed and reported at annual meetings at the national level.

Some of UNODC Provincial Coordinators that participated in the Evaluation Workshop echoed the same sentiments on the need to include other government departments that were traditionally viewed as not having a VE mandate. Such departments include; Home Affairs to oversee VE issues related to counter trafficking and Department of Housing to provide permanent housing solution to victims that cannot return to their former places of residence.

District and local forums were established in KwaZulu-Natal, North West, Mpumalanga and Gauteng provinces, decentralising coordination of service delivery to victims of crime to local levels. District and local forums provided a platform for closer collaboration between service providers who are in touch with the beneficiaries. CSOs that participated in the evaluation indicated that, through the local forums; they were able to create consortia to enhance their capacity to implement and monitor VE activities in their localities. There were reports of informal mentoring between the established and upcoming CSOs on issues to do with grant management, proposal writing and reporting.

The Programme has been effective in improving coordination among VE service providers in South Africa. More could have been achieved had UNODC and DSD nurtured harmonious working relationships at national and provincial levels. Reports of Provincial UNODC and DSD staff duplicating training and in some instances recommending conflicting procedures are a cause for concern²².

Outcome 3: The capacity of government staff to implement policies and comply with minimum standards in all relevant Government departments is strengthened.

²¹ National Consolidated Baseline report, 2009

²² Information obtained from briefings by CSOs at the Evaluation workshop organised by UNODC and DSD

Prior to UNODC Programme of support, relevant government VE departments and CSOs lack sufficient capacity to comply with minimum standards which leads to fragmentation of services to victims of crime, lack of coordination and cooperation between government departments and civil society organisations. The programme provided support to meet the learning needs of different stakeholders and delivered tailored training to around 1800 persons in all 9 provinces. Numerous activities to provide information, knowledge and skills were planned and implemented by the UNODC Project team at the province level.

The mid-term impact assessment of the training conducted in July 2010 indicated a positive and significant immediate impact on the perceived skills level and attitude of participants. The summative assessment revealed that the majority of the participants had completed the assessment. It corresponds to the general positive course evaluation provided by the participants and verified, in general, by the presentations of the working groups in the VEP Final Evaluation Workshop.

Implementation of the training programs has improved the capacity of VE staff in trauma counselling and VE leadership. The findings of the final evaluation imply improved skills on the part of social workers, manifested by increased self-confidence in handling trauma cases and decreased tendency to refer the cases to other service units. However, it is worth noting that assessment of the training participants regarding the effectiveness of the training is mixed. The participants who were already experienced on the training topics reported that they perceived the training as refresher training rather than an opportunity to acquire new knowledge.

The Programme capacitated the staff in relevant government departments, including DSD, as well as CSOs to comply with minimum standards. The training programs, tailored to the needs of different target groups, have laid the ground to ensure that the staff of government departments and CSOs is better equipped to deliver services to crime victims by providing them the conceptual as well as legal and policy framework and a common vocabulary on VE initiatives.

The mentorship training was well received and, as verified through interviews with the field workers, provided an excellent learning opportunity for both the mentors and the mentees. They gained a better understanding of the basics for analysing and strengthening organisational capacity. They developed strategies and M&E mechanisms to further build on their capacity. The mentoring within the framework of the grant scheme implementation has created synergies. However, the interviews with field staff implies that mentoring by government staff has experienced challenges and mentoring by well-established NGOs might have been more effective.

The participatory learning experience have led to a better understanding of their roles and responsibilities as well as the importance of inter-institutional and inter-sectoral cooperation in the implementation of VE policies.²³ VEP Final Evaluation Workshop participants indicated that there was improved communication, cooperation and joint planning, especially at the provincial level. In fact, there are cases of joint-budgeting and/or cost-sharing initiatives in KZN.

How these improvements led to improvements in the services provided to victims as verified by the result of surveys to measure victim satisfaction is yet to be assessed. On the other hand, due to high staff turnover in government departments and CSOs, there is a strong need for continuous training.

Outcome 4: The capacity of the National and Provincial Departments of Social Development and Victim Empowerment Coordinators of other government agencies to manage, coordinate

²³ NICDAM, *Final Programme Report*, 11 May 2011.

and lead the government's VEP is strengthened.

Prior to UNODC programme support, the institutional capacity within the Department of Social Development to lead and champion the government's VEP was limited. The project design attempted to strengthen DSD's leadership through interventions to improve critical processes such as Minimum Standards of KPI, DSD funding strategy, service provision models, victim satisfaction surveys, and GIS for monitoring and evaluation of National VEP.

The production of Outcome 4 played a key role in achieving the project purpose and in ensuring the institutional sustainability of the intervention. As explained under efficiency, the outputs under this outcome have not been fully achieved as planned and hence their contribution was limited towards attainment of the outcome:

- Due to lack of information about the progress towards the use of Minimum Standards, it is not possible to assess its effectiveness. The work on the DSD funding strategy is on-going. It can, however, be expected to create a favourable environment for emerging CSOs, especially the ones operating in remote rural areas.
- Due to delays in implementation it is not possible to comment on the effectiveness of the One-Stop Centre in Limpopo. Moreover, M&E framework is at its pilot stage that made it impossible to comment on its effectiveness, except for the work being carried out in the service units at the provincial level.

Given the situation, it is too early to comment on the overall effectiveness of this outcome. However the achievements should be maintained, monitored and assessed for their efficiency and effectiveness within the framework of the National VEP to ensure that the experience and impetus gained within the framework of VEP UNODC are sustained.

Outcome 5: Improving the capacity of CSO's in delivering services to victims of crime.

Prior to UNODC Programme support, the capacity CSOs to deliver Victim Empowerment Interventions was limited and services and support for victims of crime, in particular for women, orphans and vulnerable children, were insufficient. DSD funding schemes provided the major financial input for the registered CSOs to cover most related administrative costs as opposed to funding project-based interventions. Considering the key role of CSOs in service delivery, especially at the grass roots level, the Programme interventions were well linked with the outputs under outcomes 3 and 4, to enhance CSOs' capacities and to draw lessons learned for future planning. The CSOs received extensive capacity-building on Integrated Trauma Counselling, Mentorship and project proposal writing.

The high rate of return of the considerable amount of investment in the form of grants, training, and mentoring, as well as hands-on assistance by UNODC staff (thus the effectiveness of the grant scheme implementation), is highlighted by all stakeholders at all levels.

The activities planned and implemented to produce this outcome were effective in "strengthening service delivery to victims of crime through Civil Society Organisations", as verified through the stakeholder consultations and the discussions during the VEP Evaluation Workshop.

The evaluation team found that the UNODC grant scheme has created an added value on VE-related activities and services: a) UNODC funding has provided an important financial input for activities and services that could not be covered by DSD funding only; b) the dissemination activities were held for all

prospective beneficiaries to explain the scope and content of the grant scheme and expectations of the applicants to ensure transparency and informed decision-making; c) the templates used to prepare proposals as well as writing up-reports were user-friendly; d) the method of intervention was project-based; the activities had to be carried out in a more structured manner and provided the grant beneficiaries with learning opportunities to work within a plan and a budget; e) the obligatory activities on establishing a monitoring and evaluation system, conducting capacity building activities and including plans to build partnerships was an innovative attempt to build capacity.

The interviews held within the framework of final evaluation implies that the experience they gained through implementing their projects, along with the training and mentoring support, has enhanced the administrative and organisational capacity of CSOs. The obligatory M&E activities built on their filing, accounting and reporting systems. The capacity-building activities improved their human resources. Their physical structure was improved. Their cooperation and collaboration with public, private and civil entities have improved. Above all, with the additional funds received from UNODC's grant scheme they were able to extend their outreach and deliver new services, and improved their contacts with community and established networks. The CSOs have been capacitated to reach out to other sources of funding.

Although the achievements are well documented in the reports by the grant beneficiaries, in the absence of an MIS to allow the retrieval of systematic information about the achievements and outreach of individual grant projects, it is not possible to reflect on the improvements in terms of the quality and quantity of services, thus the effectiveness of individual grant projects. The fact that the activity to review and document best practices have not been carried out is yet another challenge for the evaluation team in duly highlighting the effectiveness of this output. Nevertheless, the experience is expected to provide input for ongoing efforts to improve the funding schemes of DSD.

F. Impact

The Programme has contributed to elevating the VEP within the DSD such that there are now considerations to have a Chief Directorate and two Directors for the VEP at national level. Significant progress has been made towards developing VE legislation. At provincial level, the VEP has grown in stature and visibility and most provinces (about 70%) are almost ready to have stand-alone VE Directorates²⁴. The programme has also extended its coverage to other previously uncovered groups like men and Lesbians, Gays, Bisexual, Trans-gender and Inter-sexual persons (LGBTI)²⁵. Some provinces reported that provincial budgetary allocations for VEP have increased as a result of the visibility that came with the Programme. Men's involvement in the programme has resulted in an increase in the number of functional men's forums and positive changes in behaviour with regards to GBV. The capacity-building activities have increased the knowledge base on VE as well as the quality of services provided to victims. The central role of CSOs in implementing government policies has improved, which in turn has resulted in improved service delivery to victims of crime at community level. The grants scheme is applauded for facilitating the establishment and strengthening of CSO networks, increased outreach and improved community relations. The pending activity to review and document best practices has impaired the chances of multiplier effects through scaling up, replicating and/or mainstreaming some very successful interventions.

The evaluation noted evidence of improved multi-sectoral coordinated responses to victims of crime. Reports of normalisation in the number of reported cases of violence against women and children in the provinces could be taken to imply a marginal decline in the number of new crimes being committed. In this

²⁴ Information received from discussions with national DSD officials

²⁵ DSD VE Evaluation workshop presentation, March 2012

regard, the programme is showing early signs of its contribution towards “addressing the high rates of criminal victimisation” and in “building safe and peaceful communities” in South Africa.

G. Sustainability

The political sustainability of the project intervention is strong on the part of DSD. However, there is room for improvement in the levels of commitment from other VE departments, through a MoU. DSD expresses the will to sustain the achievements made through the re-activation of VE Forums. Improved working relations with CSOs maintain its priority within the framework of VE. Steps are already being taken to adopt a new funding strategy and plans are being made to draw lessons learned through the implementation of grant projects. The mentorship component of the programme is well appreciated and acknowledged by the decision-making body and will possibly be sustained.

The financial sustainability of the Programme is a huge challenge unless innovative solutions and or cost-sharing models are introduced for Programme continuation. DSD indicated that Treasury approved funding to sustain the programme which will only kick start during 2013/14 and there was no provision made to close the VEP funding gap for the 2012/13 fiscal year in provinces. At the time of the evaluation, there were no certainties – regarding alternative funding sources. However, DSD indicated that there were efforts to raise funds to cover the gap for the 2012/2013 fiscal year. The evaluation found that without additional budgetary support to CSOs, most initiatives that have been implemented with UNODC's support will be discontinued. At the time of the evaluation, there were already some indications of previously supported CSOs cutting down on their activities. As an example, one CSO from Northern Cape that had received support in running a call centre for victims of crime had already ceased operations due to funding constraints.

Whilst information dissemination using the already produced material will continue, there is currently no provision for additional production to sustain activities. Provincial VE forums, already flagging warning signs in most provinces, will be difficult to sustain without external support. The absence of a VE strategy and legislation were given as potential threats towards continuity of the forums beyond the programme as there is no instrument to enforce stakeholders' participation. There is however hope for continuation of district and local forums as they have previously thrived without funding. The absence of a viable financial sustainability plan after four years of implementation is cause for concern. It raises questions surrounding the Programme management team's commitment towards sustaining the benefits that the programme has generated.

The evaluation noted that persistent lack of communication and understanding of responsibilities and obligations between PMU and DSD including procurement processes and approval processes within UNODC caused an enormous delay in Programme implementation. Whilst EU policies would not have allowed the Programme to go beyond the extension period, in light of their excellent working relationships with the EU, with an extension in due time and a well-articulated rationale, DSD and PMU could have negotiated for a second extension.

Another alternative could have been to jointly approach prospective donors for funding. The results and great potential exhibited by this programme was a credible bargaining platform for UNODC and DSD. This would have minimised the implementation gap between the Programme end date and the start of the 2013/14 financial year.

III. CONCLUSIONS

Relevance and Design

The Programme Document was well written and highly relevant to the GoSA's priorities. However, the design was ambitious for a project of that magnitude. The Logical Framework needs to be reviewed and revised to make it consistent with the Programme document, and in order to better realise the expected outputs to assess Programme performance.

Institutional arrangements and management

The management design initially had PMU located within UNODC. This led to a communication gap and insufficient understanding that were largely resolved with a change in UNODC management and placement of core staff within DSD. But this process led to significant delays in implementation and to a loss of institutional memory. The management support received from UNODC-ROSAF was instrumental in cushioning the Programme against the effects of staff attrition.

Outcome 1

Awareness-raising campaigns were among the highlights of the project achievement. The campaigns resulted in increased knowledge on VE policies and victims' rights among policy makers, CSOs and the public. However, the content of the awareness-raising instruments, mainly printed materials, were centrally produced with strict control over their launching at the province and district level.

Outcome 2

The Programme strengthened coordination between government departments and CSOs. However, lack of commitment and/or ownership by some VE departments continues to pose a challenge. Non-involvement of other departments like Departments of Agriculture, Home Affairs and Housing among VE partners limits the Programme's effectiveness in offering comprehensive services to victims of crimes.

Outcome 3

The provision of training opportunities to meet the learning needs of all stakeholders have enhanced their capacity to effectively implement and/or oversee the VE Programme. Enhanced knowledge base also laid the grounds for stakeholder buy-in, at least at the service level. However, the structure of the Integrated Trauma Counseling and Coaching in Victim Empowerment Programme as a block training package, has posed challenges in terms of logistics and participation. A 1-2 week training programme is reported to bring additional distress regarding their routine responsibilities for -most participants at different levels. Such training arrangements, increases the unit costs of organising the training activities, thus reduces the chances for their replication unless sufficient funding is secured.

Outcome 4

The interventions planned to produce the output are of paramount important for setting standards, improving the provision of ongoing services and introducing new service models and establishing an M&E system for National VEP. Unfortunately the outcome could not be fully produced to the level anticipated.

Outcome 5

Support provided to CBOs enhanced service delivery, strengthened CBOs' institutional capacities, networks with other CSOs and ties with the communities. However the achievements of individual organisations are not well documented to allow replication and/or scaling up.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

- There is further scope of improvement of the logical framework. It should be detailed, reflecting the full results chain and updated for new baseline information that becomes available during Programme implementation.
- At the outset all stakeholders, particularly UNODC and DSD, may hold extensive discussions and clearly spell out their roles, responsibilities and obligations. This may be made possible through signing of MoUs or joint memos.
- The communication strategy for an awareness campaign should make balanced use of different media and make maximum use of local resources (local media, grass roots organisations, opinion leaders etc.) and electronic media (CDs, DVDs, internet, social media etc.) to disseminate the basic messages while minimising costs.
- DSD should afford the provincial department the opportunity to customise the materials to suit their environs, taking into account the diversity of cultural values and languages to ensure maximum impact on the target audience.
- DSD should make efforts towards affecting an MoU to ensure full participation and commitment of relevant VE departments, including allocation of funds and other resources as a concrete indicator of collaboration.
- DSD should engage other government departments and organisations specialising in improving service delivery with concrete results on VE-related issues.
- Considering the similarities in the content of the tailored programmes, DSD should ensure that the training package for VE service providers is broken into modules that are provided in stages so as to allow their integration to pre-, in- and on-the job training programmes of the departments and to allow trainees to focus on other duties while ensuring capacity building in a continuous manner.
- Plan continuous non-formal capacity-building interventions in the form of peer education, refresher trainings for permanent staff and introductory courses for newly recruited staff. Collaborating with relevant tertiary education institutions to include VE-related courses in their undergraduate curricula and give credit to applicants who have completed courses in assigning staff to VE-related tasks, since they are already members of the VE forums at national and international levels.
- Piloting of GIS and DSD Funding Strategy should continue, one-stop-centre should be closely monitored for effectiveness at least a year.
- Rendering victim satisfaction surveys an integral part of the M&E system to allow continuous flow of data available, which will provide valuable feedback for policy decisions.
- In addition to the GIS, DSD should develop an M&E and reporting system for the funding/grant schemes to facilitate the documentation of best practices that can be replicated, multiplied or scaled up.
- Improve donor coordination at national and international level to promote and support VEP-related interventions with a view to facilitate financial planning of CSOs.
- To sustain VEP initiatives, UNODC should develop an effective and comprehensive Programme exit strategy clearly articulating the procedures, roles and responsibilities of DSD and other stakeholders. UNODC may provide support to DSD in seeking funding alternatives to lessen the implementation gap.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

Forward planning or pre-implementation is crucial for the timely start of Programme to minimise the risk of delays in approvals, procurement and recruitment of staff. Example: the Programme faced delays in the beginning of implementation and lost a significant amount of time on recruitment and procurement processes that could have been saved.

Establishing trust is an effective management tool that works through a series of meetings and soft dialogues among stakeholders and facilitates the resolution of differences between stakeholders. Example: most of the issues that emerged due to miscommunication between UNODC and DSD were eventually resolved through this process.

An iterative management approach, learning from mistakes and adjusting Programme interventions based on the implementation realities contributes to the formulation of good working models.

A degree of flexibility is desirable in order for activities to achieve their maximum impact, and to ensure optimum utilisation of available resources. However, this would require mutual compensations by stakeholders; given the reality that all parties within the development framework are integral, the needs and/or institutional mandate of all stakeholders in achieving objectives need to be respected.

Qualitative assessments through desk review of regular reports, minutes of inter-sectoral meetings, field reports as well as interim evaluations provide opportunities to replicate, scale-up and mainstream good practices while presenting strong arguments for future planning in terms of increased collaboration and/or increased resources.

Large scale awareness-raising campaigns are highly effective in drawing the attention of the community as a whole. However, awareness-raising on VE requires that the basic messages are delivered on a continuous basis through different media, using various methods to ensure that they are duly comprehended and internalised by the target populations.

Facilitating a culture of mutual understanding and collaboration between stakeholders at different levels through genuine participatory processes requires a persistent and systematic approach, good leadership skills and dedication that need to be sustained over a long period of time to reach the overall objective of National VEP.

An effective transfer of skills and knowledge is the most important component for the sustainability of the learning achievement of trained staff. This allows for investments to have maximum impact and life-span. However, building sustainable initiatives should be thought of as a continuous process. Monitored and thorough activities and training and participatory evaluation to realistically assess the absorption capacities of beneficiaries allows for the internalisation and integration of knowledge gained.

Qualitative and quantitative assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact and sustainability prospects of pilot implementations leads to analytical decision-making to produce the desired outcomes. Systematic review and analysis of regular reports, meeting minutes, field reports as well as interim evaluations may provide valuable clues to assess progress and ways forward.

Funding schemes based on a comprehensive need assessment and tailored to match the capacities of targeted beneficiaries, matched with intensive technical support, can produce significant impact in terms of individual, institutional and community development.

Transparency of interventions and mutual trust between UN agencies and their government counterpart agencies is a key to the success and long-term sustainability of the Programme.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: ToRs for Final Independent Evaluation

1. BACKGROUND

Programme duration : Jan 2008 / March 2012

Location : South Africa- Pretoria

Executing Agency : UNODC Regional Office of Southern Africa –Pretoria

Partner Organisation : Department of Social Development (DSD) of South Africa

Donors : European Union – European Delegation Office in South Africa

The European Union funded Programme, "Support to the Government of South Africa's Victims Empowerment Programme", implemented by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the Department of Social Development (DSD) aims to address the high rates of criminal victimisation in South Africa by strengthening the country's Victim Empowerment Programme (VEP). The Programme, which is an integral part of the wider Government of South Africa Victim Empowerment Programme, has a specific purpose of "improving the implementation of victim empowerment policies in South Africa by building capacity, improving coordination, strengthening relations between the government and civil society organisations (CSOs) and thereby improving services to victims, especially women and vulnerable children". VE has been identified as one of the Government's priority programs in the 1996 National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS). According to the NCPS, the main purpose of the Victim Empowerment Programme (VEP) is to facilitate the establishment and integration of interdepartmental/intersectoral Programmes and policies for the support, protection and empowerment of victims of crime and violence with a special focus on women and children.

The development of this Programme follows the stipulations contained in the revised EU finance agreement "rider" with the Government of South Africa (Programme of Assistance to the Victim Empowerment Programme of the Department of Social Development in the South African Government" Addendum No. 1 to Finance Agreement – SA/21.031700-05-02) which states in section 3.2. Organisational and implementation procedures:

"The Programme will be implemented under centralized management. A contribution agreement will be signed with UNODC Regional Office for Southern Africa. UNODC shall be liable to the Commission for the satisfactory execution of the activities covered by the Programme. UNODC will be responsible for the management of all funds allocated to it and for providing audited accounts thereof. According to the terms of the contribution agreement used by the Commission, the UNODC shall be able to use its own procedures for the management of this Programme in conformity with United Nations standards as outlined in the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) between the EC and the UN."

Following approval of the rider by the EU HQs in Brussels, the EU Delegation in Pretoria entered into a Contribution Agreement with UNODC on 19 December 2007 through which funding of this Programme were provided.

The Programme is fully funded and was initially designed to be a 36 months' funded by the European Union through the European Delegation Office based in South Africa – Pretoria. Although the Contribution Agreement between UNODC and the European Union came into force in December 2007, initial activity was restricted to identifying and recruiting staff until the second half of 2008 this was the time when the Programme Management Unit (PMU) staff and Programme coordinators based in the nine provinces of South Africa took their respective positions.

As a consequence, during the course of Programme implementation it was realised that significant activities were not able to be completed by the end of December 2010; hence due to availability of funds a request of Programme extension period was positively endorsed by the Government and authorised by the donor. The amendments introduced by the revision have been approved by the EU and incorporated in an amended Contribution Agreement.; therefore the Programme was extended until the end of March 2012. (51 months in total). UNODC has been the implementing agency, while the Department of Social Development, South Africa has been the main Government counterpart. Partnership modalities between UNODC and the Department of Social Development have been outlined in a separate Letter of Agreement.

UNODC has been responsible for the management of all funds allocated to it. In this context, through a contribution agreement EC model, the UNODC received a grant to manage the Programme. According to the terms of the contribution agreement used by the European Union the UNODC was entitled to use its own procedures for the management of this Programme in conformity with United Nations standards as outlined in the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) between the EU and the United Nations.

The strategy, planning and implementation of the Programme has been guided by a Programme Steering Committee (PSC) comprising of UNODC, mandated representatives at the DG or DDG level from the National Department of Social Development, other relevant government departments and provincial governments as well as representatives from Coos, the South African Human Rights Commission, the Commission on Gender Equality and independent

experts. The EU delegation has had the *observer status* at the Programme Steering Committee. The PSC has been established in order to facilitate synergy between the different Programme components, review outcomes and advice on realignment of outputs and activities as necessary. Members of PSC have met twice annually at key milestones during the implementation of the Programme.

A **Programme Coordination Meeting (PCM)** comprising the Representative of UNODC, two representatives from the National Department of Social Development, the UNODC Programme Manager and Financial Administrator was set-up and met on a monthly basis to review Programme implementation progress in detail vis-à-vis Programme work-plan. In particular the PCM identified bottlenecks in Programme implementation and propose solutions to the **Program Management Unit (PMU)**. The PMU was established within UNODC office in Pretoria, led by the international Programme Manager and assisted by 3 international experts in the fields of capacity building of government institutions (1), monitoring and evaluation (1), grant management/capacity building of CSO's (1). One senior national Programme Officer and national administrative and financial support staff (6) were recruited for Programme management support. In addition, in each of the country's nine provinces, a provincial Programme Coordinator and one support staff were appointed to implement Programme interventions within the provinces. The provincial Programme Coordinators and their assistants were located at the offices of the provincial DSD.

This Programme was specifically designed for the Department of Social Development as the lead agency on Victim Empowerment in South Africa and e main government counterpart, and in agreement with them the Programme was developed in order to address problems related to:

a) Lack of institutional capacity within the Department of Social Development to lead and champion the government's VEP.

The capacity of the Department of Social Development was considered one of the main priorities to be strengthened both at the national and provincial level, in order to lead, expand and sustain the VEP in South Africa. In particular by setting up at the provincial level dedicated staff is able to promote and monitor the implementation of victim empowerment policies. An improved system was requested to be developed and implemented for resource mobilization, funding management and financial management of the government's VEP. As well as an effective monitoring and evaluation frameworks with baselines to track progress in the implementation of the government's VEP was considered necessary.

b) Fragmentation of services to victims of crime - lack of coordination and cooperation between government departments and civil society organisations.

Victim Empowerment is a cross-cutting theme through many government departments, nationally and provincially, hence should be mainstreamed with many others policies throughout the government's work if progress has to be made. When the Programme was designed a need to put effective mechanisms and practices in place to strengthen coordination and cooperation amongst all relevant victim empowerment role players in particular at the provincial and the community level was identified. For this purpose, Victim Empowerment Forums comprising of at least five different government departments and representatives from civil society, was planned to be established/ strengthened in the nine provinces of South Africa.

c) Lack of awareness on South Africa's Victim Empowerment Policies.

By having recognized the large need of making South Africa people fully aware on the rights of victims of crime on the assistance and services available to victims and how to access these services, design and plan a sustained advocacy program at highest political level was considered a crucial part of the Victim Empowerment policies to be addressed.

d) Lack of capacity among NGOs and CBOs to deliver Victim Empowerment Interventions.

Non-governmental organisations and community based organisations working with victims of crime, trauma and violence perform a major role in delivering services to victims, compensating for governments service delivery deficit. Lack of funding, competition for scarce resources, limited capacity in Programme cycle management and financial management as well as burnout and migration of staff threaten the future of many civil society organisations.

e) Insufficient services and support for victims of crime, in particular for women, orphans and vulnerable children.

The continued high incidence of rape and violence against women and children, at the time when the Programme was designed, confirmed that effective services to support victims of gender based violence must remain a priority. Government departments took several measures to improve services for victims of crime. For example, the Division of

Crime Prevention of South Africa's Police Services (SAPS) established in 2007, 223 victim-friendly facilities at police stations.

The National Prosecuting Authority planned to have established by 2010 a total of 80 Thutuzela Centres to deal with the challenge of violence against women and children by improving the process of reporting and prosecution of rape and other sexual offences cases in a dignified and caring environment. The Department of Social Development established in collaboration with the United National Office on Drugs and Crime several victim-assistance centres in four provinces in South Africa. These provide concrete, sustainable and effective services for women and children who have experienced gender-based violence. The services placed, however, were considered still insufficient given the high levels of domestic violence and rape in South Africa.

2. PROGRAMME OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS

In accordance with the challenges above described the overall development objective of this Programme was defined as follows: *“The Victim Empowerment Programme has contributed to building safe and peaceful communities, strengthening a human rights culture and provides more effective, multi-sectoral, coordinated responses to victims of crime and trauma, particularly children”*.

A total of five **outcomes** and associated **outputs** have been identified:

Outcome 1: Implementation plan on Victim Empowerment Policies including the Victims Charter, Anti-Rape Strategy, Minimum Standards and Integrated Victim Empowerment Policy are disseminated to service providers and the public.

Outcome 2: Improved coordination between relevant victim empowerment government departments both vertically and horizontally and with CSO's.

Outcome 3: The capacity of government staff to implement policies and comply with minimum standards in all relevant Government departments is strengthened.

Outcome 4: The capacity of the National and Provincial Departments of Social Development and Victim Empowerment Coordinators of other government agencies to manage, coordinate and lead the government's VEP is strengthened.

Outcome 5: Improving the capacity of CSO's in delivering services to victims of crime.

2.1 Disbursements History

Overall Programme Budget (Jan 2008 –March 2012)	Total Approved Budget (Jan 2008 –Dec 2011)	Expenditure (up to Dec 2011)	Expenditure in % (up to Dec 2011)
\$ 27,433.628	\$21,880,770	\$ 19,692.210	96%

3. PURPOSE OF THIS ASSIGNMENT - FINAL PROGRAMME EVALUATION

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the Victim Empowerment Programme in South Africa `s Programme's relevance, in respect of: Programme implementation (efficiency), attainment of outputs, outcomes and impacts (effectiveness) its sustainability and Programme coordination and management. The final evaluation will cover a period of the entire Programme duration from December 2007 to March 2012.

The evaluation seeks to identify lessons learned during the entire period of Programme implementation in both substantive and technical aspect on Victim Empowerment program. It intends to analyse to what extent best practices have been developed and be used also within the context of Southern Africa UNODC regional strategy to support and to empower the victims of crime, in particular women and children. Not only that, the final evaluation will serve as appraisal platform to the Government of South Africa, in particular to the

Department of Social Development, as base line from where to develop and consolidate further policy and strategy on Victim Empowerment Programs at national and provincial levels. The findings and recommendations as outcomes of this evaluation will be useful also to the European Union in its donor capacity, in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the financial support provided through the Programme to the South Africa Government.

4. SCOPE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The final evaluation will address among others, the following:

- The Programme concept and design (including the ways in which problems and priorities are determined), strategy, implementation results, and outputs;
- Measure performance outcomes, impact and sustainability of the benefits of the Programmes;
- Efficiency of Programme planning and implementation (this will include Programme structures, managerial arrangements, co-ordination mechanisms, logical framework, work plan, etc.);
- Whether the results have been achieved, if not why. Determine if progress has been made towards their achievement;
- The Programme's contribution to human and institutional capacity development and whether this capacity is creating conditions for sustainability;
- Determine the sustainability of results and benefits beyond UNODC funding/support.
- The evaluation will cover the entire period of Programme implementation from January 2008 to March 2012;
- The evaluation will geographically cover South Africa in particular it will assess the development and capacity building progress made by the Department of Social Development at national and provincial level on Victim empowerment policy, strategy and programs. In this respect at least four provinces will be identified and field missions will be planned to take place during the evaluation period.

6. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

In this context, the purpose of the final evaluation is to analyse the relevance of the Programme, its effectiveness, efficiency its design in terms of

- a) The Programme concept
 - b) Programme implementation modality ;
 - c) Outputs, outcomes and impact of the Programme;
 - d) Programme coordination and management;
 - e) Sustainability
-
- a) The evaluation will help to analyse the relevance of the Programme concept with the focus on Programme elements directly related to Victim Empowerment (VE). The evaluation should encompass an assessment of the appropriateness and how the Programme purpose and planned outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs were achieved. An evaluation of the executing modality and managerial arrangements will also be included. The evaluation will also aim at assessing the appropriateness, quality and cost effectiveness of results, planned duration of and budget for the Programme. Finally, an analysis of the clarity, logic and relevance of the Programme to the needs of VE sector, development priorities and strategies of the Government of SA.
 - b) The evaluation will aim at assessing **the Programme implementation modality** in terms of Programme purpose, quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management, as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all stakeholders to the Programme, will be evaluated.
 - c) The evaluation will assess the relevance of **the outputs** vis a vis with **outcomes** achieved and their **impact** in terms of contribution to long –term social , economic, technical environmental changes for individuals communities and institutions. The evaluation will also assess if the Programme has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.
 - d) Programme coordination and management will be assessed in order to ascertain to what extent:
 - The Programme coordination and management mechanisms have been efficient and effective. Did each partner have specific roles and responsibilities from the beginning and understand their roles? Did each partner fulfill its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, identifying risks, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)?

- The PMU management, coordination, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient and effective.
 - Whether the monitoring and self-evaluation were carried out effectively, based on indicators for outputs, outcomes and impacts. The consistency btw activities implemented and work plans formulated on annual basis. Was any steering or advisory mechanism put in place? Did reporting and performance review take place regularly?
- d) In terms of **sustainability**, the evaluation will assess to what extent the benefits from the Programme is likely to continue after the Programme completion in terms of financial, institutional, technical and local ownership.

In general, the evaluation will seek to draw lessons and best practices that can be used to improve Victim Empowerment sector as a “*model*” to be implemented elsewhere within the African context and able to meet the needs of target beneficiary.

6. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluators will have access to all relevant documents and staff who have worked on the Programme and will develop a full methodology for the final evaluation and the sampling strategy as part of this assignment with guidance provided by the PMU.

The **evaluation methods** will include the following:

- Document review and analysis;
- Interviews with key beneficiaries and players, including government officials (Through person-to-person interviews or by telephone) as well as Representatives of European Delegation
- Field visits to at least in four provinces of South Africa to be determined
- Participatory observation and rapid appraisal and
- Stakeholder feedback to the draft of the final evaluation report.

The following **documentation** related to the Programme will be provided as reference:

1. Programme document;
2. Summary records of review meetings;
3. Semiannual and annual Programme reports;
4. Consultancy reports and any additional documentation published during Programme Implementation
7. Mission reports;

7. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

- a) **Timeframe**: Presently, the mid-term evaluation of the XAMT 15 Programme will be carried out in 25 days from 15th February to 15th of March, 2012.

b) **Indicative Programme**

The evaluation will take place in South Africa – Pretoria and four site visits to provinces will be part of the plan.

	Timing	Location
Desk review of Programme documentation	3 days	Home base
Report at the UNODC Offices in Pretoria.	1 day	Countries/ Cities
Meeting at UNODC/PMU and finalization of desk review	2 days	Pretoria

Inception report containing a refined work plan methodology and evaluation tools / Matrix / Questions.	2 days	Pretoria
Meetings with EU, VE Management team, key national departments	2 days	Pretoria
Travel to Four Provinces (targets to be determined)	4 days	South Africa provinces
Feedback session with PMU	1 day	Pretoria
Draft evaluation report(in line with UNODC evaluation policy and standards) to UNODC –ROSAF	4 days	Pretoria
Presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations to Core Learning Partnership (CPL) and other key stakeholders	1 day	Pretoria
Final evaluation report including annex with management responses	5 days	Home base
	TOTAL 25 days	

c) **Expected deliverables and products of the evaluation**

- At the beginning of the field mission, the evaluation team, upon completion of the desk review will present the inception report containing and refined work plan methodology and evaluation tools plus a **comprehensive evaluation matrix** with a detailed list of questions/sub questions relating to the evaluation criteria (hyper link); indicators/measures; data to be collected; data sources; methods of data collection and methods of data analysis.
- In order to share preliminary findings and avoid factual mistakes, a **feedback session** with PMU will be organized in Pretoria upon the visits made in the provinces. The first draft of the report will also be completed in country, together with UNODC Programme Evaluation Questionnaire.
- The first draft will contain summary of key findings, lessons learned, and recommendations and it will be presented in Pretoria to UNODC – DSD – and CLP and to any other key stakeholders.
- The evaluation team bears responsibility for finalization of the report, which will be submitted to UNODC within **two weeks** after receiving the comments on the **first draft** by UNODC (PMU), DSD National, and European Delegation and by the Core Learning Partnership (CPL)¹.

UNODC will receive the **final report** on the XAMT 15 Programme covering the Programme concept, design and relevance, Programme implementation, outputs, outcome and impact of the Programme, sustainability, coordination and management, lessons learned recommendations and implementation plan. The length of the report should be around 30-35 pages (excluding Annexes) with a 3-page executive summary. The report should be written in English.

8. COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM: QUALIFICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS²

The Evaluation team will include:

1) **A lead evaluation consultant:** With wide experience of evaluating Programmes and/or programs on capacitating public institutions and supporting good governance development namely focused on social welfare and protection of vulnerable groups, with at least 7 years of experiences in Programme/ program evaluations.

The team leader will be responsible to guide and manage the evaluation team including the division of labor and for the collection of all substantive responses and data to be submitted into the final evaluation report. He/ She is fully accountable for the evaluation deliverables according to the substantive aspects and time line requirements.

¹ The **Core Learning Partners** are the key stakeholders of the subject evaluated (Programme, Programme, policy etc.) who have an interest in the evaluation. It encourages a participatory evaluation approach by allowing its members to participate in and provide feedback on key steps of the evaluation process. For this evaluation the CPL members are: UNODC (PMU) at national and provincial levels; DSD with two representatives: VE program manager and VE Director; 1 representative from each of the National Government Cluster Departments (JSPC: Justice – Health- Correction – National Prosecutor Authority – Police –Education); 1 representative from the European delegation office in South Africa; 3 representatives of CSOs who have been grant beneficiaries.

² The evaluation team will be selected in order to meet gender balance requirement .To any possible extend the selection process will take into account multicultural and geographical representation.

2) **A consultant:** With experience of evaluating program management cycle including activities vis a vis the budget assigned. At least 5 years of similar experiences conducted in program management and evaluation.

3) **A consultant:** With specialized knowledge in capacity building development (including training and grant management) and with at least 5 years proven experience in that field.

Each consultant has to meet overall the following requirements:

- Knowledge and familiarity with various aspects of social welfare protection of vulnerable groups with specific experience in Victim Empowerment programs including policies and strategies;
- International exposure to similar activities carried out at least during the last 7 years;
- Experience and knowledge of the UN system and its own evaluation rules and requirements;
- Previous similar experiences gained in Africa in general and in Southern Africa in particular during the last 5 years;
- Ability to conduct field work;
- Good command of English written and spoken.

Each consultant is fully responsible for his/her independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the South African government, the Donor or UNODC.

9. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS.

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) based at the UNODC Head Quarters in Vienna will guide the process of this evaluation as per the UNODC's evaluation policy and the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards. The IEU will be consulted from the beginning of the evaluation process and will clarify the Evaluation Terms of Reference and validate the selection of the evaluation team. It will also provide comments on the draft report and the final report as well to ensure that a proper evaluation process was followed.

The Programme management Unit (PMU) based in Pretoria at UNODC Regional office for Southern Africa will be responsible for the provision related of desk review materials to the evaluation team, the UNODC's standard format and guidelines for the preparation of Programme evaluation reports, the UNODC evaluation policy documents, the UNEG's evaluation Norms and Standards and the Terms of Reference for the evaluation. The PMU will review the evaluation methodology liaising with the Core Learning Partnership (CLP), the draft and the final report. It will also brief the evaluation team on the status of Programme implementation and finalization of activities. The PMU will prepare in advance the suggested list of all key representatives of institutions that should be part of the evaluation process. The PMU will be in charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team including arranging their missions to the provinces. The PMU will disseminate the final report to all key stakeholders as well as to the Core Learning Team. If requested the UNODC Regional office in Pretoria will offer an office space to the evaluators' team.

The members of the Core Learning Partners (CPL) will represent the key stakeholders groups which includes representatives of the Department of Social Development main are the key stakeholders of the subject evaluated (Programme, Programme, policy etc.) who have an interest in the evaluation. It encourages a participatory evaluation approach by allowing its members to participate in and provide feedback on key steps of the evaluation process.

For this evaluation the CPL members are: UNODC (PMU) at national and provincial levels; DSD with two representatives: VE program manager and VE Director; 1 representative from each of the National Government Cluster Departments (JSPC: Justice – Health- Correction – National Prosecutor Authority – Police –Education); 1 representative from the European delegation office in South Africa; 3 representatives of CSOs who have been grant beneficiaries. The CPL will be requested to facilitate the evaluation process by providing all relevant information to the consultants. At the same time the CPL will be requested also to comment the key steps of the evaluation.

Based on the expected deliverables described above, the **consultants** will work under the guidance of the **lead evaluator** who will carry out a desk review, draft the inception report and finalize the evaluation methodology; lead and coordinate the evaluation process and oversee the tasks of the evaluators, ensure that all aspect of the terms of reference of the evaluation are fulfilled, ensure that all aspect of the evaluation report are in line with UNODC evaluation policy finalize

the evaluation report on the basis of all comments received. **The evaluators** will assist the lead evaluator in all stages of the evaluation process as described above and they will participate to the selected visits to provinces.

The consultants will also be guided by the UNODC - Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) based in Vienna in order to ensure compliance with UN norms and standards of evaluation.

Although the consultants should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerning anything relevant to their assignment, they are not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the Donor, or UNODC.

ANNEX B. List of persons contacted during the interview

Name	Organisation	Position	Date
UNODC			
Ms. Mundiaye Niang	UNODC	Regional Representative	06/03/2012
Ms. Elisabeth Bayer	UNODC	Deputy Representative	05/03/2012
Ms. Carla Ciavarella	UNODC	Program Coordinator	05/03/2012

Mr. Cornelius Moyo	UNODC	Operations Manager / Procurement	05/03/2012
Mr. Aaron Mokabane	UNODC	Capacity Building Expert	06/03/2012
Ms. Rebecca Modipane	UNDOC	Grant Monitoring Expert	06/03/2012
Mr. Gaspard Ostrowski (via telephone)	UNODC	Associate Expert –IEU -UNODC, Vienna	
Ms. Lebogang Molai	UNODC	Monitoring Evaluation Expert	06/03/2012
Provincial Coordinators			
Mr. Buti Kulwane	UNODC	Provincial Coordinator - Gauteng	06/03/2011
Ms. Vuyelwa Nyati	UNODC	Provincial Coordinator - Eastern Cape	13/03/2012
Ms. Sharon Koute	UNODC	Provincial Coordinator - Western Cape	16/03/2013
Ms. Innocentia Mosemeng	UNODC	Provincial Coordinator - Northern Cape	15/03/2012
Ms. Modi Marishane	UNODC	Provincial Coordinator - Limpopo	12/03/2012
Mr. Vusi Khoza	UNODC	Provincial Coordinator - Kwazulu Natal	15/03/2012
Ms. Zodwa Mahlangu	UNODC	Provincial Coordinator - Mpumalanga	16/03/2012
Mr. Thenbi Moidimek	UNODC	Provincial Coordinator – North West	15/03/2012
Department of Social Development, Government of South Africa			
Ms. Conny Nxolamo	DSD	Chief Director of Social Crime Prevention	14/03/2012
Ms. Tsholo Moloji	DCD	National VEP Director	07/03/2012
Ms. Ellen Mollo	DHSD	Social Worker	07/03/2012
Ms. Myrtle Morris	DHSD – Gauteng	VEP Manager	07/03/2012
Ms. Lulama Mpongask	DCD – Eastern Cape	Act. Sen. Man. – Families and VEP	13/03/2012
Ms. Nozodawa Kobes	DCD – Eastern Cape	Social Worker – VEP Ass. Man.	13/03/2012
Mr. Johannes Mphasha		VEP Coordinator - Limpopo	12/03/2012
Community Based Organisations, Volunteers and community			
Ms. N.C. Qegu	Khansiya Community Educare Development Centre, Eastern Cape	Grant Project Coordinator and Trainer	13/03/2012
Mr. Bonisa Foji		Acting Manager – Finance Officer	13/03/2012
Mr. M. Fumbatha		Grant Project Final Beneficiary	13/03/2012
Mr. U. Tutuka		Grant Project Final Beneficiary	13/03/2012
Mr. G. Davies		Grant Project Final Beneficiary	13/03/2012
Mr. T. Hill		Grant Project Final Beneficiary	13/03/2012
Ms. Lorraihe Kuotlhanci	Road Show Volunteers - Gauteng	Counselor - Lifetime	07/03/2012
Mr. Tuapelo Mocoao		Ley Counselor	07/03/2012
Mr. Tshidi Makhoere		Counselor – People Against Human Abuse	07/03/2012
Ms. Lbogang Chabalala		Auxiliary Social Worker – The Potters House	07/03/2012
Ms. Linda Kabar	Polokwane Child and Family Care Society Limpopo	Senior Social Worker	12/03/2012
Modjadji Nphela	MOLATSI Community Radio Station– Limpopo	NGO Board Member	12/30/2012
Mr. Andrew Koena Mpecti		Program Manager	12/03/2012
Mr. Ronny Mosima Lesudi		Projects Manager	12/03/2012
Ms. Puuti Nyaka		Marketing Manager	12/03/2012
Mr. Koena Kamatswi		Corporate Manager	12/03/2012
Mr. Vester Sibuye	One Stop Centre - Limpopo	Social Worker	12/03/2012
Mr. M. Maladudzi		Senior Care Worker	12/03/2012
Mr. Tirsha Lelegan		Care Worker	12/03/2012
Mr. Linah Ralepelle		Care Worker	12/03/2012
Ms. Portia Mamome		Administration Officer	12/03/2012

Mr. Konyane Mphahlede		Care Worker	12/03/2012
Ms. Gairo Monus	CDN BADISA	NGO representative, Western Cape	16/03/2012
Ms. Matipa Mwamuka	Activists Networking Against the Exploitation of Children	NGO representative , project coordinator, Western Cape	16/03/2012
Ms. Mhongwe Mtshotshisa	EMPILWENI	Director,	16/03/2012
Mr. Dawn Theys	TAMAR Shelter	Director	
Mr. Basil Theys	IKHAYA LETHU house for HIV Abandoned Orphans	Director	16/03/2012
Ms Mohlatlego Lebogo	Mentee	Director	14/03/2012
Mr. Cristopher Hanisi	Northern Cape	Researcher CGE	16/03/2102
Ms. Kathleen Dey	Western Cape	NGO, Researcher “Roads to Justice”	16/03/2012
Mr. Radesh Byroo	KZN	DSD Provincial Office	15/03/2012
Mr. Sibangile Mofaka	KZN	Khanyiselani Development Trust	15/03/2012
Ms. Sisegail Mborrywa	KZN	Ethembeni CCC	15/03/2012
Ms. Tasneem Khan	KZN	Gay and Lesbian Network	15/03/2012
Mr. Pule Mocuhenyang	NW	SAPS	15/03/2012
Mr. Maruma Mosenog	NW	CGE	15/03/2012
Ms. Potrohella Tmeriso	NW	DSDWCPS – Social Development	15/03/2012
Ms. Lebogang Setoe	NW	DSDWCPD	15/03/2012
Ms. Demeo Komane	NW	DSDWCPD	15/03/2012
Ms. Lebogang Bonopane	MOTHUTLONG VEP	Director	15/03/2012

ANNEX C. Review of progress made towards attainment of output

Efficiency on outputs

Outcome 1: Implementation plan on Victim Empowerment Policies including the Victims Charter, Anti-Rape Strategy, Minimum Standards and Integrated Victim Empowerment Policy are disseminated to service providers and the public

National Policy Guidelines on services to victims of crime were developed and disseminated through a series of workshops in all provinces. The National Directory of Victim Empowerment Resources was updated and disseminated, adding to over 50,000 copies of the Service Charter for Victims of Crime and the Minimum Standards for Service Delivery to Victims of Crime distributed in the course of the year.

The Programme produced and disseminated, 20,000 copies of the National Policy Guidelines on Victim Empowerment; 50,000 copies of the Service Charter for Victims of Crime in South Africa and the Minimum Standards for Service Delivery in Victim Empowerment; 10,000 Guidelines on services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and serious crimes and shelter strategy; 5,000 copies of national resource directory for VE services; 10,000 copies of National VEP policy guidelines; 10,000 copies of Men and Boys strategy; 10,000 copies of news letters to disseminate information and 540,000 copies of comic cartoons on; domestic violence; human trafficking, sexual assaults, child sexual abuse, abuse of older persons and abuse of people with disability²⁶. All copies were produced in the main languages spoken in South Africa to cater for a wider audience. The produced copies were distributed through national and provincial DSD offices, CSOs and during outreach campaigns. This output directly and effectively contributed to the Programme's awareness raising initiative. At the time of the evaluation, printing of 10,000 copies of International VEP conference report and 15,000 copies of the Human trafficking Rehabilitation was still outstanding.

Two key conferences were held in 2008 to exchange information about VE and develop strategies for making VE projects more effective. In 2008, the Programme supported the DSD in organising and convening a national conference to mark the 10th Anniversary of the VEP in SA that was held in Durban. A follow up International VEP conference was held in Limpopo in September 2010. The Men-In-Action Programme was launched in March 2009 in Northern Cape Province. The campaign is an initiative of the Network Organisation and was aimed at sensitizing men with regard to issues relating to gender-based violence. At the time of the evaluation, almost all provinces were rolling out the Everyday Heroes Campaign, a national VEP awareness raising brand. Mass awareness campaigns in all provinces were linked to days marking specific events such as International Drugs Day, Human Rights Day on 21st March and Women's Month among others. Linkages to these events meant that awareness raising materials were produced and made available in time for the earmarked events. In this respect there were no noticeable delays apart from the lag that the Programme suffered due to delayed start and suspensions.

Outcome 2: Improved coordination between relevant victim empowerment government departments both vertically and horizontally and with CSO's

Nine provincial VEP offices were established and operational with the exception of Free State. The Coordinator from Gauteng province provided support whilst a Grant Associate within UNODC assisted CSOs with Grant management issues. However, CSOs from the province felt they would have benefited more had there been a resident Coordinator. Nine provinces held quarterly provincial VE forum meetings bringing together key stakeholders from government and civil society. By December 2010, about 39 Provincial forums had been held²⁷. District level forums were established or revived in North West, Mpumalanga, Kwa-Zulu Natal (KZN) and Northern Cape. Local forums were also established in these provinces and brought together service providers at community level. In KZN, Provincial Coordinator supported the Human Trafficking, Pornography, Prostitution and Brothels Forum; the first of its kind in South Africa. In Mpumalanga and KZN, Project Coordinators participated in Provincial Gender Machinery, Child Protection and Human Rights Forum meetings increasing visibility of UNODC activities and creating project links to Women's Day and other relevant events. Victim empowerment forum meetings at both national and provincial levels were supported financially and technically by the Programme.

These outputs indeed contributed to improved coordination between VE service providers in the country. There is however still room for improvement in terms of active involvement of other key stakeholders, particularly the Department of Education.

Outcome 3: The capacity of staff to implement VE policies and comply with minimum standards in all Government VE departments is strengthened.

²⁶ *DSD VEP achievements presentation, March 2012*

²⁷ *UNODC Annual Progress Report for XAMT15, 2010*

The outputs under this outcome are produced through training activities designed to meet the assessed learning needs of the staff identified to implement VE policies.²⁸

The development of the training curriculum and implementation of the training activities in nine provinces to produce this outcome was undertaken by National Institute Community Development and Management (NICDAM), South African Qualification Authority (SAQA) accredited training provider in the field of Victim Empowerment. The implementation faced delays during the tendering process which coincided with the period of suspension. The activities were finalized with a delay of around five months^{29, 30},

Following the start-up activities, the curriculum on integrated trauma was developed and discussed with DSD. A generic content on Trauma Leadership Training in Victim Empowerment was tailored to the needs and institutional responsibilities of: a) staff of national VE departments; b) staff of provincial cluster departments (VE Forums); c) social workers; d) CSOs. Around 1800 participants in 9 provinces received training on Integrated Trauma Counseling and Coaching Program for Victim Empowerment. Also under this outcome The Mentorship Training for Government Officials and CSOs were conducted for 300 participants by NICDAM. The information provided to the evaluation team by UNODC³¹, NICDAM³² and DSD³³ displays discrepancies in terms of numbers and titles (thus content) and number of the training programmes developed by NICDAM. The information and data available on this aspect was not sufficient to provide an accurate account of the trainees by training programs, geographical distribution or institutional affiliations. Nevertheless, the information available implies that participation by cluster departments and national government departmental officials was around 50%.³⁴

The results of the training activities were monitored through site visits and a mid-term impact assessment. Learner summative assessment conducted revealed a high level of learning achievement. The participants' level of satisfaction was found to be high in terms of applicability and relevance of the training content.³⁵ On the other hand, the disadvantages of a 5-day training program, quality of the training and training materials were raised in the working groups of VEP Final Evaluation Workshop. It was not feasible to conduct a cost-benefit and unit-cost analysis for the purposes of this evaluation, but the evaluation team strongly believes that financial efficiency of the intervention needs to be considered before rolling out the activity.

Another training program prepared and implemented by NICDAM is the Mentorship Training delivered to 300 representatives of CSOs and government officials. The implementation of the mentoring activities piloted in predominantly rural provinces of Mpumalanga, North West and Northern Cape and Limpopo and was monitored at the field level.

The trained team of trainers prepared and implemented specific trainings including but not limited to trainings on legal and political framework and strategies, GBV and relevant issues, legal procedures, counseling for special/disadvantaged/underserved groups, management skills and proposal writing. The interviews with the stakeholders during the field visits have provided the evaluation team with a strong insight about the context and scope of the learning activities for all stakeholders, details of which are reported to be covered by the quarterly reports of the Provincial Coordinators. Non-availability of consolidated data did not allow a systematic assessment of the outreach of such "mobilization".

Also under this outcome, a feasibility study on legislative act for Victim Empowerment was conducted by a consortium.

²⁸ UNODC, *VECapacityNeedsAssessment*

²⁹ *UpdatedMilestonesNICDAM Contract, April 2010.*

³⁰ *NICDAM, Final Programme Report, 11 May 2011.*

³¹ *UpdatedMilestonesNICDAM Contract, April 2010.*

³² *NICDAM, Final Programme Report, 11 May 2011.*

³³ *DSD, EU Program Assistance to Strengthen South African VEP, 14-16 March 2002, Power Point Presentation.*

³⁴ *NICDAM, Final Programme Report, 11 May 2011.*

³⁵ *NICDAM, Final Programme Report, 11 May 2011.*

Outcome 4: The capacity of the National and Provincial Departments of Social Development and Victim Empowerment Coordinators of other government agencies to manage, coordinate and lead the government's VEP is strengthened.

The outputs to produce this outcome aim at building the capacity of national and provincial departments of DSD through different interventions, some of which could not be fully implemented. The strategies used to produce this outcome include training, improving service delivery and strengthening the VE monitoring and evaluation system.

The training activities were based on the capacity assessment planned as well as the 10-day training of trainers (ToT) for 85 National and Provincial DSD staff. To initiate and /or roll out trainings were carried out by UNODC VEP team. The evaluation team was provided with the documentation compiled at the preparatory phase of the content development, and therefore is not in a position to comment on the content of the training. Nevertheless, interviews with the field staff implies that the ToT has capacitated the provincial teams to plan, organize and implement specific training activities to meet the local needs, and they effectively rolled out numerous training activities/workshops mentioned under Outcome 3.

Activities aiming at improving service delivery consisted of: a) promoting the application of Minimum Standards; d) strengthening the DSD funding strategy; e) developing a complaint system; and f) establishing four OSCs.

Promotion and Facilitation of Minimum Standards as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) was undertaken by the DSD. The already prepared Minimum Standards were printed, and promoted by DSD using the project resources. Any detail was not available to the evaluation team regarding this output. Activities to strengthen the DSD funding strategy were carried out with a view to develop a funding strategy and procedures to render social services that are more affordable and responsive to the needs of communities. Following a situation analysis, desk review and a series of stakeholder consultations in the provinces, the tools including business plan, quarterly progress report template, contract template, and evaluation grid were drafted but not finalized. Upon the request by DSD the work focused on drafting costing models in consultation with provincial staff. The activities, reported to be finalized by March 31, were ongoing during the final evaluation.

Mechanisms for recording and monitoring of complaints by victims of crime were redefined to conduct a Victim Satisfaction Survey. However, due to problems faced regarding the eligibility of the bidders and the time constraints on the part of the Government, the process could not be carried out within the framework of UNODC VEP. DSD tapped on to other resources to conduct the survey. The draft report is prepared but not approved.

The Programme had foreseen the establishment of four one-stop-centres (OSCs) using the lessons learned from previous cooperation between UNODC and DSD. Despite such experience, the activities under this output encountered serious challenges. The necessary arrangements to provide appropriate buildings could not be completed. The targeted number of OSCs was first reduced to two with the addendum. However, the risks highlighted by the implementing agency³⁶ to the effect that it would be difficult to produce the output realised and only one centre in Limpopo could be established within the life-time of the project on early October 2011. The buildings allocated for the Limpopo OSC within a larger social service complex are renovated, equipped and furnished using the project funds. A vehicle was also procured to ensure efficient operation of the OSC. Volunteers who have received training within the framework of UNODC VEP were recruited as care givers. A research was commissioned and conducted to review existing OSCs and make recommendations regarding best practise models (Khuseleka). However, the evaluation team believes in the need to conduct unit-cost and cost effectiveness before going to scale. The evaluation team also encourages probing the possibility of introducing flexibilities to the Khuseleka model, to allow integrating the unique characteristics of the model into existing service structures. This can allow the scaling up the best practice while cutting down on capital investments.

The intervention through strengthening the VE M&E system elaborates on the monitoring responsibilities of the Government is outlined in the National Policy Guidelines for Victim Empowerment.³⁷ The Generic Indicators System

³⁶ Note on critical assumptions and risks for VEP extension, UNODC, 09 September, 2010.

³⁷ National Policy Guidelines for Victim Empowerment, p25

(GIS), developed with the joint efforts of relevant departments, consists of seven sets of indicators designed to collect integrated data from different levels with VE responsibilities. These range from national to grass roots level which requires the active involvement of the relevant service units of the relevant departments, namely police, hospitals, social workers, volunteers in CSOs. The piloting of the GIS was initiated with the training of around 240 relevant staff in the six pilot provinces (around 40 per province). The training was designed and conducted through service procurement. The process was still at its pilot stage and will have to be carried out beyond the life time of the Programme. Some challenges were faced in practice. Some provinces were hesitant to even try, the wording of some of indicators needed revision. Some criticism was received regarding the length of the questions directed to traumatized persons. Currently, the piloting at the level of service units is efficiently implemented as verified by the interviews with field staff. Piloting at the national and VE forums has not started. A service provider is contracted to analyse the data and to establish a web-based MIS system, which is expected to accelerate the efforts towards achieving the outcome.

Outcome 5: Improving the capacity of CSO's in delivering services to victims of crime.

The eligibility criteria for CSOs as well as the procedures/formats/guidelines for grant applications and approval mechanisms are identified in line with the UN rules and regulations. Involving provincial coordinators and local stakeholders in the process and using their recommendations during the assessment, has ensured due consideration of the eligibility and the capacity of the CSOs while providing room for an equitable distribution of awards across the projects.

Two calls for proposals were made: 1) First call targeted CSOs providing direct services to victims of crimes; 2) Second call targeted emerging CSOs considering their disadvantaged status to meet the criteria used during the first call. 1st call

Considerable efforts were put into the capacity development of CSOs before the awarding of grants: a) Over 600 CSO representatives and 122 from provincial DSD staff in 9 provinces were provided training through workshops on proposal writing to assist them in developing project ideas and project proposals; b)

The first call resulted in the awarding of 68 grants totaling an amount of US\$ 3,362,909 (ZAR 25,221,820) with budgets ranging from ZAR 50,000 – 700,000 for each grant.³⁸ A Finance Management Training for Non-Financial Managers was organized to facilitate the implementation. Of the 68 awards, 3 were cancelled and 4 were not paid the final tranche. Despite all efforts, only 25% of the projects awarded under the first call were able to finish on time and the remaining projects needed extensions until February 2011, though most only managed to complete activities in March. Many projects with duration of 12 months were actually finalized within 18-20 months.³⁹ Of the 68 CSOs covered by the first call, 3 were cancelled and 4 were not paid the final tranche.⁴⁰ All grants exceeding 50,000 USD under the first call were audited.

The second call for proposals received 160 applications out of which 47 were awarded with a total amount of ZAR 4,600,715, with around ZAR 100,000⁴¹ for each CSO. Of the 47 COS's covered by the second call, 3 have been cancelled. Implementation of grant projects under the second call is completed and the reports are under review to issue the final tranche of payments.

Capacity development support to CSOs continued during the implementation. Due to lack of experience and institutional capacity of CSOs to meet the technical and financial requirements for implementing a grant project, hands-on-assistance of provincial coordinators and UNODC staff was provided to the grant beneficiaries. Also, mentoring support was provided to emerging CSOs, either by established CSOs or by provincial VE staff.

³⁸ *1st Call Tranche Reporting Schedule*

³⁹ *Grant Scheme Challenges and Ways Forward, August 2010.*

⁴⁰ *Victim Empowerment Project PCM. 1 June 2011.*

⁴¹ *2nd Call Tranche Reporting Schedule*

Nevertheless challenges were experienced in terms of the reporting obligations described by some grant beneficiaries as “overwhelming”. Delays in the payments of tranches or mismatches between the activities and timing of tranches have caused some distress on the part of the grant beneficiaries. The time-frame of the second call was short. On the other hand the provincial coordinators and UNODC had to put a lot of effort and provide additional human resources input through mentoring to ensure the efficient implementation.

The fact that the planned activities to review and document best practices and lessons learned is a missed opportunity both for DSD and UNODC. The information on the reasons of not carrying out this activity was available to the evaluation team. However, the evaluation team has found out that the grant beneficiaries presented their projects and shared their experience in their respective VE forums, which may provide a medium to disseminate successful interventions.

ANNEX D: Key Questions for data collection for Evaluation

Relevance and appropriateness

1. How relevant was the VEP concept and design to Government's needs and priorities, and National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS)?
2. Was the Programme responsive to emerging needs and changes in the government's policy?
3. Was VEP duration sufficient enough to achieve its objective?
4. Was VEP appropriately designed to fit in the local situation in terms of DSD and CSOs capacity and acceptability?

Efficiency

1. Were the VEP financial and human resources converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
2. Has the budget been allocated and spent as planned?
3. How effective was VEP management modality in achieving VEP outputs and outcomes? How management issues were addressed?
4. Did the Programme deliver in time, if not, why not?
5. What measures were taken during implementation to ensure that resources are used efficiently? Are there any potential corrective mechanisms entailed in the design of the program?
6. How effectively the coordination mechanism was adopted by the PSC, PCM and PMU in supporting the Programme?
7. To what extent were UNODC and DSDs' organisational structure, the managerial support provided to the Programme?

Effectiveness

1. Has the Programme achieved its objectives and results (outputs and outcomes)? If not, has some progress been made towards their achievement?
2. What is the level of achievement in terms of policy implementation?
3. What were the reasons for achievement and non-achievement of results?
4. Were the implementation and management arrangements adequate for implementation of VEP activities?
5. What kind of M&E system was established for tracking the progress on Programme activities and identifying issues? Was there any monitoring during the course of the Programme implementation?
6. Why mid-term evaluation was not conducted and what were the reasons?
7. Did VEP team conduct any in-house assessment/brainstorming?
8. What and where is the room for improvement?
9. Were recommendations, lessons learnt and best practices from similar Programmers and feedback from interim evaluations considered during the design and implementation of this Programme.

Impact

1. To which extent has the Programme contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term positive or negative social and technical changes for DSD, CSOs and communities that participated in the Programme? What are those changes?
2. What are the achievement in terms of positive changes in the knowledge, attitude, practices and skills of the DSD staff at national as well as provincial level?
3. To which extent has VEP led to improvements in service delivery and in what ways?
4. What and to what extent are the outputs that may be sustained and mainstreamed or used for future programming?
5. What are the foreseen restraints on sustaining the achievements at the national, provincial and local levels?
6. What are the major lessons learned to guide future planning?

Sustainability

1. To what extend are the VEP results (impact if any, and outcomes) likely to continue after the Programme completion in terms of finance, institutional capacity and human resources?
2. To which extent have the DSD and CSOs taken ownership of the Programme? Are they committed to continue working towards these objectives once the Programme support has ended?
3. Has any exit strategy or sustainability plan been developed for VEP? What are the follow-up plans to sustain and mainstream the achievements?

ANNEX E: Desk review list

1. AFReC, Draft Bussiness Plan for Non Profit Organisations, 2011
2. AFReC, Draft Contract Template DSD Funding
3. AFReC, Draft Quarterly Progress Report for DSD Funding
4. AFReC, Workshop presentations for Development of a Financial Award System
5. AFReC, Workshop presentations for Costin Models

6. Correspondence regarding the Grant Scheme, Guidelines, Contract Template, Presentations regarding the progress August 2010, June 2011.
7. Compiled by Adries Mangokvawan, Draft Provincial Report on the Baseline Study: Support to South Africa's Victim Empowerment Programme (VEP) 2008 as Baseline Limpopo Province, 2009?)
8. CSIR our future through science, DRA Development Research Africa *Report – Nature and Prevalence of Domestic Violence in South Africa*, December 2008
9. DSD, Human Trafficking Manual (short version)
10. EU, VEP Monitoring Report October, 2011.
11. 4 Chacras Consulting, Department of Social Development, Limpopo Provincial report on Victim Empowerment, 24 January, 2011.
12. FACILITATING LEARNING A Training of Trainers Manual: Simple Learning Frameworks (Draft).
13. Government of Republic of South Africa, National Crime Prevention Strategy, 1996.
14. Guidelines for Services to Victims of Sexual Offences, February 2010
15. Guidelines for Services to Victims of Sexual Offences, February 2010.
16. HANDS-ON VEP PROPOSAL WRITING TRAINING MANUAL update October 2009
17. Hands-on VEP proposal writing training manual, update October 2009.
18. International Conference on Victim Empowerment 29th September – 1st October, 2010.
19. Lifeline Pietermaritzburg, Grant Application Documents and Progress Report, KZN, 2011
20. Makuring Multi-Purpose Centre (M.M.P.C), Grant Application Documents and warning notices by UNODC, Limpopo, 2011.
21. Minimum Standards for Service Delivery in Victim Empowerment , 2008
22. National Policy Guidelines for Victim Empowerment,
23. National Policy Guidelines for VE Social Service Providers, May 2009
24. NICDAM (National Institute Community Development and Management, Integrated Trauma, Counselling and Coaching Programme for Victim Empowerment, Training Program for Civil Society Organisations, copyright 2010.
25. NICDAM (National Institute Community Development and Management) copyright 2010.
 - a. Integrated Trauma Leadership Training in Victim Empowerment for National Departments
 - b. Integrated Trauma Leadership Training in Victim Empowerment for Provincial Cluster Departments Integrated
 - c. Trauma Leadership Training in Victim Empowerment for Social Workers
 - d. Integrated Trauma Leadership Training in Victim Empowerment for Civil Society Organisations
 - e. Training Program for Monitoring and Evaluation Sites
 - f. Mentorship Training for Government Officials and Civil Society Organisations
26. NICDAM Project Final Report, 14 May 2011
27. Service Charter for Victims of Crime in South Africa.
28. Tomwalt Consultants, Outcome Mapping of Awareness Raising Activities Study in the North West Province, July 2009.
29. UN, Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, United Nations Evaluation Group, 29 April, 2005.
30. UNEG, 'Code of Conduct', June 2008.
31. UNODC, Victim Empowerment Program Document, February 2008.
32. UNODC, VEP Progress reports: Annual Progress Report, 2010, Bi-annual Report 2011, Quarterly Reports 2011.
33. UNODC, Note on Critical Assumptions and Risks for VEP extension.
34. UNODC, VEP, Draft Provincial Report on the Baseline Study: Support to South Africa's Victim Empowerment Programme (VEP) 2008 as Baseline Limpopo Province, 2009, Adries Mangokvawan.
35. UNODC, Guidelines for Evaluation – Terms of Reference.
36. UNODC, Guidelines for Inception Report.
37. Updated Milestones NICDAM Contract, April 2010.
38. Victim Empowerment Program (VEP) Consultative Stakeholder Summit 19-20 June 2008.
39. Victim Empowerment Program (VEP) Consultative Stakeholder Summit 19-20 June 2008.
40. Service Charter for Victims of Crime in South Africa

41. Tomwalt Consultants, Outcome Mapping of Awareness Raising Activities Study in the North West Province, July 2009

ANNEX F: Management Response

Management response:				
Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
Evaluation recommendation 1: There is a further scope of improvement of logical framework. It should be detailed, reflecting the full results chain and updated for new baseline information that becomes available during Programme implementation.				
Management response:				
Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				

<p>Evaluation recommendation 2: The Programme had a setback due to the lack of communication and understanding on each other's obligations. It is, therefore, imperative that at the outset all stakeholders, particularly UNODC and DSD, may hold extensive discussions and clearly spells out their roles, responsibilities and obligations. This may be made possible through signing the MOUs or joint memos.</p>				
<p>Management response:</p>				
Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 3: The content of the awareness raising instruments, mainly printed materials, were centrally produced with strict control over their launching at the province and district level. The communication strategy for an awareness campaign should make a balanced use of different media and make maximum use of local resources (local media, grass roots organisations, opinion leaders etc.) and electronic media (CDs, DVDs, internet, social media etc.) to disseminate the basic messages while minimizing the costs.</p> <p>DSD should afford the provincial department's opportunity to customize the materials to suit their environs, taking into account the diversity of cultural values and languages to ensure maximum impact on the target audience.</p>				

<p>Management response:</p>				
Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 4: The Programme strengthened coordination between government departments and CSOs. However, lack of commitment and/or ownership by some VE departments continues</p>				

to poses a challenge. Non-involvement of key departments like Departments of Agriculture, Home Affairs and Housing among VE partners limits the programme's effectiveness in offering comprehensive services. DSD should make efforts towards affecting a MoU to ensure full participation and commitment of relevant VE departments, including allocation of funds and other resources as a concrete indicator of collaboration.

Also, DSD should engage other government departments and organisations with a specialty to improve service delivery with concrete results on VE related issues.

Management response:

Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 5: The provision of training opportunities to meet the learning needs of all stakeholders have enhanced their capacity to effectively implement and/or oversee the VE Programme. Enhanced knowledge base also laid the grounds for stakeholder buy-in, at least at the service level. However, the structure of the Integrated Trauma Counseling and Coaching in Victim Empowerment Program as a block training package, has posed challenges in terms of logistics and participation. A 1-2 week training program brought additional distress regarding their routine responsibilities for almost participants at all levels and increases the unit costs of organizing the training activities.</p> <p>Considering the similarities in the content of the tailored programmes, DSD should ensure that the training package for VE service providers is broken into modules that are provided in stages so as to allow their integration to pre-, in-, on-the job training programs of the departments and to allow trainees to focus on their other duties while ensuring capacity building at a continuous manner.</p>				

Management response:

Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				

Evaluation recommendation 6: DSD should plan continuous non-formal capacity building interventions in the form of peer-education, refresher trainings for the permanent staff and introductory courses for the newly recruited.

Management response:

Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				

Evaluation recommendation 7: Collaborating with relevant tertiary education institutions to include VE related courses in their undergraduate curricula and give credit to applicants who have completed courses in assigning staff to VE related tasks, since they are already members of the VE forums at the national and international level.

Management response:

Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				

Evaluation recommendation 8: The interventions planned to produce the output are of paramount important for setting standards, improving the provision of ongoing services and introducing new service models and establishing an M&E system for National VEP. Unfortunately the outcome could not be fully producer to the level anticipated.

Piloting of GIS and DSD Funding Strategy should continue, one-stop-centre should be closely monitored for effectiveness for at least a year.

Management response:				
Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 9: DSD - Rendering victim satisfaction surveys an integral part of the M&E system to allow continuous flow of data available, which will provide valuable feedback for policy decisions.</p>				

Management response:				
Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 10: Support provided to CBOs enhanced service delivery, strengthened CBOs' institutional capacities, networks with other CSOs and ties with the communities. However the achievements of individual organisations are not well documented to allow replication and/or scaling up.</p> <p>In addition to the GIS, DSD should develop an M&E and reporting system for the funding/grant schemes to facilitate the documentation of best practices that can be replicated, multiplied or scaled up.</p>				

Management response:				
Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	

			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 11: A joint strategy should be developed and implemented to improve donor coordination at the national and international level to promote and support VEP related interventions with a view to facilitate financial planning of the CSOs.</p>				

Management response:				
Key actions	Time frame	Responsible unit(s)	Tracking*	
			Comments	Status
1.1				
1.2				
1.3				
<p>Evaluation recommendation 12: For sustaining the VEP initiatives, UNODC should develop an effective and comprehensive Programme exit-strategy clearly articulating the procedures, and roles and responsibilities of DSD and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Further, UNODC may provide support to DSD in seeking funding alternatives to reduce the implementation gap.</p>				