

Report for conducting Mid-Term Evaluation Year 1 of
the Small Projects and Support Fund (SPSF) –
Ukusekela Programme for AFSA



Ukusekela
THE SMALL PROJECTS AND SUPPORT FUND



Brot
für die Welt

1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Manna Consulting would like to thank:

- All organisations and individuals who participated in the evaluation. The organisations and individuals invaluable contributed to the evaluation by spending part of their important time responding to questions and holding discussions with Manna Consulting researchers.
- AFSA staff, Bread for the World (donor) representative and staff of Msebenzomuhle Cares, Shechem Organisation and Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products for facilitating and linking Manna Consulting with different stakeholders relevant to the evaluation.
- All the Manna Consulting researchers who participated in the evaluation research, namely:

Evaluation Team:

Paul Anderson – Lead Evaluator

Dr Vhumani Magezi – Evaluator

Nqe Dlamini – Evaluator

Dr. Chris Magezi – Evaluator / Researcher

Ms. Noxolo Mthethwa – Researcher

Ms. Siphithi Aurelia Ngwamba - Researcher

Report Compiled by:

Paul Anderson and Dr. Vhumani Magezi

Date: 31 March 2020



MIDI office

33 Alan Paton Avenue, Scottsville

Pietermaritzburg 3201

KZN, South Africa

Cell Phone: +27 (0)72 409 8223

Phone: +27 (0)33 342 1208

Email : paul@mannaconsulting.net

2 DISCLAIMER

The views, thoughts and opinions expressed in this report belong to the Lead Evaluators on behalf of Manna Consulting. They are expressed solely to address the requirements of the evaluation research as outlined in the TOR.

The report and its contents is a property of AFSA who contracted Manna Consulting to perform the process evaluation.

3 CONTENTS

- 1 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS1
- 2 DISCLAIMER1
- 3 CONTENTS 2
- 4 OUTLINE OF TABLES3
- 5 ACRONYMS.....4
- 6 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....5
 - 6.1 Evaluation Background 5
 - 6.2 Evaluation Purpose..... 5
 - 6.3 Methodology 5
 - 6.4 Conclusions..... 5
 - 6.4.1 AFSA operational level 5
 - 6.4.2 Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level.....6
 - 6.5 Recommendations 7
 - 6.5.1 AFSA operational level7
 - 6.5.2 Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level.....8
- 7 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND9
 - 7.1 Background 9
 - 7.1.1 Component 1:.....9
 - 7.1.2 Overview of projects supported.....9
 - 7.1.3 Objectives of the SPSF 10
 - 7.1.4 Purpose of the Evaluation (SPSF)..... 10
 - 7.1.5 Scope and methods of the work 10
- 8 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY 10
 - 8.1 Evaluation approach – qualitative approach 11
 - 8.2 Data Collection Methods 11
 - 8.2.1 Qualitative data collection 11
 - 8.2.2 Qualitative data analysis12
- 9 FINDINGS12
 - 9.1 AFSA OPERATIONAL LEVEL.....12
 - 9.1.1 General comments12
 - 9.1.2 Selection of Approvals Committee 14
 - 9.1.3 Selection of partner initiatives.....15
 - 9.1.4 Assessment of the outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project from April 2019 to March 2020. 16

9.1.5	Successes and Challenges.....	21
9.1.6	Lessons Learned in the SPSF Project.....	23
9.1.7	Potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved and AFSA as well as BftW.	24
9.1.8	Assessment of the value of the programme	25
9.2	<i>SUB-RECIPIENT (PARTNER ORGANISATION) LEVEL</i>	26
9.2.1	Key Successes and Challenges.....	26
9.2.2	Lessons Learned in the SPSF Project.....	28
9.2.3	Additional unintended or unspecified outcomes	29
9.2.4	The value and the Social Return on overall investment in the SPSF Project	30
10	CONCLUSIONS.....	31
10.1	<i>AFSA operational level</i>	32
10.1.1	Approvals Committee	32
10.1.2	Selection of beneficiary partner projects	32
10.1.3	Timeframe for support.....	32
10.1.4	Involvement of BftW.....	32
10.1.5	Encouragement of linkages for partners is critical for sustainability	32
10.2	<i>Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level</i>	32
10.2.1	The benefits of the SPSF project at the partner organisation level are many and varied: 32	
10.2.2	Communication of partner organisations with AFSA.....	33
11	ANNEXES	33
11.1	<i>List of key informants (KII) interviewed and Focus Group Discussions (FGD)</i>	33
11.2	<i>Interview Instruments</i>	35

4 OUTLINE OF TABLES

Table 1: Overview of SPSF Partner Organisations	9
Table 2: Composition of the Approvals Committee	14
Table 3: Breakdown of those interviewed from BftW and AFSA	33
Table 4: Table of those interviewed from Msebenzomuhle Cares.....	34
Table 5: Table of those interviewed from Shechem Organisation	35
Table 6: Table of those interviewed from Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products	35

5 ACRONYMS

ACRONYM	DESCRIPTION
AFSA	AIDS Foundation of South Africa
BftW	Bread for the World
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CRA	Climate Resilient Agriculture
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DoH	Department of Health
DSD	Department of Social Development
ECD	Early Childhood Development
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
GBV	Gender Based Violence
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HTS	HIV Testing Services
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
KZN	KwaZulu Natal
LO	Life Orientation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPO	Non-Profit Organisation
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SARS	South African Revenue Service
SPSF	Small Projects Special Fund
SR	Sub Recipient
TB	Tuberculosis
TOR	Terms of Reference
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UIF	Unemployment Insurance Fund
ZAR	South African Rand

6 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

6.1 Evaluation Background

The Ukusekela Project is the Republic of South Africa (RSA) Small Project and Support Fund (SPSF) funded by Bread for the World (BftW) to support small local initiatives. These initiatives are made up of committed and dedicated people who may belong to any of these structures: self-help groups, community based organisations (CBO's), faith based organisations (FBO's) or smaller non-governmental organisations (NGO's) or small local networks and their members working within their vicinity and context to improve the lives of the marginalised.

AFSA implemented the first phase of the project (Year 1) between April 2019 and March 2020 through a grant received from BftW in partnership with 7 initiatives that were spread over 3 geographical provinces. The SPSF project aims to empower communities to act and participate in their own development through actions that are designed, implemented and owned by the communities themselves. The SPSF is made up of two components each to be implemented annually. This mid-term evaluation is for component 1. The maximum grant amount per project under component 1 is 150.000 ZAR. There are no thematic focus areas.

6.2 Evaluation Purpose

The purpose is to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the SPSF-Ukusekela Programme in the three provinces where the programme is implemented namely Kwa Zulu Natal (3) Mpumalanga (3) and Eastern Cape (1). This mid-term evaluation covers year 1 of 3 of the SPSF.

6.3 Methodology

The evaluation utilized a qualitative method. The qualitative data was collected using programme documents review, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions and direct observations.

6.4 Conclusions

The evaluation findings are presented on two levels namely:

1. AFSA operational level
2. Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level

6.4.1 AFSA operational level

6.4.1.1 Approvals Committee

The selection and deployment of the Approvals Committee was conducted well, but it was an intensive and time-consuming process for AFSA. There was a substantial number of applicants that needed sifting through and those shortlisted were interviewed and credentials checked. The committee did their job well.

6.4.1.2 Selection of beneficiary partner projects

There were many more applications for the SPSF project than expected. It seems that there was misreading of the advert as to the exact type of organisation and project that was attractive for the SPSF project. Many applications were in the HIV theme (which was listed as an exclusion under the exclusion list), and many came from organisations that had capacity that was too low and were requiring top-up funding rather than 'kick-start' funding. This created a lot of extra work for the AFSA team and the Approvals Committee.

6.4.1.3 Timeframe for support

In line with the objectives, the organisations did improve their organisational sustainability through this project, but the timeframe for the provision of support to the partner organisations

could be slightly extended to capitalise fully on the benefits being accrued – see recommendations.

6.4.1.4 Involvement of BftW

Due to the SPSF Project being a pilot project, and this being Year 1 of that project, there were a lot of 'teething problems' which required regular communication between the donor (BftW) and the AFSA SPSF team. There were many decisions to be made and things to be ironed out along the way. Adaptations have been made and relevant protocols put in place, so that in future rounds there will be less interaction around 'operational' matters required between AFSA and BftW.

6.4.1.5 Encouragement of linkages for partners is critical for sustainability

With the termination of donor support from BftW and AFSA at the end of Year 1, it is essential that the partners can 'widen their net' in terms of developing new or greater linkages with other possible funding (or resource) sources in their local areas and beyond. The project has helped them with this, but they will need to continue this process to survive and flourish.

6.4.2 Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level

6.4.2.1 The benefits of the SPSF project at the partner organisation level are many and varied:

This project is very unique in the donor funding world in that it caters to the perceived community needs of selected organisations and is not donor driven. It also allows for small organisations of lower institutional capacity to get a foot onto the funding ladder.

The benefits are many and varied which show that the SPSF Project has been very successful at achieving its objectives – the project has been effective, efficient and relevant:

- The sub-recipients (partner organisations) in the SPSF Project have successfully designed and implemented their grass root initiatives. They have developed work plans with set objectives that they have achieved during the funding cycle of the SPSF.
- As the partner organisations designed the programmes themselves, they are very relevant to the needs of the communities where they work.
- They have used those work plans and aligned activities that have led to the achievement of their planned objectives. They have learnt how to allocate costs to an activity plan to develop a budget for the organisation which they have been able to monitor.
- Each organisation has, with the help of AFSA put in place financial controls which have helped with successful implementation of their projects and much improved financial management procedures. These measures have improved the efficiencies of the projects.
- The organisations have met their targets as per their plans for the SPSF Project (apart from Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products who did not grow animal feed successfully, partly due to late planting and the drought).
- Financial controls are in place per organisation which allow for successful project implementation and financial management procedures.
- The participating organisations have also increased their presence and footprints in the communities whilst building networks and strategic alliances (to varying extents) as they carry out their development projects.
- Social, leadership and technical skills have been developed in the partner organisations through the SPSF project. This has happened through the experiences of staff at the local level, as well as through the capacity building training provided by AFSA. This improved capacity in the people of the organisations results in increase capacity in the

communities where they live and work, thus contributing to the development of these communities.

- The staff of the partner organisations have learnt skills in project design, resource allocation, project management and project reporting which will greatly benefit the organisation in the long term.
- The staff of the partner organisations have developed improved confidence in what they and their organisations can achieve and due to this are more able to influence systematic change in their communities
- As the work that the organisations do has become more effective and higher profile, they have experienced improved stakeholder relationships which has further improved their effectiveness

6.4.2.2 Communication of partner organisations with AFSA

Some projects, such as Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products made changes to their agreed plan without consulting with AFSA staff and this resulted in cashflow problems which could have been avoided if they had communicated the changes they were making. The AFSA team would have been able to provide valuable input to help them to adjust their programming to maintain cash liquidity.

6.5 Recommendations

The evaluation recommendations are presented on two levels namely:

1. AFSA operational level
2. Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level

6.5.1 AFSA operational level

Timeframe for the SPSF Project funding

The project aims to provide a 'kick-start' to projects over a short period with targeted funding. It does not aim for long term sustainability of the project or organisation (this is not possible in this timeframe, and probably not even after 3 years of funding). However, the foundations have been laid in this time for the partner organisations to improve in their project management, get more recognition and be able to continue their project without the funds from the SPSF.

However, two years of funding would have been more realistic, or at least 1.5 years per project. Then it would be good to continue to provide some ongoing mentoring support or have an advisory role to ensure that the organisations can really move towards sustainability.

Extension of the project timeframe would also reduce the administration for the project and allow for greater feedback from AFSA to the partners as they would have more time for this.

Selection and appointment of Approvals committee

Keep as many of the Approvals Committee members on board for as long as possible. They know the processes and can learn from the previous selection process. The Approvals Committee members should receive continual feedback from AFSA on the progress of the selected projects to provide learning that can guide future selection.

Keeping the Approvals Committee Members informed

The AFSA SPSF team should ensure that the Approvals Committee are kept informed of project developments after the selections have been made. In this way they can also learn lessons as they go along, which could be incorporated into the selection process in the following years.

Selection of Organisations

The call is intended to be as open as possible so that communities respond with projects that address their specific needs. This will mean that there are a wide variety of applications. Efficiency could be improved with applications being sent to AFSA via email as well as postage, as email is easier to handle at AFSA (if the organisations have the capacity to use email). AFSA needs to establish a secure post box for mailing of applications to SPSF (and other programmes) and they also need to ensure that the email service provider is providing an acceptable service that does not 'lose' or delay emails (with or without load shedding) and a service that can handle large attachments (which is very feasible)

The selection process could be conducted more efficiently. AFSA could increase the levels of due diligence checking before partner organisations are shortlisted for this project. Checklist forms (basic capacity assessment forms) could be sent to the organisations earlier on (before the review of the applications by the Approvals Committee- once the screening has happened in-house by AFSA team) to help to sift those that are either too underdeveloped or too overdeveloped for this project. Then the site visits could take place to finalise the selection.

Select a certain number of thematic areas that will be covered by each round of the SPSF project. These should align with the skills base of the AFSA team so that they could provide technical support in these particular areas. This would mean that ongoing mentoring could be improved and lead to better results. It would reduce the amount of desktop research that the AFSA team would have to do to be able to mentor effectively. As is already happening, but which could be encouraged even more, organisations that have similar themes could be encouraged to network together (and visit each other) to share information and linkages.

Increased capacity building around fundraising

It is felt by the evaluator that there was not enough time given to fundraising capacity building for the organisations in the training that was provided. This skill is key for the sustainability of the initiatives and organisations beyond the AFSA funding. At least 2 days should be allocated to this in entirety to develop fundraising skills and strategies relevant for each organisation.

Select best projects to present to BftW

AFSA could make a list of the Project Partners from each successive year/round and provide a brief assessment of the capacities of each. AFSA could then make BftW aware of the most capacitated organisations that could have potential for future funding. This could be useful for BftW if circumstances change and they are looking for South African CBO partners.

6.5.2 Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level

Continue to work to accrue increased and ongoing benefits from the SPSF Project

As shown above the partner organisations have benefited greatly from the SPSF project. Many of the benefits are social benefits (improved standing, reputation, linkages with stakeholders) and technical benefits (increased skills in project management, donor management, reporting, financial management, human resource management). It is important that these benefits continue to be exploited as the partners move forward and reduce their reliance on AFSA. Each organisation should assess how far they have come, what are their main strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats, and use their improved capacity to address these areas to ensure increasing impact and sustainability.

In particular, the relationships developed (apart from that with AFSA) should be leveraged going forward to accrue greater benefits.

Building of linkages to other funding and resource support

Key for the ongoing sustainability of the projects is their ability to leverage on the successes they have gained through this project to build closer and more fruitful linkages with other organisations, donors and Government Departments. They must focus great effort to develop and maintain these linkages

7 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

7.1 Background

The Ukusekela Project is the Republic of South Africa (RSA) Small Project and Support Fund (SPSF) funded by Bread for the World (BftW) to support small local initiatives. These initiatives are made up of committed and dedicated people who may belong to any of these structures: self-help groups, community based organisations (CBO's), faith based organisations (FBO's) or smaller non-governmental organisations (NGO's) or small local networks and their members working within their vicinity and context to improve the lives of the marginalised.

AFSA implemented the first phase of the project (Year 1) between April 2019 and March 2020 through a grant received from BftW in partnership with 7 initiatives that were spread over the 3 geographical provinces. The SPSF project aims to empower communities to act and participate in their own development through actions that are designed, implemented and owned by the communities themselves. The SPSF is made up of two components each to be implemented annually. This mid-term evaluation is for component 1.

7.1.1 Component 1:

Focuses on supporting a maximum number of 10 small projects in Kwa Zulu Natal, Mpumalanga, and Eastern Cape in each year. The maximum grant amount per project under component 1 is 150.000 ZAR. There are no thematic focus areas.

7.1.2 Overview of projects supported

Table 1: Overview of SPSF Partner Organisations

No.	Name of Project	Main Focus	Province	Grant provided
1	Msebenzomuhle Cares	Youth awareness talks and dialogues on health promotion education and life skills using Latin American dancing, netball and soccer	KwaZulu Natal	R105,000
2	Shechem Organisation	A school for vulnerable and foreign national children	Mpumalanga	R105,000
3	Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products	Family pig farming project where pigs have been bought and seed provided to grow feed crops	Eastern Cape	R120,000
4	Sabie and Kruger Eco Club Co-operative	Visiting schools to create awareness on ways to protect the environment as well as dialogues in and around the community	Mpumalanga	R75,000
5	Ithubalethu Old Age Centre	Old Age Centre runs a day care centre where the elderly visit daily in order to be safe and protected from social ills	KwaZulu Natal	R105,000
6	Noncoko Dental Studio	Outreach programmes to create awareness and to educate on the importance of oral hygiene targeting learners at crèches and schools.	KwaZulu Natal	R75,000

		Communities outreach to the elderly and children living with disabilities		
7	Simama Centre for Career and Professional Development	University and TVET Colleges application form distribution grade 12 learners, Orphans and Vulnerable Children and learners with disabilities as well as Bursary application support.	KwaZulu Natal	R75,000

The contract with the Noncoko Dental Studio was terminated early on due to fraudulent activity and so this organisation left the SPSF project.

7.1.3 Objectives of the SPSF

The objectives of the SPSF Project for Component 1 are:

1. Funded applicants implement development projects to improve the living conditions of their communities.
2. Funded applicants are strengthened as organisations.

7.1.4 Purpose of the Evaluation (SPSF)

The purpose is to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the SPSF-Ukusekela Programme in the three provinces where the programme is implemented namely Kwa Zulu Natal (3) Mpumalanga (3) and Eastern Cape (1).

This mid-term evaluation covers year 1 of 3 of the SPSF. Year 2 will also be evaluated in March 2021 and a final evaluation will be conducted in 2022 for the entire 3-year programme.

The key users of the evaluation results will be the project implementing partner (AFSA) and the German funding organization (BftW). These results will be chiefly used for learning and project steering and for determining the priorities project strategy of a subsequent project phase.

7.1.5 Scope and methods of the work

The evaluation will:

- Assess the outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the first year of the project from April 2019 to March 2020.
- Assess whether the supported initiatives achieved their project objectives, and if not why? It will also seek to assess whether AFSA is on track with the project with regards to the roll out of year 1 as it is in the process of being finalized.
- Identify key successes of the implemented activities as well as key challenges that were encountered by the initiatives during the implementation of the programme.
- Determine whether there were additional outputs or outcomes which were unspecified.
- Identify whether there are potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved and AFSA as well as BftW.
- Assess the value of the programme intended and unintended, positive and negative impacts. An overall assessment is required in terms of social return on overall investment. This would specifically look at how the programme has benefited the community in its locality taking into account social, economic and environmental factors which can be indicators of this. Based on the assessment of this, then make recommendations to the areas which would improve the return on investment in the replication of the programme.

8 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Manna Consulting engaged AFSA staff, partner staff, existing beneficiaries, community stakeholders and partners, to gather relevant information to inform their findings and recommendations.

8.1 Evaluation approach – qualitative approach

The evaluation utilized a qualitative method. A qualitative method helps the research to gain in-depth understanding of a social phenomenon such as a social programme. The qualitative data was collected using programme documents review, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions and direct observations. Relevant data collection tools were developed, and informed verbal or written consent obtained from participants. Relevant participatory tools that are appropriate to the participants were developed to ensure maximum participation of respondents.

Findings and recommendations were made on the basis of overall emerging trends rather than on isolated instances – whether positive or negative.

8.2 Data Collection Methods

8.2.1 Qualitative data collection

8.2.1.1 Documents review

Programme documents were reviewed and analysed. The documents reviewed included: M&E reports, planning and implementation plans and the grant agreement. Service quality assessment and secondary data that assisted in answering the research questions was also analysed.

8.2.1.2 Field visits (Site visits) - Sampling

Three of the seven active projects were selected to be evaluated (one per Province). In each Province they were selected regarding location, languages spoken, activity of the projects as outlined below:

1. Eastern Cape: Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products near Idutywa

Project Overview

For the SPSF project, the organisation is carrying out pig farming project where a male and several female pigs have been bought. These will be mated to produce more stock, then the piglets will be raised and bred for sale at a later stage. Crops will be planted during the rainy season that will be used as feed for the pigs. Access to water supply is one of the key challenges in order to successfully run this project that they will address through procurement of Jojo tanks. The pigs will be vaccinated and monitored through the various milestones and records of which will be kept.

2. Mpumalanga: Shechem organisation near White River

Project Overview

The SPSF project runs a school that teaches the vulnerable and foreign national children according to the South African education system which the children are unable to attend due to lack of proper registration documents. Since they come from poor backgrounds, they are provided with school uniforms, meals on a daily basis and are taught life skills through the use of qualified volunteers. Once the learners receive the proper documentation, they're able to join mainstream school and complete their studies. Psychosocial support is also provided to the learners where social workers provide counselling and support to the learners.

3. KwaZulu-Natal: Msebenzomuhle Cares – organisation near Kosi Bay

Project Overview

The SPSF project focuses on the youth whereby awareness talks and dialogues are conducted on health promotion education and life skills through the use of Latin American dancing, netball

and soccer. Championships and knockout tournaments are held to build momentum for the different programmes.

8.2.1.3 Methods used

The breakdown of key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs) and observations that took place for the mid-term evaluation are shown in Annex 1.

Key informant interviews (KIIs)

A total number of 26 in-depth interviews were held with key informants (KI) Semi-structured and open questions were used as interview guides to collect information that was relevant to the evaluation questions. The questions were developed from the evaluation questions to be answered.

Selection of participants

Participants were selected and linked with evaluators by staff at the project, and other interviews were snowballed from there.

Focus group discussions (FGDs)

A total number of twelve (7) FGDs were held with 60 participants. FGD discussion questions were developed based on the evaluation questions.

Selection of participants

At each site, each Focus group consisted of 50% boys/50% girls where relevant or feasible, or one focus group would be all girls and the other all boys. The participants were selected randomly by the evaluators on arrival at the site.

Observations

A total number of three (3) observations took place at the sites where the initiatives are occurring.

8.2.2 Qualitative data analysis

The collected evaluation data was analysed using a thematic approach. The analysis themes were developed from the evaluation purpose, objectives and questions to be answered. Under each broad thematic category, sub themes were developed to compile lessons learnt.

9 FINDINGS

The evaluation findings are presented on two levels namely:

1. AFSA operational level
2. Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level

9.1 AFSA OPERATIONAL LEVEL

9.1.1 General comments

The idea for the SPSF project came from the donor Bread for the World (BftW). They were keen to support it as a pilot project. They approached AFSA to be the project holder. They are also doing similar projects in Sierra Leone and Brazil.

Charlene Donald of AFSA reported in the evaluation that the project aligns well with the AFSA portfolio of projects, even though it is smaller, so they were pleased to be approached by BftW.

AFSA is a development organisation that, as well as having a strong history regarding HIV (as the organisational name implies), is involved in community strengthening and granting to small projects. At present it is managing grants for The Global Fund and ELMA Philanthropies that are designed for capacity building, however these have a focus on HIV/AIDS and the partner organisations are mandated as to what work they must carry out.

AFSA appreciated the fact that this project was (and continues to be) a pilot in the eyes of BftW and so learning and adaptation were prioritised.

It was reported by the BftW representative, as well as the AFSA team that there has been a good relationship of learning between AFSA and BftW in the implementation of this project.

The BftW representative stated that BftW was very satisfied with the way AFSA was administering the project. There was worry that with the change of staff early into the project, that the momentum could be derailed, but AFSA quickly arranged the new team and BftW was impressed with the quick, honest and straightforward communication from the team. Challenges were shared timeously through skype calls and emails. It is felt that the project is now established with protocols in place so in the 2nd year there will not be as much need for regular operational discussion. The relationship has been one of true partnership which bodes well for the continuation of the project up to Year 3.

The SPSF project is a 3-year project for AFSA, with 3 sets of grantees receiving funding for one year only, so as to be able to reach as many small organisations as possible. There is a point of discussion as to whether the first set of grantees should have contracts extended to 1.5 years, but this would reduce the fund to 2 cycles instead of 3, reducing the number of beneficiary organisations. BftW usually seeks out longer term relations and outcome and impact. At present they are the only donor for the SPSF project, but they are hoping for other donors to be attracted to the project. They are aware though, that South Africa, as a middle-income country is not as attractive to many donors as other countries in Africa. BftW believe that although the funding is short term, there is a capacity building component, which can prolong the impact of the funding for the organisation receiving funding.

The SPSF project is meant to run for one year per cycle, but due to the delayed setting up of the project (partly due to staffing changes at AFSA) and partner selection, the partners were only funded in late August. This meant that they were only funded over a period of 8 months (Aug 2019- March 2020)

RECOMMENDATION
<p>The project aims to provide a 'kick-start' to projects over a short period with targeted funding. It does not aim for long term sustainability of the project or organisation (this is not possible in this timeframe, and probably not even after 3 years of funding). However, the foundations have been laid in this time for the partner organisations to improve in their project management, get more recognition and be able to continue their project without the funds from the SPSF.</p> <p>However, two years of funding would have been more realistic, or at least 1.5 years per project. Then it would be good to continue to provide some ongoing mentoring support or have an advisory role to ensure that the organisations can really move towards sustainability. Extension of the project timeframe would also reduce the administration for the project and allow for greater feedback from AFSA to the partners as they would have more time for this.</p>

9.1.2 Selection of Approvals Committee

The SPSF project has an Approvals Committee to identify and approve the organisations/projects that were to receive funding. The committee is made up of a diversity of independent members (6) with skills and experience in one or more of the following areas: Community Development, Corporate governance in NPO sector, Financial Management, Strategic Planning, and Project Management. A background in the Faith Based sector was also an added advantage. The candidates also had to possess high personal and ethical standards. The Approvals Committee was well selected as shown in the table below with good gender balance, provincial representation and broad skills and experience.

Table 2: Composition of the Approvals Committee

Name and Role	Area of expertise
1. Bishop Rubin Phillip KZN-Male	Retired Anglican Bishop and served as chairperson of the committee.
2. Lindiwe Dlamini KZN- Female	Social worker with governance, SMME development and entrepreneurship skills. Passionate about community development.
3. Zeodor Arends EC- Female	M +E specialist work for Eastern Cape AIDS Council and Global Fund Country Coordination Mechanism experience.
4. Oziel Mdletshe KZN- Male	HIV/AIDS activist with vast NPO experience. Currently works for HEAIDS.
5. Phokuhle Zungu KZN-Female	Pastor who works with the youth in her community.
6. Sbonelo Ndlovu KZN-Male	Paralegal experience in rural KZN NPO-Woza Moya

It obviously took a long time for the Approvals Committee to be selected and in place (advertising, receiving applications, checking references, conducting interviews, providing guidance), and BftW were surprised that AFSA were planning to change the committee members each year. This was to reduce the long-term burden of commitment for the members, who were not getting paid for their services. However, this does mean that AFSA have to go through the selection process each year. One member of the Year 1 Approvals Committee is continuing to serve in Year 2, but the others are leaving.

RECOMMENDATION
Keep as many of the Approvals Committee members on board for as long as possible. They know the processes and can learn from the previous selection process. The Approvals Committee members should receive continual feedback from AFSA on the progress of the selected projects to provide learning that can guide future selection.

9.1.2.1 Role of the Approvals Committee after selection of initiatives

Both the members of the Approvals Committee that were interviewed stated that they did not receive feedback from AFSA about the progress of the selected projects (one member sought out information of her own accord).

At this point in time they are unaware of how the projects have fared. They stated that they would have liked to have been kept informed of progress.

RECOMMENDATION

The AFSA SPSF team should ensure that the Approvals Committee are kept informed of project developments after the selections have been made. In this way they can also learn lessons as they go along, which could be incorporated into the selection process in the following years.

9.1.3 Selection of partner initiatives

The Approvals Committee meant that the selection of projects to support was independent and non-partisan. Some of the criteria for selection were:

- Province – needed balance of projects across KZN, Mpumalanga and E. Cape. The great majority were from KZN.
- Theme of project - responding to environmental, social justice or gender based issues
- HIV projects were not selected – there were many of these, but the adverts were clear
- The funding had to be to give a ‘kick-start’ to a project, not a top up of an existing project.
- Unique and innovative approaches were prioritised. There were a lot of Early Childhood Development (ECD) or Old Age Home projects that applied. They were all fairly similar.
- Projects that involved women or youth, particularly in farming, with a different angle were prioritised.
- The project objectives, activities, outcomes and budgets had to talk to each other
- Women led organisations were prioritised
- Budget within the acceptable range (R75,000-R150,000)

AFSA was surprised to receive over 200 applications. This is because the NGO/CSO sector funding in South Africa is in decline and it is rare to be able to access small funds such as this that have straightforward application procedures.

Due to the uniqueness of the SPSF project, we had anticipated to receive a large volume of applicants from Faith Based Organisations (FBO's) and Cooperatives as funding is normally available for NPO's.

However very few applications were received from FBO's and Cooperatives, most applications were received from NPO's. Narrative Report April- Sept 2019

There were lots of projects addressing HIV which discounted the applications. The AFSA SPSF team was disappointed with the generally poor standard of proposals that were submitted.

AFSA actioned the call, they did the first screening of applications and then checked compliance by looking at certificates and organisational documentation.

The Approvals committee then went through the remaining applications. The committee met for 2 days to kickstart the process of selection. Due to the number of applications and varying quality of these, it took the committee longer than they expected to go through the shortlisted applications. They then tasked the AFSA team to visit in person some of the organisations that had potential. The committee also scanned through the applications that had failed the screening just to be sure none had slipped through the net.

Despite this the team struggled to get the 10 organisations they were looking for out of the 200 applicants! This is a reflection of the capacity of the NGOs/CBOs in the country, and it emphasises all the more the need for a project like this one, with its concomitant capacity building.

In the end only 7 projects that matched the criteria were selected. The balance can be made up in the following years.

On further inspection, after 2 months one of the 7 projects was dropped due to fraudulent practices. This brought the total to 6 organisations being supported.

The applications reached AFSA by postage, courier and hand delivery. Musgrave Post Office has since closed and the AFSA post is collected at Overport Post Office where there is not a post box allocated to AFSA. The mail is stored in a pile, and the SPSF team are of the opinion that some applications could get lost.

Regarding email delivery of applications (which is not used at present), AFSA has also often experienced technical problems with downtime on the mailbox exchange resulting in emails going into a blackhole which are often not received or come through much later than they should. Load shedding has also compounded this issue. There have also been issues with AFSA receiving emails with large attachments, meaning that multiple emails need to be sent with attachments which are often not labelled correctly resulting in the documents being lost and not being aligned with the same sender.

RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>The call is intended to be as open as possible so that communities respond with projects that address their specific needs. This will mean that there are a wide variety of applications. Efficiency could be improved with applications being sent to AFSA via email as well as postage, as email is easier to handle at AFSA (if the organisations have the capacity to use email). AFSA needs to establish a secure post box for mailing of applications to SPSF (and other programmes) and they also need to ensure that the email service provider is providing an acceptable service that does not 'lose' or delay emails (with or without load shedding) and a service that can handle large attachments (which is very feasible)</p> <p>The selection process could be conducted more efficiently. AFSA could increase the levels of due diligence checking before partner organisations are shortlisted for this project. Checklist forms (basic capacity assessment forms) could be sent to the organisations earlier on (before the review of the applications by the Approvals Committee- once the screening has happened in-house by AFSA team) to help to sift those that are either too underdeveloped or too overdeveloped for this project. Then the site visits could take place to finalise the selection.</p> <p>Select a certain number of thematic areas that will be covered by each round of the SPSF project. These should align with the skills base of the AFSA team so that they could provide technical support in these particular areas. This would mean that ongoing mentoring could be improved and lead to better results. It would reduce the amount of desktop research that the AFSA team would have to do to be able to mentor effectively. As is already happening, but which could be encouraged even more, organisations that have similar themes could be encouraged to network together (and visit each other) to share information and linkages.</p>

9.1.4 Assessment of the outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project from April 2019 to March 2020.

9.1.4.1 Assessment of Effectiveness

An assessment of effectiveness involves an assessment of whether the intervention is achieving its objectives.

The BftW representative noted that the objectives were set with a 3-year time frame so should only be fully assessed after the 3 years. However, an initial assessment of progress towards project objectives is provided below.

9.1.4.1.1 Objective 1: Funded applicants implement development projects to improve the living conditions of their communities.

The AFSA staff, and the project partners all agree that this has been achieved for the Year 1 cycle for the project. Six of the seven selected organisations have achieved what they set out to do and have made a difference in their communities. Only the Noncoko Dental Studio was terminated early on due to fraudulent activity.

The partners have been helped to fulfil their objectives – see examples below:

- Shechem Organisation has enabled 36 children to go to school, is operating better, and has provided food and equipment for the children
- Lixhase 301 piggery project has purchased the required pigs, and they have reproduced to produce piglets for fattening (sadly one sow died when giving birth). They have not completed one cycle yet and so have not been able to sell pigs, but the project has gone to plan.
- Msebenzomuhle Cares have bought sports/dance kits, conducted practices to develop teams that can enter competitions and have provided lifeskills training during practice sessions

The partner organisations that were evaluated were all very vocal about the support they had received from AFSA to implement their projects. Msebenzomuhle Cares and Lixhase 301 projects staff both stated that they still could not believe they had been selected by AFSA for the support and they were so grateful!

9.1.4.1.2 Objective 2: Funded applicants are strengthened as organisations.

The capacity building formed a very important and much needed component of the SPSF project as stated in the AFSA Narrative Report April – Sept 2019 below:

There was anticipation to focus more on other aspects of the SPSF like networking as a means to build their skills. This however has not been the case as none of the organisations that were approved for funding had ever received donor funding before. This created a need for increase capacity building and monitoring of the organisation to ensure appropriate handling of donor funds. Organisational governance and compliance matters were unknown to them. Close monitoring and capacitation in terms of creating their identity and up skilling of their capacity to ensure implementation went as per proposed work plan has been significantly resource consuming as the grass root nature of the organisations means that they are not familiar with various operations and procedures standard to spending and reporting on donor funds

Three Training workshops were held as outlined below:

1. Orientation workshop in July 2019 for orientation into the SPSF programme and the reporting and financial compliance requirements.
2. Capacity building workshop in November 2019 for training in Human Resource Management, Governance and Organisational Compliance.
3. Close out workshop in March 2020 to share learning together and feedback, also with training in financial management, fundraising and planning the way forward. This

workshop is also to remind partners of the closure of the project and encourage them to seek other funding sources.

The Msebenzomuhle staff who attended the 5 Day training in November stated that:

- It helped with planning and to do things formally
- It helped with creating budgets and managing expenditure
- It helped the team to be able to reach their planned targets

In terms of Human Resource training the course helped with:

- Management of staff
- Staff contracts
- South African Revenue Service (SARS) regulations and the Unemployment Insurance Fund (UIF)
- Registration of an NPO - helped them to understand that more
- Volunteer agreements
- Job Descriptions

The capacity building was much appreciated by all the organisations that this evaluation interacted with. They appreciated the training but also the opportunity to meet with other partners, share learning and to network.

The capacity development also included ongoing mentoring with monthly reporting. There were also site visits to provide one on one support. Though these created logistical demands they were very much appreciated by the partners and cemented relationships between AFSA and the partners.

The SPSF Project Grant Accountant and Finance officer at AFSA stated that they had been involved in ongoing capacity building with partners as they helped them to draft workplans and budgets. Many did not know how to draft a budget and what should be included. Support was provided which built capacity in the organisations. This fact was corroborated by partners who really appreciated this help.

AFSA staff have noted a large improvement in the quality of reports received from partners between August 2019 and March 2020 which also illustrates improved capacity.

Other areas of capacity development include:

- The organisations now have improved compliance due to the training. They are now registered with the Department of Labour and paying UIF etc for employees
- They also have improved Board governance with more developed structures
- Organisations have developed their own logos, slogans and profiles.

According to the two staff who attended the organisational development training from Msebenzomuhle Cares, it was very beneficial for the following reasons:

- It helped with planning and to do things formally
- It helped with creating budgets and managing expenditure
- It helped the team to be able to reach their planned targets

Mama Zodwa commented:

This training helped us to set up a lot of these things such as contracts and agreements that were not in place previously. They have now been formalised within the organisation.

The family at Lixhase 301 Piggery Project stated that

We are breathing today because of AFSA. The AFSA team from Durban took us from total collapse and despair to what you see today. AFSA team, Sne, Vuyo and Ayanda were extremely patient with us. We have learnt everything we needed to get this business up and running again.

RECOMMENDATION

Increased capacity building around fundraising

It is felt by the evaluator that there was not enough time given to fundraising capacity building for the organisations in the training that was provided. This skill is key for the sustainability of the initiatives and organisations beyond the AFSA funding. At least 2 days should be allocated to this in entirety to develop fundraising skills and strategies relevant for each organisation.

Improved Networking

Efforts were made by the AFSA SPSF team to improve the networking skills and linkages of the partner organisations. It is early days to estimate the networking skills developed by the partners through this project, but some insights can be shared.

AFSA have noted that the physical office presence and working with local volunteers improves the networking opportunities for the partners in their communities:

These local relations assist in establishing a footprint and presence of the projects in the communities as the communities are greatly involved in the work and partnerships of the organisations. This is demonstrated through the monthly narrative reports where the organisations have an on-going base of volunteers. Due to the fact that all the partners have office bases within the community where they also implement means they have increased presence and networking relations with other local stakeholders. AFSA SPSF Project Narrative Report April – Sept

Some examples include:

- The meeting of SPSF partners at the capacity building workshops has improved the networking abilities and opportunities of the partners.
- Staff at Msebenzomuhle and the family at Lixhase 301 projects stated that they had improved confidence to be able to approach other organisations or donors because of the AFSA funding.
- Lixhase 301 was linked by AFSA to the Department of Agriculture for support and guidance as the AFSA team realised that they did not have adequate knowledge of pig farming.
- Ithubalethu Old Age Centre had participants that were already on social grants, so there was no Government mechanism to provide support, or other organisations that they know of to help but AFSA linked them to crafting organisation in the area to provide skills building and entrepreneurship opportunities..
- The partners stated that they appreciated the linkages provided by AFSA, but it is also true that the link with AFSA gave credibility to the organisations which opened the door for higher level networking. Msebenzomuhle Cares stated that they now get invited to meetings and event that they would never have been invited to before the AFSA grant.

9.1.4.1 Achievement of observable outcomes

Even at this early stage of the SPSF Project there were observable outcomes as shown under the objectives below.

9.1.4.1.1 Objective 1: Funded applicants implement development projects to improve the living conditions of their communities.

The living conditions of the communities where the partner organisations work have improved as described below:

- Msebenzomuhle Cares work brought improved purpose, self-esteem and confidence to their community. The lifeskills classes provided have (and will continue to have) life changing impacts in the lives of the young people as they make different life choices to the ones they would have made before.
- Shechem Organisation – this project directly improved the schooling conditions of the children involved, with regular meals, improved equipment and teaching materials. The improved education of these children, along with improved psychosocial and spiritual support with impact on the lives of the children well into the future.
- Lixhase 301 piggery project has greatly improved the living conditions of the family involved with the provision of home-grown pigs that they can sell, as well as through greatly improved psychosocial and emotional wellbeing following the hard times after the death of the father in the family.

9.1.4.1.2 Objective 2: Funded applicants are strengthened as organisations.

The partner organisations have been strengthened as organisations. This has occurred through the capacity building as described earlier, and through the improved linkages they now have with other service providers and Government Departments. All the directors of the evaluated partner organisations were very quick to say how the SPSF project had put their organisation on a lot stronger footing for going forward, as compared to the situation before the relationship with AFSA began.

The capacity building section of this report describes the organisational development that has happened as a result of this project. The outcomes of that, which are evident, are:

1. Increased confidence of Project Directors and project staff in the work they are doing, the change that it is bringing, and their ability to promote their work more widely.
2. The improved systems are leading to greater efficiencies within the organisation.
3. The organisations are now more legally compliant and so can access higher level funding opportunities.
4. The experiences they have had during the SPSF funding window, have shown them what they are capable of e.g. Msebenzomuhle now know that they can hold large scale soccer tournaments and players and key stakeholders will attend. They are much more likely to now repeat and expand on these achievements.
5. The organisations now have a history of working successfully with a larger donor (AFSA) and this will help to open doors with other larger donors.

9.1.4.2 Assessment of SPSF Project Efficiency

There are several areas where this project displayed high levels of efficiency as described below:

1. The Approvals Committee were not paid for their services (just provided with refreshments, travel and accommodation costs by the SPSF) and so the selection

process for SPSF Project partner organisations had low cost implications and so was conducted efficiently.

2. Initial partner project plans were checked to ensure that funds would be used efficiently to bring the greatest change possible in each project scenario. The project partners were then monitored closely by the AFSA SPSF Team to ensure that they were using the funds as planned.
3. Projects were selected with the aspect of efficiency being considered. The project plans were assessed against the requested budgets. Projects requesting 'top-up' funding were not selected. The funding was given to organisations where it would provide a 'kick-start' i.e. make a big difference very quickly.
4. The funding provided to each project was an amount that was specifically allocated for their needs and so there was not surplus funding available for each project in their budget. This meant that all the money provided was used for purpose, and there was not any left over which could be used inefficiently on other things.
5. As stated elsewhere, the project selection process could have been made more efficient through finding ways to select the projects more swiftly e.g. through more exclusion criteria, capacity assessment checklists so that fewer due diligence visits had to be conducted for partner selection

9.1.4.3 Assessment of the relevance of the SPSF Project

The whole premise of the SPSF Project is that it would seek out the most relevant projects to support. It would not come with criteria that the organisations had to align with, regarding the type of projects to be supported. This ensured that the project was highly relevant to the needs of the communities being served.

Provision of this kind of 'open' funding is very relevant for South Africa as South Africa consists of many diverse communities with differing needs. This was exemplified by the large variety of projects that applied for the funding (and the variety of projects that received the funding).

9.1.4.4 Is AFSA is on track with the project with regards to the roll out of year 1

Despite the delayed start for the project activities (August 2019 instead of soon after April 2019) the six projects that were funded have managed to complete their activities and Year 1 is on track to be completed in March 2020.

This is credit to the AFSA SPSF Project team, and to the partner organisations which they were supporting.

9.1.4.5 Monitoring by AFSA

The AFSA team provided ongoing monitoring of the SPSF project in the following ways:

1. Monitoring achievements against work plans that were developed during the orientation workshop which have set activities.
2. Monitoring Monthly reports that are submitted which demonstrate alignment with the set objectives as per work plan.
3. At each site visit that is conducted the project implementation of the partner organisation is assessed to ensure that it is still aligned to the set organisational work plan.

This monitoring is important to the project and it also builds capacity in the partner organisations as they experience the process and learn from it.

9.1.5 Successes and Challenges

9.1.5.1 Key successes

9.1.5.1.1 Speed of Project set up despite challenges

This project was established as a pilot and some processes were unclear. The project evolved as it was developed so this required lots of energy from the AFSA team. As they go into the 2nd cycle from April 2020 things should be better.

The BftW representative stated that despite all the hurdles the project was set up quickly and successfully. She was positively surprised by AFSA's way of implementation. BftW have not worked with AFSA like this before but have been very satisfied with project progress. Even though the project did not enrol the estimated number of partners (10), but enrolled 7 (one of which was removed, leaving 6) BftW did not feel that this was anybody's fault- the project does not have a fixed expectation for any given year. It is considered a success that 6 organisations were successfully supported throughout Year 1.

9.1.5.2 Key Challenges

Some of the key challenges faced in the SPSF project at the AFSA/BftW level are outlined below.

9.1.5.2.1 Staff changes

Some key AFSA staff left at the beginning of the project but AFSA reacted quickly to replace them with the present team who are executing the SPSF project to a high standard. The new staff had to quickly get up to speed with the project objectives and requirements.

9.1.5.2.2 AFSA team very stretched

The AFSA team is very thin on the ground and consequently are very stretched to achieve all the project requirements, especially when working with SPSF project partners who do not have the capacity that was expected at the inception of the project. The AFSA team do not always have time to do additional duties that they feel would be helpful, such as taking time to learn lessons, or developing the standard of reporting.

9.1.5.2.1 Establishment of the Approvals Committee

The establishment of the Approvals Committee proved to be a challenge. It was not easy to get applicants (it was an unpaid position with only expenses provided, in tight economic climate when many possible applicants are very stretched in support of other NGOs) and the process of selection to fill all the committee criteria was not easy (the aim was to have all the requisite skills represented by the members of the committee).

9.1.5.2.2 Selecting enough organisations to support

Despite the large number of applications received it proved a big challenge to select enough organisations that fulfilled the AFSA and BftW criteria for NGOs. AFSA had not anticipated the low level of capacity they would find at the local level.

AFSA had objectives and indicators to report on and it proved a challenge to get the required information so at times they had to lower their expectations and approach. It is hoped that the applications will be of a higher standard in the next round.

9.1.5.2.3 Diversity of Projects to support

The open theme of the SPSF project means that each project is very different to the others. This means that staff have to learn how to capacitate and work with each organisation / project that is selected.

9.1.5.2.4 Communicating with relevant people in partner organisations

Communication with the partner organisations was often a challenge. Most of them were based in rural areas. The Coordinator or founder would work at the grass roots level, but they were not

able to access funding or write proposals so they would get a relative to do these things while they conducted the activities. It was sometimes hard for AFSA to get the required information, as the contact person they worked with sometimes did not know all the information required. The hope of AFSA was that the operations people would be able to write reports. Often other people apart from the director would write reports and manage funding. The director would then not be sure what funds are available and what can be spent per line item.

In cases such as this, the skills transfer is not happening either as the people coming to the training are not necessarily the most relevant people.

9.1.5.2.5 Deselection of one SPSF Project partner organisation

The misuse of funds by the Noncoko Dental Studio was a setback for the SPSF project and the process of deselection of them from the project was a new experience which required delicacy and new learning.

9.1.5.2.6 Short time period to support each partner organisation

Due to the short project period, the AFSA team had to develop capacity in the organisations very quickly which has not been easy. This will repeat itself as new organisations are selected each year. Some organisations were very slow to get used to the systems and the AFSA team felt like they were babysitting. Some were stubborn and not helpful at following the systems and providing the required documentation on time.

9.1.6 Lessons Learned in the SPSF Project

Several lessons have been learnt in the SPSF project as outlined below:

9.1.6.1 Adaptability is key

The AFSA team and BftW donor learnt to be very adaptable as the pilot project evolved. There was not a Standard Operating Procedure that had to be adhered to but now that lessons have been learned about the process used it may be good to formulate things a bit more, but it is still good to leave space for adaptability.

There has also been adaptability in creating the tools that are needed when they are needed, for example, the re-allocation form, to be used if a partner is changing the use of something from agreed budget – the tools are now in place to adjust line item expenditure in budgets using the post expenditure approval form.

9.1.6.2 Communication is key

The AFSA team and partners have learnt that it is always important to communicate with each other, especially when processes are moving away from the agreed plan. Record keeping, report writing and keeping to the templates for monthly reports have all helped in clearer communication.

9.1.6.3 Learning to manage failing organisations

The AFSA team have learnt lessons on how to manage organisations that don't do what they are supposed to do. An example of this leading to termination, due to fraudulent activity is the Noncoko Dental Studio. AFSA had documents in place for this termination process to happen smoothly.

In the case of Simama Centre for Career and Professional Development the AFSA team could see that the work was being done, there was not misappropriation of funds but mis-expenditure, which the AFSA team could micromanage to get through the situation. However, this approach

required inputs of valuable time from the AFSA team who were already stretched thin to cover the work.

All the projects had instances when they needed extra input from the AFSA team to help them manage the situation.

9.1.7 Potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved and AFSA as well as BftW.

There are several linkages and networks that could be leveraged by this SPSF project.

9.1.7.1 Bread for the World (BftW)

BftW funded this project but they are in a reduction phase in South Africa, hence unable to take on new projects at present. However, AFSA could highlight the partner organisations with highest capacity to BftW so that if future funding does become available these organisations could be approached.

BftW is hoping that another donor could come on board during the project period or in the next phase. However, they are aware that European donors are receding more and more. The BftW representative interviewed stated that BftW is approaching other European ecumenical donors and nonfaith-based donors to provide support. BftW understands that it is hard for many of these donors to get into a project like this as they have very exacting standards to adhere to, laid upon them by their back donors. Questions raised by the back donors include:

- Who is responsible if the project fails?
- Who will provide back-up funds if there is a failure?

These questions highlight the uniqueness of this donor funded project and the 'risks' that BftW are prepared to take to combat identified social ills at the grass roots level in order to make a difference as well as build learning.

RECOMMENDATION

AFSA could make a list of the Project Partners from each successive year/round and provide a brief assessment of the capacities of each. AFSA could then make BftW aware of the most capacitated organisations that could have potential for future funding. This could be useful for BftW if circumstances change and they are looking for South African CBO partners.

9.1.7.2 AFSA

AFSA could also seek out donors in South Africa (Corporates, Trusts and institutional donors) who may want to provide ongoing supplementary support to the SPSF project. This would allow for increased funding to present partners or allow the project to continue beyond the present 3 years.

AFSA has close links with DSD as they manage a payroll for DSD supported NGOs. AFSA could approach DSD to share the profiles of Ithubalethu Old Age Centre and Shechem organisation to encourage them to provide support for these relevant initiatives.

Some linkages where AFSA can help the partners include:

Shechem Organisation have seen cases where foreign nationals commit violence and rape in the home against minors. As they are known as foreign nationals then South African Police do

not take up the case. Shechem has worked with psychosocial organisations and social workers on these issues, but the families do not want to bring legal cases as the Dad (the perpetrator) is the breadwinner and so they do not want him to go to prison. This means the children are vulnerable and there is a gap in their support. Shechem would like to provide support for them. AFSA recommended that they link to other independent schools for support around GBV and rape.

AFSA would still like to find a suitable organisation to partner in the long term with **Sabie and Kruger Eco Club Co-operative** e.g. initially for an event such as a community workshop.

Ithubalethu Old Age Centre is working with a local doctor. AFSA suggested they approach local businesses to subsidise them, but they have not been active in doing that. However, they do work with other old age centres in the area.

9.1.7.3 ELMA Philanthropies

ELMA Philanthropies have small grants projects, but they have exclusions which would make the SPSF project partners ineligible. – they would not fund organisations that have already received external funding, which the SPSF project partners now have.

9.1.7.4 Other Funders and Linkages

The AFSA Programme Manager stated that she saw potential in accessing future funding to develop media support and publications writing amongst the SPSF partners. The project has helped to establish Facebook pages, organisational profiles and logos but the next step is to improve the scripting of information coming from the organisations. She stated that it could be good to centralise this writing (with capacity building) role with AFSA or hire a consultant to help with this on an ongoing basis, as happens with the Financial consultant. This person would take a report and put it into a story for insertion into a publication for improve positive exposure of the organisations.

According to one Approvals Committee member the partners must be more innovative and look at ways to generate other funding. Social entrepreneurship should be encouraged to reduce dependency on donors. They must investigate linkages to help them to develop enterprises to run alongside (and complement) their social initiatives. AFSA could aid partners in developing this thinking and providing linkages.

9.1.8 Assessment of the value of the programme

The SPSF Project is a 3-year project so a value judgement can only be made at the end of this period. However, there are some early judgements that can be made.

The project is being run as a pilot project and already in Year 1 there have been many lessons learned at the AFSA / BftW level and at the partner organisation level. These learning will benefit the project going forward and in future possible cycles of the project, as well as providing valuable information to AFSA and BftW regarding the implementation of this kind of small project support.

9.1.8.1 Social Return on overall investment in the SPSF Project

This is discussed under the activities of the SPSF partners later in the report.

9.1.8.2 Discussion of Sustainability Issues

When funding (in many cases for the first time) is provided to small scale NGOs/CBOs over a short period of time as was the case with this project, then questions of sustainability of the initiatives funded and the organisations supported must be raised.

The design of the SPSF project does allow for sustainability beyond the life of the project funding. Objective 1 provides funding to enable the organisations to be able to carry out their planned activities but Objective 2 (capacity building) is in place to encourage sustainability beyond the life of the project.

As shown above the capacity building was effective. Networking was also facilitated and encouraged by AFSA to encourage sustainability.

In terms of sustainability, the AFSA funding to the 6 initiatives allowed for:

1. the scaling of the programme
2. improved the quality of the programme
3. improved ability to raise funds
4. improved systems
5. improved the public perception of the programme
6. improved linkages to other NGOs, service providers and Government Departments

Factors 2-6 above have led to an improvement in the sustainability of the programme and the organisation while the scaling (1) may need to be reduced (back to previous levels), if present levels cannot be sustained.

According to the BftW representative the funding was seen as being able to provide a 'kick start' to the selected organisations. It is a short term, limited funding to build capacity and enable organisations to be able to apply for other funding. It is likely that going forward the time frame may be extended to 1.5years as opposed to the present 1 year (which was only 9 months in Year 1).

One Approvals committee member stated that it is unrealistic to expect organisations to achieve sustainability in one year (or in this case, 9 months) especially when they are coming from such a low starting point. Many of the organisations are from deep rural areas and some were not computer literate.

They have never been accountable for larger funds. Two years of support would have been more realistic.

9.2 SUB-RECIPIENT (PARTNER ORGANISATION) LEVEL

The evaluation included three of the seven selected partner organisations that were evaluated in line with the evaluation questions. The organisations evaluated were:

1. Msebenzomuhle Cares – KwaZulu Natal
2. Shechem Organisation - Mpumalanga
3. Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products – Eastern Cape

This report will highlight the relevant findings from the evaluation of each of the organisations. A full report on each partner organisation evaluated is available as an attachment to this evaluation.

9.2.1 Key Successes and Challenges

Key successes of the implemented activities as well as key challenges that were encountered by the initiatives during the implementation of the programme are outlined below.

9.2.1.1 Key successes

Some of the many key successes in the SPSF project at the partner level are outlined below.

9.2.1.1.1 Msebenzomuhle Cares

- Organisational Development has improved the sustainability of the organisation
- Achievements of the Individuals and Teams that are part of Msebenzomuhle
- Increased visibility of Msebenzomuhle Cares
- Improved standing in the community for Msebenzomuhle Cares

9.2.1.1.2 Shechem Organisation

- Organisational Development has improved the sustainability of the organisation
- Children progressed from looking unhealthy to looking nourished
- Children changing from being unable to read and write to being able to read and write
- Children changed from being unable to understand and speak English to being able to understand and speak the language
- Children changed from lacking discipline and concentration to being disciplined and focused
- Children have developed a constructive understanding of God, which is helping them to have positive behaviour
- Children are no longer roaming in the streets as a result of being involved in a school where they are learning
- Children developing life skills that will help them in the future

9.2.1.1.3 Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products

- A dedicated and skilled team to operate a barn and breed pigs
- Budget has been spent according to the contractual arrangements
- Participants are already interacting with input suppliers and potential buyers (the abattoir they used to supply before)

9.2.1.2 Key Challenges

Some of the several key challenges faced in the SPSF project at the partner level are outlined below.

A challenge for all supported organisations is that of where to get funding to replace that provided by AFSA post March 2020

9.2.1.1 Msebenzomuhle Cares

- Initial Orientation and Learning to know how to manage the funding was required as they had not handled funds as large as these before
- Introducing the parental consent forms and attendance registers proved difficult but they succeeded in the end
- Stretched human resources to conduct all the activities
- Limited finance to pay salaries, stipends, transport and rent
- Poor attendance of activities around exam time (especially for Grade 11 and 12 learners) and no attendance through the holidays.

9.2.1.1.1 Shechem Organisation

- Limited human resource in the form of teachers
- Limited infrastructure to work effectively with the children

- Limited playground space for children
- Limited toilet facilities
- Lack of legal documentation for children of foreigners

9.2.1.1.2 Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products

- A cashflow crisis is looming as funding to purchase feed ends in March and the piglets will not be ready for sale until July 2020. This is due to poor planning and liaison with AFSA on the part of the organisation.
- Drought delayed the planting season last year and as a result maize will be not be available for feeds in good time
- Poor soil health accompanied by lack of technical skills on the part of family resulted in poor maize and vegetable plants establishment
- Grazing of maize by sheep due to poor fencing
- Poor fencing also led to theft of one piglet
- Water is short due to lack of a borehole pump
- Costs are high for feed transportation to the piggery
- Development of favourable contracts with suppliers and purchasers proved difficult
- There was little support from other agricultural agencies

9.2.2 Lessons Learned in the SPSF Project

Several lessons have been learnt in the SPSF project as outlined below:

9.2.2.1 Msebenzomuhle Cares

There have been several lessons learned by Msebenzomuhle Cares through this programme as described below:

1. The Director, Ms. Zandile Mngomezulu stated that the receipt of funding and the implementation of the programme had been a large learning curve for the organisation. They had learned a great deal about programming and reporting on a development project.
2. It takes time to change community perceptions when you change what you are doing. The organisation had worked with participants before the funding from AFSA but when they had to complete consent forms and attendance registers, there was initial resistance to this from pupils, parents and staff.
3. The Coordinator, Mama Zodwa has realised that it is best to conduct all communications with donors and other stakeholders by email, as this keeps a record of correspondence for future reference.
4. More care will be taken when developing budgets in future. It was realised that there were funding gaps after signing the agreement with AFSA. They should have included some line items (e.g. money to go to buy the kits in Durban) into their initial budget.

9.2.2.2 Shechem Organisation

5. Life issues are intertwined.

It is important to note that life issues are intertwined. At the surface level, the organisation wants to provide food and education, yet the learners' underlying problem is lack of legal documentation. In other words, life issues are interconnected because addressing one aspect of children's life leads to other challenges and needs that also need to be addressed. The issue of legal documentation for many foreign nationals' children who attend school at Shechem organisation is a good example. The organisation is committed to educating vulnerable school-going age children who are not attending school because of various circumstances. When

Shechem organisation opened a school for these children, the founder realised that there were other fundamental problems that prevented children of immigrants from enrolling in mainstream schools. In addition, this challenge needs to be addressed so that the children at Shechem organisation can also be enrolled at other schools.

6. Constitutional rights versus practical realities.

There is also an emerging lesson about the conflict between our constitutional rights and the practical (i.e. cultural and religious) realities of people's preferences in communities, e.g. the notion of children's rights is generally resisted by parents in black communities. Our rights can be in conflict with the practical realities in homes and certain institutions. People's cultures can be in conflict with the constitution of the country. The statutory rape issue that was reported by Mrs Sizakele Tshabalala, and which a social worker is currently dealing with, is a good example. In this case, a minor girl child attending school at Shechem Organisation fell pregnant after being statutorily raped. Subsequently, Mrs Tshabalala facilitated for the pregnancy to be terminated, in keeping in line with the constitution of the nation, but contrary to Sizakele's Christian beliefs.

7. Our religious preferences can be at law contrary to the country's pluralistic constitution.

Apparently, the issue of teaching learners to believe in the name of Jesus Christ for salvation is contrary to the national constitution that views all religions as equal. Thus, indoctrinating children with Christian beliefs at school violates the education act.

8. Some issues require multisectoral partnerships to be adequately resolved.

Some issues require multisectoral partnerships to be addressed sufficiently. For example, the issue of access to education requires legal documents, which the Department of Home Affairs issues. The issue of documentation for immigrants' children also touches on aspects of international relations and international law.

9.2.2.3 Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products

9. Agribusiness support programmes require a longer duration of support and subsidies. The initial support is largely capital intensive and slowly tails off when participants start to run on their own.

10. A sector specialist is required where beneficiaries are unable to secure extension services from the state institutions. A recommendation is made to mobilise and draw non-governmental organisation(s) in the climate resilient agriculture (CRA) space.

11. The family still need support with stakeholder management to help them to establish supportive networks with useful stakeholders that are nearby. For instance, participants mentioned opportunities to access waste milk (by-product) from Parmalat in Queenstown and sawdust from nearby sawmills. They also need help to connect and negotiate affordable prices from input suppliers and negotiate good prices from buyers (abattoirs), in other words, support the beneficiaries in securing purchase and sales agreements.

12. The entire value chain should be considered when designing the project and in particular mapping out suppliers of inputs and the capacity of beneficiaries to produce the bulk of the feeds (mainly yellow maize).

9.2.3 Additional unintended or unspecified outcomes

9.2.3.1 Positive unintended outcomes

Some key positive outcomes that were unintended include:

9.2.3.1.1 Improved community recognition

The increased recognition from local community stakeholders was a pleasant and added spin-off from the support by AFSA.

9.2.3.1.2 Improved cross – gender relations

The young girls and boys involved in the dancing have to partner with each other to practice and perform. They get used to dancing physically together in a non-sexual way which is very important in South African society in which Gender Based Violence is so prevalent.

9.2.3.2 Possible Negative outcomes

Some key outcomes that could have negative implications were:

9.2.3.2.1 Higher expectations from the community and stakeholders

The improved community standing that emanated from this project now places greater responsibility on the organisation to maintain that reputation going forward. This is not necessarily a negative outcome, but it does increase the pressure on staff to perform and hopefully can be a motivator for them.

The higher expectations also extend to the demand for the programme, which means staff could be even more stretched or would have to say no to requests for the implementation of the programme at other venues.

9.2.3.2.2 Conflict between parents and children at Shechem Organisation

As they learn to be assertive in new beliefs in life, e.g. Christian values, the children often find themselves in conflict with their parents, who are rooted in African traditional and cultural beliefs.

9.2.4 The value and the Social Return on overall investment in the SPSF Project

The SPSF Project is a 3-year project so a value judgement can only be made at the end of this period. However, there are some early judgements that can be made.

9.2.4.1 Social

There was a large social return on investment in all the initiatives supported by the SPSF Project with examples shown below.

- Msebenzomuhle Cares work with the youth around sports and lifeskills brought massive social benefits for the youth involved. They were able to participate in teams, dance together, build self-esteem and confidence as well as develop lifeskills through the sessions provided.
- Shechem Organisation – this project which provided educational support to children in immigrant families, encouraged literacy and English medium communication which had a big social impact on the children involved. They were now able to read, write and speak in English to a much higher standard than previously. They were also provided with psychosocial and spiritual support and guidance which impacted on them very positively.
- Lixhase 301 piggery project – this was a family project focussing on economic empowerment but the development of the piggery improved the social standing of the family and they are keen to share their experience with those around them. It also gave hope to the family who had gone through the very difficult loss of their husband/father.

9.2.4.2 Economic

There was economic return on investment evidenced for the evaluated partners as shown below:

- Msebenzomuhle Cares has experienced increased public awareness and capacity in raising resources so it is hoped this will lead to increased economic benefit for the project. The director has submitted several grant proposals so it is hoped some of these will be successful.
- Shechem Organisation has experienced increased public awareness and capacity in raising resources so it is hoped this will lead to increased economic benefit for the project. It is still too early to see direct improvements.

- Lixhase 301 piggery project was aiming to improve the economic status of the family. This was achieved in terms of increased capital in the project, in terms of increased numbers of pigs, but it is still to be seen if this will lead to increased income, but this is likely as there are piglets to sell in July, and an increase in breeding sows due to the project. The challenge will be finding cash to feed the piglets from April to July so that they can be ready for sale. So economic benefits are still to be proved.

9.2.4.3 Environmental

The environmental return on investment for each evaluated project is outlined below:

- Msebenzomuhle Cares has developed sports fields for use by the youth and has used existing ones. This will encourage environmental management of these fields.
- Shechem Organisation
The environment where the children study and play was improved by the support provided by the SPSF project. However, this project did not add value or social return to the environment as it was not addressing environmental issues.
- Lixhase 301 piggery project has led to improved cropping and environmental management of the field they use, but due to the drought and inadequate management, planting was late so harvest will be reduced. They are trying to use climate smart agriculture (CLA) which is beneficial for the environment.

RECOMMENDATION

Building of linkages to other funding and resource support

Key for the ongoing sustainability of the projects is their ability to leverage on the successes they have gained through this project to build closer and more fruitful linkages with other organisations, donors and Government Departments. They must focus great effort to develop and maintain these linkages

RECOMMENDATION

Continue to work to accrue increased and ongoing benefits from the SPSF Project

As shown above the partner organisations have benefited greatly from the SPSF project. Many of the benefits are social benefits (improved standing, reputation, linkages with stakeholders) and technical benefits (increased skills in project management, donor management, reporting, financial management, human resource management). It is important that these benefits continue to be exploited as the partners move forward and also reduce their reliance on AFSA. Each organisation should assess how far they have come, what are their main strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats, and use their improved capacity to address these areas to ensure increasing impact and sustainability.

In particular, the relationships developed (apart from that with AFSA) should be leveraged going forward to accrue greater benefits.

10 CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation findings are presented on two levels namely:

1. AFSA operational level
2. Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level

10.1 AFSA operational level

10.1.1 Approvals Committee

The selection and deployment of the Approvals Committee was conducted well, but it was an intensive and time-consuming process for AFSA. There was a substantial number of applicants that needed sifting through and those shortlisted were interviewed and credentials checked. The committee did their job well.

10.1.2 Selection of beneficiary partner projects

There were many more applications for the SPSF project than expected. It seems that there was misreading of the advert as to the exact type of organisation and project that was attractive for the SPSF project. Many applications were in the HIV theme (which was listed as an exclusion under the exclusion list), and many came from organisations that had capacity that was too low and were requiring top-up funding rather than 'kick-start' funding. This created a lot of extra work for the AFSA team and the Approvals Committee.

10.1.3 Timeframe for support

In line with the objectives, the organisations did improve their organisational sustainability through this project, but the timeframe for the provision of support to the partner organisations could be slightly extended to capitalise fully on the benefits being accrued – see recommendations.

10.1.4 Involvement of BftW

Due to the SPSF Project being a pilot project, and this being Year 1 of that project, there were a lot of 'teething problems' which required regular communication between the donor (BftW) and the AFSA SPSF team. There were many decisions to be made and things to be ironed out along the way. Adaptations have been made and relevant protocols put in place, so that in future rounds there will be less interaction around 'operational' matters required between AFSA and BftW.

10.1.5 Encouragement of linkages for partners is critical for sustainability

With the termination of donor support from BftW and AFSA at the end of Year 1, it is essential that the partners can 'widen their net' in terms of developing new or greater linkages with other possible funding (or resource) sources in their local areas and beyond. The project has helped them with this, but they will need to continue this process to survive and flourish.

10.2 Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level

10.2.1 The benefits of the SPSF project at the partner organisation level are many and varied:

This project is very unique in the donor funding world in that it caters to the perceived community needs of selected organisations and is not donor driven. It also allows for small organisations of lower institutional capacity to get a foot onto the funding ladder.

The benefits are many and varied which show that the SPSF Project has been very successful at achieving its objectives – the project has been effective, efficient and relevant:

- The sub-recipients (partner organisations) in the SPSF Project have successfully designed and implemented their grass root initiatives. They have developed work plans with set objectives that they have achieved during the funding cycle of the SPSF.
- As the partner organisations designed the programmes themselves, they are very relevant to the needs of the communities where they work.

- They have used those work plans and aligned activities that have led to the achievement of their planned objectives. They have learnt how to allocate costs to an activity plan to develop a budget for the organisation which they have been able to monitor.
- Each organisation has, with the help of AFSA put in place financial controls which have helped with successful implementation of their projects and much improved financial management procedures. These measures have improved the efficiencies of the projects.
- The organisations have met their targets as per their plans for the SPSF Project (apart from Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products who did not grow animal feed successfully, partly due to late planting and the drought).
- Financial controls are in place per organisation which allow for successful project implementation and financial management procedures.
- The participating organisations have also increased their presence and footprints in the communities whilst building networks and strategic alliances (to varying extents) as they carry out their development projects.
- Social, leadership and technical skills have been developed in the partner organisations through the SPSF project. This has happened through the experiences of staff at the local level, as well as through the capacity building training provided by AFSA. This improved capacity in the people of the organisations results in increase capacity in the communities where they live and work, thus contributing to the development of these communities.
- The staff of the partner organisations have learnt skills in project design, resource allocation, project management and project reporting which will greatly benefit the organisation in the long term.
- The staff of the partner organisations have developed improved confidence in what they and their organisations can achieve and due to this are more able to influence systematic change in their communities
- As the work that the organisations do has become more effective and higher profile, they have experienced improved stakeholder relationships which has further improved their effectiveness

10.2.2 Communication of partner organisations with AFSA

Some projects, such as Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products made changes to their agreed plan without consulting with AFSA staff and this resulted in cashflow problems which could have been avoided if they had communicated the changes they were making. The AFSA team would have been able to provide valuable input to help them to adjust their programming to maintain cash liquidity.

11 ANNEXES

11.1 List of key informants (KII) interviewed and Focus Group Discussions (FGD)

A total of 90 people were interviewed for this evaluation - 30 in KIIs and 60 in FGDs as outlined below.

Table 3: Breakdown of those interviewed from BftW and AFSA

Category of the participants	Gender of participants	of In-depth interview / Focus Group Discussion (FGD)	Number of participants	Date collection date
------------------------------	------------------------	--	------------------------	----------------------

Uta Hergenröther Programme Officer for South Africa Bread for the World	1 female	1 in-depth telephonic interview	1	5 March 2020
Charlene Donald AFSA HIV Prevention Program Manager	1 female	1 in-depth telephonic interview	1	5 March 2020
Snegugu Vilakazi SPSF Programme Coordinator	1 female	1 in-depth interview	1	14 Feb 2020
Vuyolwethu Dlamini – SPSF Project Officer	1 male	1 in-depth interview	1	14 Feb 2020
Mildred Nomonde Mkulisi – Grant Accountant and Ntombifikile Ngiba Finance Officer SPSF Finance Team	2 females	1 in-depth interview (an in- depth interview was conducted with 2 staff together)	1	14 Feb 2020
Lindiwe Dlamini Approvals Committee member	1 female	1 in-depth telephonic interview	1	5 March 2020
Zoedor Arends Approvals Committee member	1 female	1 in-depth telephonic interview	1	5 March 2020
			Total 7	

Table 4: Table of those interviewed from Msebenzomuhle Cares

Category of the participants	Gender of participants	In-depth interview / Focus Group Discussion (FGD)	Number of participants	Date collection date
4 project staff (Director, 2 staff members and a Facilitator)	4 females	2 in-depth interviews (an in-depth interview was conducted with 3 staff together and the Director separately)	4	25 and 26 Feb 2020
1 local pastor	1 female	1 in-depth interview	1	27 Feb 2020
2 staff from Sports Department of Local Municipality	2 males	1 in-depth interview (an in-depth interview was conducted with 2 staff together)	2	26 Feb 2020
1 Teacher	1 female	1 in-depth interview	1	25 Feb 2020
1 Learner Support Teacher	1 male	1 in-depth interview	1	26Feb 2020
9 Members of Open Soccer Team	All males	1 FGD	9	25 Feb 2020
11 Members of U15 Soccer Team	All males	1 FGD	11	26 Feb 2020
11 Members of Netball Team	All females	1 FGD	11	26 Feb 2020
			Total: 40	

Table 5: Table of those interviewed from Shechem Organisation

Category of the participants	Gender of participants	Nationality of participants	In-depth interview	Number of participants	Date collection date
2 teachers	females	South Africans	2 in-depth interviews (an in-depth interview was conducted with each teacher)	2	24 Feb 2020
3 volunteers	1 male & 2 females	South Africans	3 in-depth interviews (in-depth interview was done with each volunteer)	3	27 Feb 2020
5 parents	females	4 Mozambicans & 1 South African	FGD was conducted for the parents	5	26 Feb 2020
20 learners	10 males & 10 females	14 Mozambicans & 6 South Africans	2 FGD's were conducted. One (1) for male learners and one (1) for female learners	20	25 Feb 2020
				Total: 30	

Table 6: Table of those interviewed from Lixhase 301 Agricultural Products

Category of the participants	Gender of participants	In-depth interview / Focus Group Discussion (FGD)	Number of participants	Date collection date
Direct beneficiaries and members of Lixhase NPO	Females (2)	Focus group discussion with 4 participants	4	11 Feb 2020
	Males (2)	2 in-depth interviews conducted the next day	2	12 Feb 2020
Community member	Females	Interview	2	12 Feb 2020
Barn operator	Male	Interview and observations	1	12 Feb 2020
Local leader	Male	Interview	1	12 Feb 2020
Department of Agriculture	Male	Interview	1	13 Feb 2020
Councillor	Male	Interview	1	13 Feb 2020
			Total 12	

11.2 Interview Instruments

11.2.1 AFSA Staff

6. Did BftW or AFSA initiate the SPSF project?
7. It is unusual to provide one-year funding for a wide range of different initiatives as BftW did through AFSA for this project. What was the motive / thinking behind launching this project?
8. What are your thoughts on the selection and approval processes for the initiatives selected for the SPSF project?
9. What are your thoughts on sustainability regarding the different initiatives that are funded through the SPSF project?
10. Has the project achieved the planned objectives?
11. What do you think have been key successes and challenges with the SPSF project?

12. Can you identify any lessons learned through the project – particularly lessons that can be implemented in similar projects in future and continued by AFSA in Year 2 funding cycle?
13. Are you aware of any potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit AFSA?
14. Final Open Question
15. Are there any other points that you would like to raise or comments that you would like to make regarding the SPSF project?

11.2.2 Approval Committee Members

1. Why did you choose to be on committee?
2. How were you selected?
3. Did you have many applications?
4. How did you make a selection -what was the process?
5. Was unanimous consensus achieved in decision making?
6. How did you feel that you only selected 7 instead of 10 projects to begin?
7. How many times did you meet?
8. Will you meet again to review success of projects?
9. What role did you have after approval?
10. What are your thoughts on the project?
11. Have partners matched up to your expectations?
12. How would you improve the project (or approvals process) in future?
13. What are strengths and weaknesses of the project (or approvals process)?
14. What are (if any) potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved, AFSA as well as BftW?

11.2.3 BftW Representative

1. Did BftW or AFSA initiate the SPSF project?
2. It is unusual to provide one-year funding for a wide range of different initiatives as BftW did through AFSA for this project. What was the motive / thinking behind launching this project?
3. How much feedback have you received from AFSA regarding the project?
4. What are your thoughts on the selection and approval processes for the initiatives selected for the SPSF project?
5. What are your thoughts on sustainability regarding the different initiatives that are funded through the SPSF project?

You may not have answers to the following questions and expect these answers to come from the evaluation:

6. Has the project achieved the objectives BftW had in mind for it?
7. What do you think have been key successes and challenges with the SPSF project?
8. Can you identify any lessons learned for BftW through the project – particularly lessons that can be implemented in similar projects in future and continued by AFSA in Year 2 funding cycle?
9. Are you aware of any potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit AFSA as well as BftW?

Final Open Question

10. Are there any other points that you would like to raise or comments that you would like to make regarding the SPSF project?

11.2.4 Lixhase 301 Animal Products NPC Instrument for Family running the Piggery

Review Element		Probing Questions	Target
1	<p>Intervention priority analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions</p> <p>What efforts are needed to ensure that the programme and the partner initiatives achieve their objectives? What should be prioritised in the remaining project period?</p>	<p>1.1 What is it that you are doing to ensure that your business succeeds?</p> <p>1.2 What resources that you currently have and that are helping your business to succeed?</p> <p>1.3 What business skills do you have that are contributing to the success of your business?</p> <p>1.4 What technical skills do you have that are contributing to the success of your business?</p> <p>1.5 What are your business priorities for this year?</p>	Beneficiary family
2	<p>Administrative analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions</p> <p>Critically assess the programme's administrative strategies</p>	<p>2.1 What is your daily work schedule? Explain</p> <p>2.2 What business records do you keep?</p> <p>2.3 Who helps you with administration of your business?</p> <p>2.4 What is it that AFSA expects from you in terms of administrative compliance?</p> <p>2.5 What administrative support do you receive from AFSA? Probe frequency of support</p>	Beneficiary family
3	<p>Technical strategy analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions</p> <p>Critically assess the programme's and partner initiative's technical strategies</p>	<p>3.1 What technical support do you receive from AFSA besides grant funding? (cropping skills, piggery, business development, market penetration, co-operatives development, etc.)</p> <p>3.2 How do you receive support from AFSA and/or other support institutions?</p> <p>3.3 In your view, what else do you think AFSA should do to enhance support strategy?</p>	Beneficiary family
4	<p>Project SWOT analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions</p> <p>Determine and document the programme's and partner initiative's strengths and weaknesses (including opportunities and threats)</p>	<p>4.1. Which organisations support farming, business development, co-operatives development, etc. in this village?</p> <p>4.2. What strengths should be enhanced by you, AFSA, co-operatives and other organisations to make this project sustainable?</p> <p>4.3. What weaknesses should be addressed by you, AFSA, co-operatives and other organisations to make this project sustainable?</p> <p>4.4. What opportunities do you see from these challenges that will make your co-operative and your business sustainable?</p> <p>4.5. What threats should be addressed by you, AFSA, co-operatives and other organisations supporting you?</p>	Beneficiary family, co-operative and community leader
5	<p>Beneficiary analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions</p> <p>Who has benefited and who has not benefited?</p>	<p>5.1. Who has benefited from programme and partner initiative interventions?</p> <p>5.2. How have they benefited?</p> <p>5.3. How have you benefited?</p> <p>5.4. Who are not benefiting that should be benefiting?</p> <p>5.5. What is it that they can do so that they can benefit?</p> <p>5.6. How can AFSA programme ensure inclusivity?</p>	Beneficiary family, co-operative and community leader
6	<p>Community participation analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions</p> <p>Critically assess the programme's degree of community ownership and participation.</p>	<p>6.1. Who are direct participants of this project?</p> <p>6.2. Who are indirect participants of this project?</p> <p>6.3. How does their participation enhance and/or frustrate the project?</p> <p>6.4. How could their participation be improved in order to advance the objectives of this project?</p> <p>6.5. How much is the community involved in this project?</p>	Beneficiary family, co-operative and community leader

Review Element		Probing Questions	Target
7	<p>Intervention relevancy analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions Which interventions are relevant, and which are less so? How could interventions be adapted to make them more relevant?</p>	<p>7.1. Does this project address a real need that you have? What is that?</p> <p>7.2. Are there other needs that you feel should be addressed?</p> <p>7.3. Can you briefly describe AFSA's intervention in your own words?</p> <p>7.4. How are these interventions helping you to improve your income and livelihood?</p> <p>7.5. What else can be done to make AFSA's intervention more responsive to your development needs?</p>	Beneficiary family, co-operative and community leader
8	<p>Problems Identification and analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions What Problems have been encountered? Why? What can be done to mitigate, eradicate, solve these problems.</p>	<p>8.1. What problems have you experienced during AFSA's intervention?</p> <p>8.2. What have you done to mitigate or eradicate the negative impact of these problems?</p> <p>8.3. What has your co-operative done to mitigate and resolve these problems?</p> <p>8.4. What has AFSA done to mitigate and resolve these problems?</p>	Beneficiary family, co-operative and community leader
9	<p>Lessons learnt analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions What have we learnt so far in the project that will help us improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the project?</p>	<p>9.1. What is it that you have learnt that has helped you to start and/or operate your (i) piggery; (ii) crop farming; and (iii) business operations?</p> <p>9.2. What else do you think you should do to improve effectiveness of your (i) piggery; (ii) crop farming; and (iii) business operations?</p> <p>9.3. What lessons can you draw for AFSA and your co-operative?</p>	Beneficiary family, co-operative and community leader
10	<p>Unspecified outcomes Determine whether there were additional outputs or outcomes which were unspecified.</p>	<p>10.1 Are there any additional outputs or outcomes that were achieved but were unspecified? Which ones are there?</p>	
11	<p>Sustainability analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions How sustainable are the interventions? What should be done to ensure that sustainability of interventions is maximised?</p>	<p>11.1. How sustainable do you think this project is, without funding from AFSA?</p> <p>11.2. What could continue after the end of the project?</p> <p>11.3. What should be done to ensure that sustainability of interventions is maximised?</p> <p>11.4. Are you raising pigs in accordance to set standards (feeding, vaccinating, cleanliness, etc.)?</p> <p>11.5. Are you producing crops accordance to set standards (sourcing of inputs, land preparation, planting, crop maintenance, irrigation, harvesting, etc.)?</p> <p>11.6. Who is your market? How do you know that they will buy your produce?</p> <p>11.7. Do you have appropriate skills and knowledge to produce (and to operate your business)?</p> <p>11.8. Are you making savings that you will use post AFSA's support?</p> <p>11.9. What other resources do you have that you plan to invest into your business post AFSA's support?</p> <p>11.10. Do you think you will make enough money to pay for your household needs and at the same time grow your business?</p> <p>11.11. How do you get your inputs? Where do you get your inputs?</p> <p>11.12. Who provides you with technical support other than AFSA?</p> <p>11.13. Are you keeping records of your operations?</p>	Beneficiary family, co-operative and community leader
12	<p>Value analysis</p>	<p>12.1. What benefits is your household enjoying that were not there before the project?</p>	Beneficiary family, co-operative

Review Element	Probing Questions	Target
<p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions What is the value of the programme - intended and unintended, positive and negative impacts? What is the social return on overall investment?</p>	<p>12.2. In what ways can this benefit be described as a social return on overall investment? What social good this project has brought to you? 12.3. What bitter experiences have you endured as a result of this projects 12.4. Would you recommend the same project to another person or community? 12.5. How has the project benefited you in its locality economically? 12.6. How has the project benefited you in its locality environmentally? 12.7. What recommendations can be made to the project to improve the return on investment in the community? 12.8. What aspects of the project can be replicated to extend project benefits going forward?</p>	<p>and community leader</p>
<p>13 Networking and partnership analysis</p> <p>Corresponding Guiding Scope Questions What is the state of networking and partnership in the programme?</p>	<p>13.1 Who are partners or organisations that support farming, enterprise development, co-operatives development and related income generating initiatives? 13.2 What are the strengths in networking and partnerships? What are the key challenges/limitations in networking and partnerships? 13.3 Are there potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved and AFSA as well as BftW?</p>	<p>Beneficiary family, co-operative and community leader</p>

11.2.5 Msebenzomuhle Cares

YOUTH BENEFICIARIES

1. What would you say are your key needs at present as a young person in this community?
2. Does this project meet any of those needs?
3. What else can be done to make AFSA's intervention more responsive to your needs?
4. How might your life have been different if you had not been involved in the project?

How did the programme benefit you in terms of?

5. Knowledge/insight on sex, relationships, HIV, testing, ARVs, Drugs and substance use.
6. Protect themselves from social ills
7. Understanding healthy lifestyle
8. Soccer Week practice: to be able to pass or trap the ball and learn dynamics of working within a team.
9. Netball Week practice = Be able to catch and throw the ball and learn dynamics of working within a team.
10. The importance of education.
11. Understand what Entrepreneurship is (Knowledge of business plan)
12. Requirement Knowledge for being a job seeker
13. Knowledge and importance of Agriculture

ORGANISATIONAL STAFF AND STAKEHOLDERS

Assess the outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project from April 2019 to March 2020.

1. What are the project outcomes that can be observed from the time the project started (outcomes)?
2. To what extent are the activities conducted as planned (**effectiveness**)?
3. How is the project addressing the needs of the beneficiaries (children and families) (**relevance**)?
4. In what ways are the activities done well or not well (**efficiency**)?

Assess whether the supported initiatives achieved their project objectives, and if not why not?

5. Did the project achieve the project objectives? If yes, how? If not, why not?
6. To what extent is AFSA on track with the project regarding the roll out of year 1?

Identify key successes of the implemented activities as well as key challenges that were encountered by the initiatives during the implementation of the programme.

7. What are key successes of the implemented activities?
8. What are key challenges that were encountered by the initiatives during the implementation of the programme?

Determine whether there were additional outputs or outcomes which were unspecified.

9. Are there any additional outputs or outcomes that were achieved but were unspecified? Which ones are there?

Identify whether there are potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved and AFSA as well as BftW.

10. What are (if any) potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved, AFSA as well as BftW?

Assess the value of the programme intended and unintended, positive and negative impacts. An overall assessment is required in terms of social return on overall investment. This would specifically look at how the programme has benefited the community in its locality taking into account social, economic and environmental factors which can be indicators of this. Based on the assessment of this, then make recommendations to the areas which would improve the return on investment in the replication of the programme.

11. What is the value of the programme to the people (beneficiaries and community)? i.e. Intended or unintended value; positive or negative impacts.
12. What is the social benefit of the programme to the community? In what ways can this benefit be described as a social return on overall investment?
13. How has the project benefited the community in its locality socially, economically and environmentally?
14. What recommendations can be made to the project to improve the return on investment in the community?
15. What aspects of the project can be replicated to extend project benefits going forward?

State lessons learnt and recommend key approaches to support the implementation of similar projects in future and the continued work of AFSA in Year 2 funding cycle.

16. What lessons can be learnt from the project?
17. What key approaches have been learnt that can be implemented in similar projects in future and continued by AFSA in Year 2 funding cycle?

Assess the sustainability of this project.

18. How well will this project continue after the funding from AFSA stops?
19. What can be done to improve sustainability?

11.2.6 Shechem Organisation

Assess the outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project from April 2019 to March 2020.

1. What are the project outcomes that can be observed from the time the project started (outcomes)?
2. To what extent are the activities conducted as planned (**effectiveness**)?
3. How is the project addressing the needs of the beneficiaries (children and families) (**relevance**)?
4. In what ways are the activities done well or not well (**efficiency**)?

Assess whether the supported initiatives achieved their project objectives, and if not why not?

5. Did the project achieve the project objectives? If yes, how? If not, why not?
6. To what extent is AFSA on track with the project regarding the roll out of year 1?

Identify key successes of the implemented activities as well as key challenges that were encountered by the initiatives during the implementation of the programme.

7. What are key successes of the implemented activities?
8. What are key challenges that were encountered by the initiatives during the implementation of the programme?

Determine whether there were additional outputs or outcomes which were unspecified.

9. Are there any additional outputs or outcomes that were achieved but were unspecified? Which ones are there?

Identify whether there are potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved and AFSA as well as BftW.

10. What are (if any) potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved, AFSA as well as BftW?

Assess the value of the programme intended and unintended, positive and negative impacts. An overall assessment is required in terms of social return on overall investment. This would specifically look at how the programme has benefited the community in its locality taking into account social, economic and environmental factors which can be indicators of this. Based on the assessment of this, then make recommendations to the areas which would improve the return on investment in the replication of the programme.

11. What is the value of the programme to the people (beneficiaries and community)? i.e. Intended or unintended value; positive or negative impacts.
12. What is the social benefit of the programme to the community? In what ways can this benefit be described as a social return on overall investment?
13. How has the project benefited the community in its locality socially, economically and environmentally?

14. What recommendations can be made to the project to improve the return on investment in the community?
15. What aspects of the project can be replicated to extend project benefits going forward?

State lessons learnt and recommend key approaches to support the implementation of similar projects in future and the continued work of AFSA in Year 2 funding cycle.

16. What lessons can be learnt from the project?
17. What key approaches have been learnt that can be implemented in similar projects in future and continued by AFSA in Year 2 funding cycle?

Assess the sustainability of this project.

18. How well will this project continue after the funding from AFSA stops?
19. What can be done to improve sustainability?

Children

1. How did the activities help you?
2. What should be changed next time to enjoy the activities more?
3. How did the activities help you as a person and your parents?
4. What did you not like about the activities?