

Report for conducting Mid-Term Evaluation Year 2 of the Small Projects and Support Fund (SPSF) – Ukusekela Programme for AFSA



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 Inkunzi Isematholeni, Port Dunford OVC Centre, On Eagles' Wings and Masivuke Community Development for facilitating and linking Manna Consulting with different stakeholders relevant to the evaluation.
- All the Manna Consulting researchers who participated in the evaluation research as named below.

Evaluation Team:

Paul Anderson – Lead Evaluator

Dr Vhumani Magezi – Evaluator

Dr. Simphiwe Mngadi – Evaluator / Researcher

Nqe Dlamini – Evaluator / Researcher

Report Compiled by:

Paul Anderson and Dr. Vhumani Magezi

Date: 26 April 2021



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

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.

CONTENTS

- ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... 1
- DISCLAIMER 1
- CONTENTS 2
- OUTLINE OF TABLES 3
- ACRONYMS 4
- 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 5
 - 1.1 *Evaluation Background* 5
 - 1.2 *Evaluation Purpose* 5
 - 1.3 *Methodology* 5
 - 1.4 *Summary Findings* 5
 - 1.4.1 AFSA operational level 5
 - 1.4.2 Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level 7
 - 1.5 *Conclusion* 8
 - 1.6 *Recommendations* 9
- 2 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND 10
 - 2.1 *Background*..... 10
 - 2.1.1 Component 1 11
 - 2.1.2 Overview of projects supported..... 11
 - 2.1.3 Objectives of the Ukusekela - SPSF 12
 - 2.1.4 Purpose of the Evaluation (Ukusekela -SPSF)..... 12
 - 2.1.5 Scope and methods of the work..... 12
- 3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY 13
 - 3.1 *Evaluation approach – mixed methods approach* 13
 - 3.2 *Data Collection Methods* 13
 - 3.2.1 Qualitative data collection 13
 - 3.2.2 Quantitative data collection 14
 - 3.2.3 Qualitative and Quantitative data analysis 14
- 4 FINDINGS 14
 - 4.1 *AFSA OPERATIONAL LEVEL* 14
 - 4.1.1 General comments 14
 - 4.1.2 Impact of COVID-19 15
 - 4.1.3 Selection of Approvals Committee 16
 - 4.1.4 Selection of partner initiatives 18
 - 4.1.5 Assessment of the outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project from April 2020 to March 2021 20

4.1.6	Successes and Challenges.....	28
4.1.7	Lessons Learned in the Ukusekela - SPSF Project.....	31
4.1.8	Potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved and AFSA as well as BftW.	32
4.1.9	Assessment of the value of the programme.....	34
4.2	<i>SUB-RECIPIENT (PARTNER ORGANISATION) LEVEL</i>	35
4.2.1	Overview of Growth of All Partners	35
4.2.2	Key Successes and Challenges.....	36
4.2.3	Lessons Learned in the Ukusekela - SPSF Project.....	41
4.2.4	Positive unintended outcomes	42
4.2.5	Possible Negative outcomes.....	44
4.2.6	The value and the Social Return on overall investment in the Ukusekela - SPSF Project 44	
5	RECOMMENDATIONS	46
6	CONCLUSION	48
7	ANNEXES	50
7.1	<i>List of key informants (KII) interviewed and Focus Group Discussions (FGD)</i>	50
7.2	<i>Timeline of COVID-19 Progression through Year 2</i>	52
7.3	<i>Interview Instruments</i>	53

OUTLINE OF TABLES

Table 1:	Overview of Ukusekela – SPSF Year 2 Partner Organisations	11
Table 2:	Composition of the Year 2 Approvals Committee.....	17
Table 3:	Overview of the Ukusekela - SPSF Year 2 Partners	35
Table 4:	Breakdown of those interviewed from BftW and AFSA	50
Table 5:	Table of those interviewed from Inkunzi Isematholeni.....	50
Table 6:	Table of those interviewed from Port Dunford OVC Centre.....	51
Table 7:	Table of those interviewed from On Eagles' Wings.....	51
Table 8:	Table of those interviewed from Masivuke	51

ACRONYMS

ACRONYM	DESCRIPTION
AFSA	AIDS Foundation of South Africa
BftW	Bread for the World
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CMT	Community Media Trust
COVID-19	Coronavirus 2019
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DoH	Department of Health
DSD	Department of Social Development
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
GBV	Gender Based Violence
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HTS	HIV Testing Services
KIIs	Key Informant Interviews
KZN	KwaZulu Natal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPO	Non-Profit Organisation
RSA	Republic of South Africa
SPSF	Small Projects Support Fund
SR	Sub Recipient
TB	Tuberculosis
TOR	Terms of Reference
UIF	Unemployment Insurance Fund
ZAR	South African Rand

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 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.

AFSA implemented the second phase of the project (Year 2) between April 2020 and March 2021 through the same grant received from BftW in partnership with 6 initiatives that were located in 2 different provinces (KZN and Eastern Cape). This mid-term evaluation relates to Year 2 of the project.

The Ukusekela - 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 Ukusekela - 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.

1.2 Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the achievement of the project objectives and the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance as well as to some degree sustainability and impact of the implemented activities of the SPSF-Ukusekela Project in the two provinces where it was implemented in Year 2, namely KwaZulu Natal (4 partners) and Eastern Cape (2 partners).

1.3 Methodology

The evaluation utilized a mixed methods approach. The qualitative and quantitative data was collected using programme documents review, in-depth interviews (33), focus group discussions (3) and direct observations (4).

1.4 Summary Findings

The evaluation findings are presented on two levels namely:

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

1.4.1 AFSA operational level

1.4.1.1 Approvals Committee

The selection and deployment of the Approvals Committee for Year 2 was conducted well. It was decided that rather than the previous widespread advertising, the call for people to serve on the Approvals committee was to be shared with the Ukusekela SPSF networks including Yr. 1 SPSF partners. These networks and partners were provided information on the role of the Approvals Committee and then encouraged to nominate potential members. The 2 Mpumalanga representatives came from the SPSF partner organisations' nominations.

The Approvals Committee was well selected with good gender balance (3 women and 3 men), provincial representation (2 from each of the 3 targeted provinces) and broad skills and experience. They did their job well.

This committee will run again (probably with some additions) for Year 3 which will reduce the selection workload for the AFSA team.

1.4.1.2 The Impact of COVID-19 on the Year 2 programming

The Ukusekela - SPSF programme has been negatively affected by the COVID-19 pandemic because the implementation of the programme could only happen at a limited level in keeping with COVID-19 restrictions. The implementing partners at community level were sometimes not able to fully meet the required number of beneficiaries due to low participation from the community due to safety concerns around the pandemic and limited space available as on-going social distance is required.

As can be imagined, the progression of the COVID-19 pandemic in South Africa as described had a large impact on AFSA, the partner organisations and the country as a whole, and yet the SPSF programme continued and most of the targets were reached. This is a testimony to the hard work, flexibility and adaptability of all concerned.

1.4.1.3 Financial Reporting Challenges

Financial challenges had a wider impact within AFSA but also brought challenges to the Ukusekela Programme. Financial reports would be completed by the partners, and then by the SPSF team financial staff, but they were then not signed off quickly enough by the AFSA senior financial staff to allow for the release of funds from BftW to AFSA, or from AFSA to the partners. BftW is receiving funds from the German Government for the programme, and so it is imperative for them, that the reports are done and provided to them on time, allowing them to report adequately to their 'back' donor. BftW were very gracious in their understanding of the problem within AFSA and did their best to release funds as soon as they could, based on compliance by AFSA. They also provided financial capacity building support to AFSA at an organisational wide level, through a consultant to improve the situation. BftW appreciated the openness and honesty of the Ukusekela team around these issues.

1.4.1.4 Selection of beneficiary partner projects

Again, in Year 2 as in Year 1, there were many more applications (103) for the Ukusekela SPSF programme than expected and possible to support (maximum of 10 could be supported), even with a clearer advert and Terms of Reference. This created a lot of work for the AFSA team and the Approvals Committee as they sifted through the applications.

1.4.1.5 Timeframe for support

In line with the objectives, the organisations did improve their organisational sustainability through this project as they did in Year 1, 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.

1.4.1.6 Adaptability was key

It was hoped that as this was Year 2 of the Ukusekela Programme things would be able to run more smoothly than in Year 1, with all the systems and protocols in place. However, with the COVID-19 pandemic and also the financial challenges at AFSA, the programme team had to be

very 'nimble' and adaptable as they endeavoured to keep the programme on track. They managed very well under the trying circumstances

1.4.1.7 Encouragement of linkages for partners is critical for sustainability

With the ending of donor support from BftW and AFSA for the partners at the end of Year 2, 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 made extra effort at this in Year 2 and helped partners with this from early on, but the partners will need to continue this process to survive and flourish.

1.4.2 Sub-Recipient (partner organisation) level

1.4.2.1 The benefits of the Ukusekela - 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 Ukusekela - SPSF Project has been very successful at achieving its objectives – the project has been effective, efficient and relevant, even in the time of COVID-19:

- The organisations have very nearly met their targets as per their plans for the Ukusekela - SPSF Project despite the impact of COVID-19.
- The sub-recipients (partner organisations) in the Ukusekela - 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 Ukusekela - 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.
- 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.

1.4.2.2 Communication of partner organisations with AFSA

On the whole, despite communications being all virtual, by email or telephonic for most of the year, partners have communicated well with the AFSA team. They have been responsive about any changes they have wanted to make regarding the budget as they adapted to the realities of COVID-19.

1.5 Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic has made this a year like no other. The Ukusekela programme AFSA team would have gone into the year feeling prepared and having learned good lessons from Year 1 of the programme. The outbreak of COVID-19 in March 2020, just as Year 2 was about to begin, changed everything for the team, and they had to adapt quickly to ensure that the programme could continue at all. They have done remarkably well to support the partner organisations, build capacity and improve their networking during this year, using virtual learning platforms and emails rather than the planned and preferred physical visits and interactions.

The programme team also experienced financial management challenges which were not caused by them but the higher level financial systems of AFSA. Again as a team they had to adapt and adjust how they worked to allow the programme to continue. This involved clear communication with the donor and the partners about the situation as well adapting systems so that partners could be paid on time.

The way the staff team handled these above challenges to ensure the programme kept operating is commendable and bodes well for their ability to implement Year 3, despite there being many more partners involved.

The Ukusekela programme proved to be relevant, effective and put partners on the road to sustainability with improved internal capacity and networking skills and linkages. The restoration of hope that is evident remains a critical factor in the empowerment and development of the target communities. Women hold key positions for implementation and management in the partner organisations which shows how they continue to be on the frontlines in embracing community centred approaches for the development of their communities.

Lessons are being learned along the way for AFSA and BftW, as well as the partners. These lessons will help to refine the programme, as a true pilot, for future cycles beyond 2022. It is hoped that BftW will be encouraged by the very positive results of this programme, to fund into the future, but also that the results shown will attract other donors to join the programme for the

benefit of many more partner organisations and the communities they serve for many years to come.

1.6 Recommendations

1. The project aims to provide a 'kick-start' to projects over a short period with targeted funding. It contributes towards long term sustainability of the project or organisation (full sustainability is not possible in this timeframe, and probably not even after 3 years of funding). However, the foundations have been laid in this time, through the support and capacity building provided by AFSA, 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. This support has encouraged the longer-term sustainability of the partner projects.

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.

2. 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.
3. The AFSA Ukusekela - SPSF team should continue to ensure (as they did in Year 2) that the Approvals Committee be kept informed on an ongoing basis, 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. It is also recommended that there is one meeting with BftW, SPSF staff and the approval committee members per year.
4. The Ukusekela Programme should, in Year 3, with at least 17 organisations being selected, make selections around certain themes, so that the programme is easier to manage and understand for the AFSA staff who will be stretched to capacity.
5. Not enough time was given to fundraising capacity building for the organisations in the training that was provided. It would be beneficial if they received help to put together a proposal with a logframe. It is important that it is a logically connected proposal. 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.
6. Publish the calls for applications on the Ukusekela website instead of the AFSA website. Application formats and documents should be downloadable from the Ukusekela website. There can be a reference to this website at the AFSA website but the main promotion of the Ukusekela SPSF should be done via the new Ukusekela website. Further, suitable information about capacity building, webinars, networking events etc. for the Ukusekela SPSF partner organisations should be published on the website. Develop a dashboard on the website plotting all the organisations that the Ukusekela Programme has partnered with over the 3 years of the pilot. This would allow existing and potential funders to see the reach of the project and some of the outcomes.

7. AFSA must ensure that financial reporting challenges do not occur in Year 3 and to this end must ensure that the staffing and systems are all in place and monitored on a regular basis.
8. AFSA is going to need an increase in personnel capacity or should relook at current duty segregation in order to support more Partners in Year 3 as the targeted number of Partners is 17. This is to avoid compromising on the quality of support given to partners. Further to this, to ensure that the application process is efficient and timely, temporary staff will need to be considered for the duration of the applications screening.
9. 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.
10. An annual networking meeting (with other communications throughout the year) between the Ukusekela - SPSF partners organisations in South Africa, Brazil and Sierra Leone, would build the skills and knowledge base of the SPSF programme in these countries
11. Work with organisations early on in Year 3 to see who they could network with (using a Stakeholder analysis) and then spend the whole year helping them with links for this relationship so that networking is an even greater priority in Year 3.
12. Find ways to ensure continued commitment to reporting by the partners throughout the year. Partners should be made well aware of reporting requirements at the beginning of their project support and should face penalties if they are not reporting adequately during the project period. These penalties could include restrictions on their office support costs provided by AFSA.
13. 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 (and AFSA) must focus great effort to help them to develop and maintain these linkages
14. Continue to work to accrue increased and ongoing benefits from the Ukusekela - SPSF Project. As shown the partner organisations have benefited greatly from the Ukusekela - 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.

2 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

2.1 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 3 geographical provinces.

AFSA implemented the second phase of the project (Year 2) between April 2020 and March 2021 through the same grant received from BftW in partnership with 6 initiatives that were located in 2 different provinces (KZN and Eastern Cape). This mid-term evaluation relates to Year 2 of the project.

The Ukusekela - 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 Ukusekela - SPSF is made up of two components each to be implemented annually. This mid-term evaluation is for component 1.

2.1.1 Component 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.

2.1.2 Overview of projects supported

Table 1: Overview of Ukusekela – SPSF Year 2 Partner Organisations

No.	Name of Project	Focus of the Ukusekela - SPSF Programme	Province	Grant provided
1	Inkunzi Isematholeni Foundation	Focus is on working with local schools and with the community where young boys and men are enrolled for a voluntary life skills programme. Those enrolled also receive a package of services such as being involved in sports activities, medical male circumcision and working with Department of Social Development to create gender-based violence awareness.	KwaZulu Natal	R80,000
2	Siyasindisa Academy	Focus is on introducing both young males and females to water sports, raising awareness on water safety, how to be safe around water and inclusion of SRH sessions to address the social ills and pressures faced by the youth.	KwaZulu Natal	R90,000
3	Port Dunford OVC Centre	Focus is on giving support to orphans, vulnerable and neglected children by providing nutrition, homework supervision, counselling, and life skills through sport.	KwaZulu Natal	R120,000

4	Shap Shap Cinemas	Focus is on providing access to information on health topics by using their own developed booklet that talks about different health topics. Youth focused skills development programmes that seek to eliminate gender-based violence, teenage pregnancy and educate young girls on topics that affect them in communities.	KwaZulu Natal	R90,000
5	On Eagles' Wings Multi-Purpose Centre	Focus is on eliminating gender-based violence, provision of counselling services to families and individuals, an SRH program in schools, where they also supply sanitary pads to young girls.	Eastern Cape	R90,000
6	Masivuke Community Development	Focus is on addressing the violation of human rights of the Lesbian, Gays, Bisexual, Transgender and LGBTIQI community through conducting workshops and educating the community about LGBTQIA issues.	Eastern Cape	R90,000

2.1.3 Objectives of the Ukusekela - SPSF

The objectives of the Ukusekela - 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.

2.1.4 Purpose of the Evaluation (Ukusekela -SPSF)

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the achievement of the project objectives and the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance as well as to some degree sustainability and impact of the implemented activities of the Ukusekela - SPSF Project in the two provinces where it was implemented in Year 2, namely Kwa Zulu Natal and Eastern Cape. This mid-term evaluation covers year 2 of 3 of the Ukusekela - SPSF. Year 1 was evaluated in March 2020 and a final evaluation will be conducted in 2022 for the entire 3-year programme.

The key users of the evaluation results are 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 and project strategy of a subsequent project phase.

2.1.5 Scope and methods of the work

The evaluation:

- Assessed the outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project from April 2020 to March 2021.
- Assessed whether the supported initiatives achieved their project objectives, and if not why? It also sought to assess whether AFSA is on track with the project with regards to the roll out of year 2 as it is in the process of being finalized.
- Identified key successes of the implemented activities as well as key challenges that were encountered by the initiatives during the implementation of the programme.
- Determined whether there were additional outputs or outcomes which were unspecified.
- Identified whether there were potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit the initiatives involved and AFSA as well as BfdW.

- Assessed the value of the programme, intended and unintended, positive and negative impacts. An overall assessment was required in terms of social return on overall investment. This specifically looked 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, recommendations were made to the areas which would improve the return on investment in the replication of the programme.
- Lessons learnt were specified and key approaches were recommended to support the implementation of similar projects in future and the continued work of AFSA in the Year 3 funding cycle.

3 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.

3.1 Evaluation approach – mixed methods approach

The evaluation utilized a mixed methods research methodology, which involved integrating quantitative and qualitative data gathered through 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.

3.2 Data Collection Methods

3.2.1 Qualitative data collection

3.2.1.1 Review of Documents

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.

3.2.1.2 Field visits (Site visits) - Sampling

Four of the six active projects were selected to be evaluated two per Province). In each Province they were selected regarding location, languages spoken, activity of the projects as outlined below:

1. Inkunzi Isematholeni – Imbali, Pietermaritzburg, KwaZulu Natal
2. Port Dunford OVC Centre – Port Dunford Reserve near Mkhonto Kayise Clinic Esikhawini, Richards Bay, KwaZulu Natal
3. On Eagles' Wings – Jeffreys Bay, Eastern Cape
4. Masivuke Community Development – Duncan Village, East London, Eastern Cape

3.2.1.3 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 33 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.

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 (3) FGDs were held with 47 participants. FGD discussion questions were developed based on the evaluation questions.

The participants were selected randomly by the evaluators on arrival at the site.

Observations

A total number of four (4) observations took place at the sites where the initiatives are occurring.

3.2.2 Quantitative data collection

3.2.2.1 Review of documents

Quantitative data was gathered from programme documents that were reviewed and analysed. Data that was provided verbally from interview or focus group participants was triangulated with either other verbal sources or programme documents.

3.2.3 Qualitative and Quantitative 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. Quantitative data was primarily used to determine if planned outputs had been achieved so this data was analysed against the planned outputs of each evaluated partner and the project.

4 FINDINGS

The evaluation findings are presented on two levels namely:

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

4.1 AFSA OPERATIONAL LEVEL

4.1.1 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.

The HIV Prevention Program Manager 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 and to implement the pilot project over these three years. 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 also managing other grants 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 continues to be a good relationship of learning between AFSA and BftW in the implementation of this project. The BftW representative continues to be happy with the Interim report (6 monthly) and end of year report. They are always on time and well written with attachments that provide information on the projects and the training provided.

During Year 2 of the Ukusekela SPSF Project, some very important changes took place in the leadership of AFSA. AFSA's long standing Chief Executive Officer, Ms Debbie Mathew retired at the end of March 2020 after more than 28 years of service. AFSA struggled to find a suitable replacement and in the interim AFSA, Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Ms Nivanie Pillay was appointed as acting CEO for a period of 6 months. AFSA internal auditors, Bonakude deployed an accountant to serve as acting Senior Finance Manager (SFM) for this period, while AFSA existing Senior Financial Manager Mr Mpilo Nxumalo served as acting CFO, taking over Ms Pillay's CFO duties.

In September 2020, AFSA's Board of Directors appointed Ms Ntombenhle Mkhize as AFSA's new Chief Executive Officer. Ms Mkhize has a background in Community Studies. She has worked extensively in sub-Saharan Africa where she worked to strengthen cooperation within regional projects.

There have been a number of changes to the staff composition of the finance department, in an attempt to create more efficient ways of working and as a result of AFSA being granted additional grants from other donors. Consequently, the finance team supporting the Ukusekela - SPSF has seen some changes to their structure. There is a Grant Accountant appointed to support the SPSF programme, namely Ms Nomonde Mkulisi. She is supported by two Junior Finance Officers; one is funded by Ukusekela and one is funded by AFSA. With the support of ZIYO (an accounting consultancy provided by BftW), the intention is to strengthen the support to the Ukusekela - SPSF programme from the finance staff to ensure that internal financial reporting and audits are completed accurately and timeously, while ensuring that partners receive sufficient capacity building support and that their funds are remitted efficiently.

Challenges were shared with BftW timeously through skype calls and emails. It is felt that the project is now established with protocols in place so in the 3rd 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.

4.1.2 Impact of COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a fundamental impact on the needs of communities and has threatened their livelihoods, this has had a major impact on the Ukusekela - SPSF and forced the AFSA team and partner organisations to reconsider methods of implementation.

The Ukusekela - SPSF programme has been negatively affected by the COVID-19 pandemic because the implementation of the programme could only happen at a limited level in keeping with COVID-19 restrictions. The implementing partners at community level were sometimes not able to fully meet the required number of beneficiaries due to low participation from the community due to safety concerns around the pandemic and limited space available as on-going social distance is required.

Please refer to Annex 2 for a timeline of the COVID-19 Progression through Year 2

As can be imagined, the progression of the COVID-19 pandemic in South Africa as described had a large impact on AFSA, the partner organisations and the country as a whole, and yet the Ukusekela - SPSF programme continued and most of the targets were reached. This is a testimony to the hard work, flexibility and adaptability of all concerned.

RECOMMENDATION
<p>The project aims to provide a 'kick-start' to projects over a short period with targeted funding. It contributes towards long term sustainability of the project or organisation (full sustainability is not possible in this timeframe, and probably not even after 3 years of funding). However, the foundations have been laid in this time, through the support and capacity building provided by AFSA, 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. This support has encouraged the longer-term sustainability of the partner projects.</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>

4.1.3 Selection of Approvals Committee

The Ukusekela - SPSF project had an Approvals Committee in Year 2 again, as in Year 1, to identify and approve the organisations/projects that were to receive funding. The selection and deployment of the Approvals Committee for Year 2 was conducted well. It was decided that rather than the previous widespread advertising, the call for people to serve on the Approvals committee was to be shared with the Ukusekela (SPSF) networks including Year 1 SPSF partners. These networks and partners were provided with information on the role of the Approvals Committee and then encouraged to nominate potential members. The two Mpumalanga representatives came from the SPSF partner organisations' nominations.

The committee did their job well. 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 (3 women and 3 men), provincial representation (2 from each of the 3 targeted provinces) and broad skills and experience.

Table 2: Composition of the Year 2 Approvals Committee

Name and Role	Area of expertise
1. Lindiwe Dlamini KZN- Female	Social worker with governance, SMME development and entrepreneurship skills. Passionate about community development. Lindiwe served in the committee in Year 1 and is the chairperson of this committee.
2. Sduduzo Blose KZN - Male	A pastor, an activist, an avid researcher, with a palate for a wide range of subjects from gender related issues to critical race theory and their interplay within the Hermeneutics space. He is currently pursuing his PhD in amplifying marginalized voices, within the area of Biblical Interpretation, through a Post-Colonial reading of religious texts. He has extensive experience in the advocacy space through work with various organisations like UN Women, Sonke Gender Justice and others.
3. Damon Greville Mpumalanga - Male	Serves on the Pastoral team and elders committee in his church. Executive Director for Pro-Vision International which is a missionary, and community-based organisation support ministry, which seeks to mentor CBO's that are implementing nation building activities and helps them with fundraising initiatives as well. Has over 40 years in Faith life & Ministry.
4. Witus Matukane Mpumalanga - Male	Business consultant with extensive quality assurance background, monitoring and evaluation, facilitates training interventions for Learning program design and development, CBO upskilling programmes. Volunteers his time for consultancy and runs community-based initiatives in MP province like a local community newspaper and is in the process of establishing a radio station that seeks to combat some of the social ills amongst the youth.
5. Nomtha Ndyoko Eastern Cape - Female	A full-time Writer, Poet, Singer/Song-Writer, Writing workshop Facilitator. She also works as a brand strategist and social media manager, Co-Curator at ALT BLK CONTINUA (An Alternative Music Series). She has experience in running community development programmes that are focused on learner development using the Arts.
6. Abongile Davani Eastern Cape - Female	An activist that is passionate about community development as well as women and youth empowerment. She currently serves as a committee chairperson at the Eastern Cape LBGTQIA+ forum which advocates for the rights of LBGTQIA+ people since 2008. She also performs tasks such as managing the team, networking, mentoring young women, marketing the organization through social media platforms and develop new concepts for content development. She has passion for literacy at community level and runs literacy workshops and readathons for the younger generation to encourage reading.

The process of selection for the Approvals Committee was very involved (advertising, receiving applications, checking references, conducting interviews, providing guidance), and BftW were again surprised that AFSA were planning to change the committee members each year. The

reason for this that was provided was that the change 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 and orientation process each year. One member of the Year 1 Approvals Committee, Lindiwe Dlamini, continued to serve in Year 2, but the others were all recruited for Year 2. Lindiwe Dlamini (Chairperson) will continue to serve in Year 3 to provide continuity.

The same Approvals Committee will be kept for Year 3, and some members will be added as there are to be more partners to select in Year 3.

Each committee member received data throughout the year and a small gift for their services at the end of the year (This was a KZN promotional bag and a book to read).

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.

4.1.3.1 Role of the Approvals Committee after selection of initiatives

Following on from the recommendation in the Year 1 evaluation the Approvals Committee have been kept better informed of project developments in Year 2 after the selections have been made and due to this, they now felt they were better equipped to be involved in the selection process for Year 3. Communication is aided by the use of a Whatsapp group for the AFSA team and the Approvals Committee which enables the team to provide updates about the organisations to the Approvals Committee.

RECOMMENDATION
The AFSA SPSF team should continue to ensure (as they did in Year 2), that the Approvals Committee be kept informed on an ongoing basis 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. It is also recommended that there is also one meeting with BftW, SPSF staff and the approval committee members per year.

4.1.4 Selection of partner initiatives

The process of advertising and selection was conducted as follows:

1. Call for applications was put out in December 2019 in 3 local newspapers for each of the provinces which had readership from the targeted communities. AFSA tried to advertise widely through 3 national newspapers plus NGO Pulse, AFSA Staff shared with their networks, it was advertised on the AFSA website, and BftW funded organisations were also made aware of the call.
2. AFSA received applications via post, courier and those that were hand delivered. People physically deliver proposals otherwise the AFSA staff say it is a nightmare to get adequate documentation e.g., through email. This is due to documents not being labelled correctly and the on-going load shedding which results in down time in the mailbox server/emails.

3. Applications were then screened according to set criteria in the Terms of Reference.
4. Review of the applications was conducted by the 6 members of the Approvals Committee in Durban from 10th March 2020 till 13th March 2020.

The presence of the Approvals Committee meant that the selection of projects to support was independent and non-partisan. The selection criteria were similar to Year 1 and described below:

- Province – needed balance of projects across KZN, Mpumalanga and E. Cape. Due to COVID-19 and travel restrictions it was not possible to visit Mpumalanga organisations to conduct due diligence despite the organisations being shortlisted/selected by the committee. Due to this, these organisations were not incorporated into the SPSF Year 2. However, later in November 2020 these organisations were visited to conduct Due Diligence in preparation for them participating in Year 3 as recommended by BftW.
- Theme of project - responding to environmental, social justice or gender-based issues
- HIV projects were not selected – there were less of these than in Year 1, due to even more explicit adverts in this regard.
- 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.
- Projects that involved women or youth, 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 again surprised to receive many applications, around 100, so not quite as many as the over 200 applications of Year 1 (probably due to less HIV projects applying). The high number of applications would still be 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.

A total of 103 applications were received from all 3 respective provinces, respectively 38 were from the Eastern Cape, 48 from Kwa-Zulu Natal and 17 from Mpumalanga. Upon screening according to the exclusions criteria shortlisted applications that were reviewed by the Approvals Committee were 15 from Eastern Cape, 19 from Kwa Zulu Natal and 6 from Mpumalanga. This resulted in the funding of 6 sub recipients (SR's) organisations in total: 2 from Eastern Cape Province and 4 from Kwa Zulu Natal Province.

Narrative Report April- Sept 2020

The review of the applications took place in March 2020 at AFSA offices in Durban with the 6 committee members. The process followed with initially selected organisations was as follows:

1. Pre-grant assessment visits were conducted to all the recommended organisations in the 2 provinces: Eastern Cape and Kwa Zulu Natal.
2. Successful organisations were guided through the programme design phase (development of a workplan and a budget) and thereafter the granting phase followed
3. Funded partner organisations were paid an initial tranche in order to start implementation of their said activities according to the prescribed calendar month as per approved work plan and budget. Support was also given to them on how best to implement the planned activities. Where implementation challenges occurred, catch up plans were submitted for review and approval by the CPH.

4. Upon approval of the monthly narrative and financial reports to AFSA and all required means of verification received, the following month's tranche was disbursed to all the 6 partners.

The partners were guided virtually on the programme design phase and were oriented virtually on AFSA granting process, reporting tools and reporting requirements for programmes and financial aspects of their initiatives. The granting process was finalised in May 2020 - it took a longer time than expected due to it being done on a virtual basis and it was a first for most of the partners. AFSA was able to disburse the first tranche in May 2020 allowing the partners to start their implementation.

The Chairperson of the Approvals Committee who served in Year 1 and Year 2 stated that AFSA and the Approvals Committee have improved in the selection and mentoring of organisations. There is a better quality of organisation applying and getting through the selection criteria.

The programme is implemented in 3 provinces namely Kwa Zulu Natal, Eastern Cape & Mpumalanga but under year 2 it was only implemented in 2 provinces Kwa Zulu Natal & Eastern Cape due to the travel ban that was imposed at the start of the pandemic. The funds that were earmarked for Year 2 will now be used for Year 3. Organisations from Mpumalanga that had been shortlisted for Year 2 but were left out due to the travel ban not allowing for compliance checks/ visits to take place, will now be incorporated into the Ukusekela Project in Year 3.

The Ukusekela - SPSF Programme was to take 10 organisations each year for three years. In reality, only 6 have been taken in Year 1 and six in Year 2 which leaves 18 organisations to be involved in the programme in Year 3. This presents a challenge for the AFSA team in terms of coping with that increased number (three times the number of each of the previous years).

4.1.5 Assessment of the outcomes, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of the project from April 2020 to March 2021.

4.1.5.1 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 could only be fully assessed after the 3 years. However, an assessment of progress towards project objectives for Year 2 is provided below.

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

The indicator for this objective is:

1. At least 75% of the projects have been successfully implemented during their project period (measured by progress towards project objective in reports).

It is clear from the attached evaluation reports of each partner, and by talking to the AFSA Ukusekela - SPSF staff that the 6 partner organisations in Year 2 of the programme were able

to implement their development projects, almost to the plan, despite the very large disruption of COVID-19 in South Africa since March 2020. Not only were the projects implemented but they did improve the living conditions of the beneficiary groups and the wider community.

The role of the AFSA team in this process was that of programming technical and financial support, funding and guidance to improve the organisations.

Regarding implementation:

- Inkunzi Isematholeni was able to provide for most of their beneficiaries (some reduction due to COVID-19 restrictions):
 - Increased education and awareness on gender-based violence (GBV) amongst boys and men
 - COVID-19 education awareness
 - TB, STI and male circumcision awareness education
 - Life skills and mentorship programme for boys at the Mayors Walk shelter
- Port Dunford OVC Centre provided services for all the beneficiaries which improved their living conditions:
 - Preparing and serving nutritional meal to our 112 beneficiaries for 5 days each week
 - Sports activities with Lifeskills for 112 beneficiaries (suspended during lockdown)
 - Homework supervision for 112 beneficiaries happened in a cautious manner under strict COVID Protocols
 - First Aid training took place but the planned Childcare training did not due to the departure of the staff worker who was to be trained
- On Eagles' Wings achieved all their planned activities and reached more than their target numbers of beneficiaries for the improvement of living conditions:
 - Provision of an integrated Sexual Reproductive Health Rights (SRHR) Intervention Programme through the implementation of 24 educational sessions (workshops) targeting 40 young people (20 boys and 20 girls)
 - Provision of educational programmes on substance abuse in relation to crime and it being a driver of Gender-Based Violence (GBV) to 40 young boys and girls
 - Provision of integrated, developmental and comprehensive family care and informal educational talks with 24 parents, 10 School Governing Bodies, 10 Circumcision Leaders and Faith Based Organisations
 - Capacity building / training of staff on COVID19 sensitisation
- Masivuke did in many instances far surpass the targets they had set and so improved the living conditions of more beneficiaries than planned:
 - Training of Human Rights Ambassadors (10), inclusivity workshops and community dialogues to address the violation of Human Rights of LGBTQI+ people in communities and to facilitate the creation of safe spaces for them
 - Round table discussions and campaigns advocating for Human Rights and Equality relating to access to health care and other services. These activities were partially achieved. COVID-19 restricted some of these activities.
 - Community workshops to address patriarchal issues - Gender-Based Violence (GBV) and Human Rights violations particularly as they relate to People with Disabilities

- Capacity building / training of staff on COVID19 sensitisation

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

4.1.5.1.2 Objective 2: Funded applicants are strengthened as organisations.

The indicator for this objective is:

At least 75% of the funded applicants have improved their organisational skills (e.g., functioning management boards, accurate and timely financial and activity reports, adapted PME system).

As in Year 1, the capacity building formed a very important and much needed component of the Ukusekela - SPSF project in Year 2.

Due to COVID-19 all the training occurred online in Year 2, which had advantages and disadvantages. The advantage was that more training could take place as there were no logistical issues to be dealt with and costs were reduced due the fact that travel and accommodation costs were not required. Having said that there were logistical issues regarding communication and coordination of the online training sessions with the partners. Disadvantages include the fact that there is less one to one interaction between AFSA staff and the partner staff which hinders relationship building. There were sometimes connection issues (even though data was provided to the participants (for 2 devices per organisation) for the training).

Most of the training was conducted 'in house' by the Programme Coordinator and the Project Officer. Each training course lasted 3 hours. The courses were as laid out below:

1. May 2020 – Introduction to the Ukusekela - SPSF Programme – processes and procedures.
2. June 2020 - Reporting tools and report writing
3. July 2020 - Organisational administration and governance
4. November 2020 – Social media guide – how to use social media as an organisation
5. November 2020 - DG Murray Trust Masked Heroes Campaign provided a workshop of Psychological First Aid skills. The workshop was aimed at equipping community care workers with the skills to cope with life and work during the pandemic. It was also a training of trainers, so the person who got trained in these skills could train others as well. Also linked to the workshop was a food voucher programme for affected community care workers. The workshop was delivered to a group of 10-15 people by a qualified mental health practitioner. It was a 5-hour workshop conducted online via Zoom. The workshop was free of charge to AFSA and the participants. All the partner organisations participated with the data provided.
6. January 2021 - Organisational Development training provided by ENZI Africa. This was conducted online over three days. The course involved teaching and participation. Sadly, on the last day one team was not able to make a presentation due to connection issues. The trainer then offered one day of one on one follow up with organisations that desired this.
7. January 2021 - Finance team training – this was conducted in-house by the AFSA finance team.

The Project Officer reported that he could see the improvement in the organisations after each session, shown by changes in the way they were run, changes in governance, improved narrative and financial reporting.

On-going telephonic and email support has been offered to the SPSF partners on programme implementation including the implications of COVID-19 for their work.

At the review of each monthly narrative report from the Partners, mentoring and coaching sessions were arranged to give them feedback on their reports and strategies on how to maximise reach and impact of their initiatives. In depth technical skills were offered during the quarterly site visits that were conducted in the month of July to the 4 funded Partners in Kwa Zulu Natal where targets achieved were reviewed in line with programme indicators and remapping of some of the activities were done on how best to maximise in overall programme achievement where necessary. In September after the easing of the lockdown restrictions from level 3 to level 2 which allowed inter provincial travel, the team was able to conduct site visits to the Eastern Cape funded organisations where more time was spent with them watching some of their implementation activities. All the funded Partners in both provinces were taken through a strategic planning session where a SWOT analysis mapping was done and stakeholder analysis was also completed. These analyses are for the partners to use as working documents in order to create and build other strategic alliances to ensure the sustainability of their projects.

In October and November of 2020, the Project Officer pursued a relationship with Community Media Trust (CMT)-Siyayinqoba¹, through the programme networks, to roll out facilitation skills to the Shap Shap and Siyasindisa Academy as well as work with their beneficiaries on CMT programmes.

The monthly review of the reports from the Partners presented a platform to provide on-going mentoring and coaching as a means of engagement where feedback is given to the Partners on a regular basis.

An example of the input given is the suggestions made by the AFSA team in March 2021 for Masivuke:

1. To have a board development workshop
2. To have a workshop with a consultant/facilitator who will help them formulate a strategic plan
3. Organisations were suggested that could be approached for funding

It is too early to see if these suggestions have been followed up yet, but they were received favourably.

In March 2021, the AFSA staff also received online training from Southern Hemisphere consultancy on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). They were encouraged to focus on outcomes and impact in evaluating the work and on putting together a Theory of Change. The AFSA HIV Prevention Manager said it would be good to incorporate these learnings into the SPSF Ukusekela Programme and they would be using these tools with the Year 3 partners.

For the Inkunzi Isematholeni staff who benefited from the training it led to:

¹ Community Media Trust website: <https://www.cmt.org.za/current-projects/siyayinqoba-3/>

- Improved project planning and execution. Narrative and financial reporting skills were enhanced through supervision by AFSA. Sticking to approved budgets, and/or where required, making necessary motivations for diversions is another skill they have gained from AFSA's capacity building programme.
- Improved presentation and facilitation skills for the Project facilitator. He has gained confidence in addressing a crowd. He is more logical in presenting the subject matter to the participants.

Port Dunford OVC Centre project team was excited that they received training and skills development during the AFSA funding period. Besides the standard financial management skills (budgeting, bookkeeping, record keeping and report writing) the project team learnt to produce their own short public relations videos for social network (Facebook in particular). They also learnt to use Google Drive to store and retrieve their records (data). Their information management skills improved a lot.

The On Eagles' Wings staff appreciated the training they received from AFSA very much as shown below:

- The Programme Management and the tools they were taught to use such as those for Planning, Monthly Reporting (going beyond numbers – telling the story behind the numbers) and the Timesheets training were all very helpful.
- The Financial Management training was helpful and appreciated, including the training on how to record transactions and file the relevant evidence of transactions.
- The training on Governance was helpful and appreciated.
- The training by Enzo Africa was extremely helpful and appreciated.

For Masivuke the support provided by AFSA on general programme management and more particularly on adhering to programme and financial reporting standards was extremely appreciated. The DGMT training on linkages was said to have been good. So was that by ENZO Africa.

However, according to Masivuke, the services of the accountant were not as effective as they could have been. They cited an instance when the accountant delivered a particular service too late for it to be of any assistance to them.

The capacity development also included ongoing mentoring with monthly reporting. Due to COVID-19 site visits only took place in July and September. These were very much appreciated by the partners and helped to cement relationships between AFSA and the partners. It is a pity that more visits could not take place in Year 2, but it is hoped that they can be more frequent in Year 3.

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 and the evaluators / researchers have noted a large improvement in the quality of reports received from partners between May 2020 and March 2021 which also illustrates improved capacity.

Other areas of successful 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.

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. It would be beneficial if they received help to put together a proposal with a logframe. It is important that it is a logically connected proposal.

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.

4.1.5.1.3 Key Sub-Objective: To equip the sub recipients with networking skills in order for them to be able to network with other actors in the field.

Efforts were made by the AFSA Ukusekela - 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 as listed below:

- In Year 2, efforts were made by AFSA early on to conduct a stakeholder analysis with each SPSF partner and to emphasise the importance of an MOU with a possible partner organisation. The stakeholder analysis encouraged improved networking and linkages to be formed with other organisations.
- All of the funded Partners activated social media accounts as a means to increase visibility and showcase their work. However not all of them are actively uploading content on these sites which is still an area of development for them.
- The use of banners and branded material continues to be encouraged by the Partners in all their engagement with stakeholders.
- Linkages were encouraged between Ukusekela partner organisations by the AFSA team, for example, efforts were made for Siyasindisa Life saving academy and Inkunzi Isematholeni to network more with each other, foster a relationship of working together and involve each other in their existing networks
- A Whatsapp group was used for all partners to share achievements and activities plus other matters.
- In Sept the Programme Coordinator and the Project Officer developed a strategic plan to describe how Ukusekela - SPSF organisations could work with each other better. Due to COVID-19 restrictions, the Year 2 partners never met together in person, only online.

- Shap Shap Cinemas based in Hammarsdale had a focus on rape and GBV. They were linked by AFSA with On Eagles' Wings who have a sexual and reproductive health programme. Both organisations work with young women and girls as their key programme beneficiaries so they were able to share lessons learned and best practices with each other. The results were not as good as AFSA expected, but at least a relationship had been formed which could bear fruit in the future.
- AFSA's efforts to link On Eagles' Wings up with another organisation (Sonke Gender Justice) was appreciated. In this regard, AFSA sent an e-mail to Sonke Gender Justice suggesting the establishment of a working relationship between the two organisations. The relationship would help enhance On Eagles Wings programming around gender equality and addressing gender-based violence. However, despite AFSA following up on the initial e-mail, Sonke Gender Justice had not responded at the time of this report.
- AFSA linked Inkunzi Isematholeni with Siyandisa Academy and they collaborated for a silent march in December 2020.
- 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.

4.1.5.1 Ukusekela Programme Website

Networking, publicity and linkages will be improved with the development of the Ukusekela website. The website is about to go 'live'. It includes links to the SPSF partner organisations' (past and present) social media sites.

The development of a dashboard of partner organisations that could be placed on the website would aid those organisations as funders see the reach of each project.

RECOMMENDATION

Ukusekela Website

The calls for applications should be published here instead of the AFSA website. Application formats and documents should be downloadable from this website. There can be a reference to this website at the AFSA website but the main promotion of the Ukusekela SPSF should be done via the new Ukusekela website. Further, suitable information about capacity building, webinars, networking events etc. for the Ukusekela SPSF partner organisations shall be published on the website

Develop a dashboard on the website plotting all the organisations that the Ukusekela Programme has partnered with over the 3 years of the pilot. This would allow existing and potential funders to see the reach of the project and some of the outcomes.

4.1.5.2 Assessment of Ukusekela - 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 Ukusekela - SPSF Project partner organisations had low-cost implications and so was conducted efficiently.

2. One issue that should be mentioned in this section is the negative impact on efficiency due to the AFSA challenges regarding financial reporting. It cost a lot of time and nerves for both BftW and AFSA/Ukusekela - SPSF staff and delayed the release of funds from BftW to AFSA and therefore delayed the release of funds to the SPSF partner organisations and consequent implementation of projects.
3. 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 Ukusekela - SPSF Team to ensure that they were using the funds as planned.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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

4.1.5.3 Assessment of the relevance of the Ukusekela - SPSF Project

The whole premise of the Ukusekela - SPSF Project is that it would seek out the most relevant projects to support. It would not come with thematic criteria that the organisations had to align with, regarding the 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).

4.1.5.4 Is AFSA is on track with the project with regards to the roll out of year 2

Despite the impacts of COVID-19 the six projects that were funded have managed to complete their activities and Year 2 is on track to be completed in March 2021.

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

4.1.5.5 Monitoring by AFSA

The AFSA team provided ongoing monitoring of the Ukusekela - 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. Observations were also made on programme roll out with direct beneficiaries to check if full benefit is reaped by the programme beneficiaries.

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.

4.1.5.6 A Brief Comparison of Year 1 and Year 2 rollout of the Ukusekela - SPSF Project

According to the AFSA HIV Prevention Manager the Year 1 organisations were really grassroots organisations that needed a lot of support. The Year 2 organisations were then selected as those who had had some funding before plus were able to present 2 years of financial reports. This meant that they were higher calibre organisations.

In Year 1, anything was amazing but in Year 2 the expectations were higher. Year 2 should have gone really well, but then COVID-19 happened and AFSA and the selected organisations had to adapt and adjust, go virtual, experience lockdown with restrictions on activities.

According to the AFSA HIV Prevention Manager the Year 2 organisations have done REALLY WELL in the circumstances.

4.1.5.7 Ongoing linkages with Year 1 partners

Some linkages have been maintained between AFSA and the Year 1 partners:

- Sizakele Tshabalala of the Year 1 partner, Shechem is now part of the Year 3 Approvals Committee
- A Year 1 organisation – Simama Career Centre in Kokstad received funding from LOTTO. The earlier funding from, and relationship with the Ukusekela Programme had aided them in the application
- The Year 1 organisation, Sabie and Kruger now has office space, When the AFSA team conducted close out visits in Nov 2020 they were sharing offices. They were also offering support to small organisations in their community.
- Ithubalethu Old Age Home in Mpumalanga and Lixhase 301 piggery from Eastern Cape also received funding from LOTTO.

The above instances point to the ongoing sustainability of the Ukusekela programme in the life of the partners who are funded for one year only.

4.1.6 Successes and Challenges

4.1.6.1 Key successes

4.1.6.1.1 Adapting to COVID-19

The AFSA staff team adapted quickly to the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure that the programme could continue and achieve its objectives.

4.1.6.2 Key Challenges

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

4.1.6.2.1 The Impact of COVID-19 on the Programme

The huge impact of COVID-19 on the Ukusekela programme has been mentioned earlier. This was the greatest challenge to the success of the programme in Year 2.

As stated, everything had to be done virtually, and this required early adaptation by the AFSA team and the partners. There could be no physical meetings until later in the year when the AFSA team could travel around, firstly, KZN and then later, Eastern Cape Province to perform site visits. This meant that organisations were taken into the programme without site visits, purely on the strength of their paperwork – proposal, plans and budget. Despite this the organisations that were chosen all fitted into the Ukusekela programme well and were proved worthy of the funding and support.

The selected partners in Mpumalanga could not be visited, and so were not taken on in Year 2. This meant that only 6 partners out of the possible 10 partners were supported in Year 2. If COVID-19 had not been present then 10 partners would have been supported, which would have eased the burden on Year 3.

The way of working with the partner organisations changed and was adapted as the year progressed. The partners also had to change their plans as the regulations and protocols changed. For example, Siyasindisa Academy were not allowed to use swimming pools for most of the year (the programme centred around using swimming pools for swimming training) and so had to adapt their programme accordingly.

4.1.6.2.2 Financial Reporting Challenges within AFSA

The second key challenge of Year 2 for the Ukusekela Programme was the challenge around the AFSA financial reporting which meant that relationships with the donor, and with the partners were put to the test.

As stated earlier, there were several major staffing changes within AFSA during the year which included changes of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and Senior Financial Manager (SFM).

This had a wider impact within AFSA but also brought challenges to the Ukusekela Programme. Financial reports would be completed by the partners, and then by the Ukusekela - SPSF team financial staff, but they were then not signed off quickly enough by the AFSA senior financial staff to allow for the release of funds from BftW to AFSA, or from AFSA to the partners.

BftW is receiving funds from the German Government for the programme, and so it is imperative for them, that the reports are done and provided to them on time, allowing them to report adequately to their 'back' donor. BftW were very gracious in their understanding of the problem within AFSA and did their best to release funds as soon as they could, based on compliance by AFSA. They also provided financial capacity building support to AFSA at an organisational wide level, through a consultant to improve the situation. BftW appreciated the openness and honesty of the Ukusekela team around these issues.

BftW had partnered with AFSA because of the strong reputation of AFSA in handling funds for sub recipients – this was AFSA's strength, so they were very surprised when AFSA experienced the above challenges. It is imperative that AFSA is able to perform well in Year 3 regarding financial oversight if they want to continue running the Ukusekela Programme beyond this first 3-year pilot stage. AFSA staff now feel that the tools and staffing are in place to ensure that the same challenges do not happen in Year 3.

The partners also experienced the impact of the financial reporting challenges within AFSA. This led to delayed payments of monthly tranches to them, which put a strain on their finances and

ability to conduct the planned activities. Later in the year, AFSA adapted to the situation and was able to provide funding in 2 monthly tranches for those organisations that were seen to be capable to manage these funds. This new method of working was successful and has been incorporated into plans for Year 3, where those 'higher level' organisations will receive funding in 2 monthly programmes (Group A), and those at a 'lower level' financially and administratively will still receive and report on funds each month.

The financial challenges and cashflow crisis within AFSA that is described above put a lot of strain on the Ukusekela staff and partner organisation staff (on top of what they were having to face due to COVID-19), making Year 2 a difficult year to manage the Ukusekela Programme. If it not for the support and understanding of BftW through the financial crisis, the programme would not have enjoyed the success that it has in Year 2.

4.1.6.2.3 Financial reporting challenges within the partner organisations

COVID-19 restrictions and fatigue amongst the Partners impacted on the financial administration of the partners as some tasks had to be done more than once in order for them to be a success for example opening of bank accounts which allow for 2 signatories to release funds (as a risk mitigation measure) took up to 6 weeks for some of the Partners

After the programme design process, some of the members of the Partners, either board or operational team were not available to sign off on some of the required supporting documentation as some of them had moved to be with family during level 5 of the lockdown. Getting documentation authenticity certification was difficult as Commissioners of Oaths were limiting contact with the public and the numbers that they served, often only attending to emergency situations. This resulted in delays in getting the required supporting documentation to finalise the granting process.

RECOMMENDATION
AFSA must ensure that financial reporting challenges do not occur in Year 3 and to this end must ensure that the staffing and systems are all in place and monitored on a regular basis.

4.1.6.2.4 AFSA Personnel Capacity Challenge for Year 3

It is expected that AFSA will need an increase in personnel capacity or should relook at current duty segregation in order to support more Partners in Year 3, as the targeted number of Partners is 17 so as to avoid compromising on the quality of support given to partners. Further to this, to ensure that the application process is efficient and timely, temporary staff will need to be considered for the duration of the applications screening.

RECOMMENDATION
AFSA is going to need an increase in personnel capacity or should relook at current duty segregation in order to support more Partners in Year 3 as the targeted number of Partners is 17. This is to avoid compromising on the quality of support given to SRs. Further to this, to ensure that the application process is efficient and timely, temporary staff will need to be considered for the duration of the applications screening.

4.1.6.2.5 Diversity of Projects to support

The open theme of the Ukusekela - 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. This was the case in Year 2 as in Year 1. AFSA staff have felt very challenged as they take time to try to understand each of the diverse programmes. In Year 3, with 17 organisations selected this is even more likely to be the case. It may be even more necessary to select organisations grouped around certain programming themes, for ease of management, even if this goes against the open theme concept of Component 1.

RECOMMENDATION

The Ukusekela Programme should, in Year 3, with at least 17 organisations being selected, make selections around certain themes, so that the programme is easier to manage and understand for the AFSA staff who will be stretched to capacity.

4.1.7 Lessons Learned in the Ukusekela - SPSF Project

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

4.1.7.1 Adaptability is key

The biggest lesson during Year 2 and the time of COVID-19 has been that of remaining adaptable and flexible while maintaining good governance and controls. Having to move to virtual due diligence checks, and virtual capacity building, with all that these entail, was not part of the original plan, but these changes have evolved out of necessity.

AFSA staff have had to keep their 'eyes on the ball' at all times. They have had to plan fully for every situation. It has been hard for them to conduct programme design exercises when all the participants are online and not in the same room together.

4.1.7.2 Capacity building is key

The programme showed again in Year 2, the lack of capacity within so many organisations in South Africa. Capacity building should be provided by Department of Social Development or the local municipalities but this is not happening. Most organisations are operating in 'survival mode' with low levels of staff retention and very poor knowledge management.

The Ukusekela Programme is playing a vital role in building capacity in organisations to enhance their effectiveness and sustainability.

4.1.7.3 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. The programme now has all the templates and tools in place to ensure smooth implementation and communication.

Year 2 also showed the importance of good communication between AFSA and the donor, BftW, and how it is so necessary to be open and honest when challenges are being faced so that they can be addressed together.

4.1.7.4 Paying larger tranches to give greater security to partners

It has proven beneficial to pay out 2 monthly tranches instead of the 1 monthly tranches to organisations that were performing well (On Eagles' Wings and Masivuke in Year 2). This is a lesson that will be carried forward into Year 3.

4.1.7.5 Placing partners into categories relating to capacity in Year 3

In Year 2, the benefits of treating partners differently depending on their capacity level proved beneficial (see above).

This lesson is being carried over into Year 3 selection. There will be Category A, Category B and Category C organisations selected. Category A will need little attention from the financial management side with Category B and C needing consecutively more support.

This will help AFSA to be able to select and support the 17 organisations required for Year 3 to make up the total of 30 organisations in total supported by the Ukusekela Programme.

4.1.7.6 Lessons Learned by Bread for the World

The BftW representative shared the following lessons that they had learned:

1. Application and selection process – they struggled to see why a new approvals committee was needed each year. The annual selection of the committee placed an extra burden on the AFSA staff. Ideally, they felt the committee could stand with the same members for the full 3 years of the pilot programme. They were encouraged to see that the Year 2 committee was going to be available for Year 3.
2. They appreciated that AFSA and themselves were keeping each other updated in a more structured or formal form on a more regular basis with quarterly skype meetings.
3. Sadly, BftW realised that the reputation of AFSA as being very good at handling this kind of programme, was eroded in Year 2 due to the challenges faced with financial reporting. In retrospect BftW should have been more proactive in monitoring the financial situation at AFSA, although their responsibility is only limited to the monitoring of the financial situation of the respective project and not the organisation.

4.1.8 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 Ukusekela - SPSF project.

4.1.8.1 Bread for the World (BftW)

BftW have proved an excellent partner for AFSA in this programme. It is a good relationship despite the internal challenges experienced largely due to the understanding and support of 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.

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.

4.1.8.1.1 *Linkages with other SPSF Programmes in Sierra Leone and Brazil*

BftW is also supporting the SPSF project in Sierra Leone and Brazil, but there is little knowledge sharing or communication with partners in these countries. The Ukusekela Programme Coordinator at AFSA felt increased networking here would be beneficial, however one of the challenges that would be faced is language differences between these partners.

An SPSF website could be developed to improve information sharing between these partners

RECOMMENDATION

An annual networking meeting (with other communications throughout the year) between the SPSF partners organisations in South Africa, Brazil and Sierra Leone, would build the skills and knowledge base of the SPSF programme in these countries

4.1.8.1.2 *Linkages with other donors*

AFSA and BftW could make greater efforts to recommend Ukusekela partners to other donors that they have contact with. Sadly however it is the case that the Northern donors known to BftW are more keen to fund larger organisations or even regional and global programmes with strong and recognised organisations.

4.1.8.2 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.

The AFSA team were very deliberate in Year 2 about working with the partners from early on to see who they could link with and benefit from. This was the purpose of the stakeholder analyses that were conducted. This is an important aspect of the programme and should be repeated in Year 3.

RECOMMENDATION

Work with organisations early on in Year 3 to see who they could network with (using a Stakeholder analysis) and then spend the whole year helping them with links for this relationship so that networking is an even greater priority in Year 3.

4.1.9 Assessment of the value of the programme

The Ukusekela - 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 in the 2 years 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.

4.1.9.1 Social Return on overall investment in the Ukusekela - SPSF Project

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

4.1.9.2 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 Ukusekela - 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) and Objective 3 (networking) are in place to encourage sustainability beyond the life of the project.

As shown above the capacity building was effective and early efforts were made to encourage networking. This had varied results.

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

1. Allowed for programme survival during a time of COVID-19
2. the scaling of the programme
3. improved the quality of the programme
4. improved ability to raise funds
5. improved governance
6. improved systems
7. improved the public perception of the programme
8. improved linkages to other NGOs, service providers and Government Departments

Factors 3-8 above have led to an improvement in the sustainability of the programme and the organisation while the scaling (2) 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' or a boost in programming 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.

It is important to note that it is a pilot phase of the programme, and the lesson learning component is key to the success of the pilot.

It is unrealistic to expect organisations to achieve sustainability in one year especially when they are coming from such a low starting point. Two years of support would have been more realistic.

4.2 SUB-RECIPIENT (PARTNER ORGANISATION) LEVEL

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

1. **Inkunzi Isematholeni** – Imbali, Pietermaritzburg, KwaZulu Natal
2. **Port Dunford OVC Centre** – Port Dunford Reserve near Mkhonto Kayise Clinic Esikhawini, Richards Bay, KwaZulu Natal
3. **On Eagles’ Wings** – Jeffreys Bay, Eastern Cape
4. **Masivuke Community Development** – Duncan Village, East London, 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.

4.2.1 Overview of Growth of All Partners

The table below provides an overview of the partners from the perspective of the Ukusekela - SPSF Programme Officer and Finance staff, who were the staff members who were closest to and provided the most input to the partner organisations

Table 3: Overview of the Ukusekela - SPSF Year 2 Partners

Partner	General Comments	
	Programmatic	Financially
Inkunzi Isematholeni	Did well tried their best Not great at reporting but good at implementing and following the workplan – did 95% of activities on workplan.	Good on finance side – not as problematic as some Slow reporting at the beginning – several follow ups to get all the required documentation but consistent thereafter. Improvement in quality. Able to interact, ask questions and learn
Siyasindisa Academy	A very unique project Conclusive plan. Developed a good workplan-even in COVID Established relationships with other stakeholders – Sports and Recreation and strengthened relationships with KZN Aquatics and Swimming SA - Done 90% of activities even with COVID – incorporated life skills. Listened well to AFSA – had young beneficiaries and so also included Lifeskills into this work	At the beginning they did well – accounted for invoices Towards the end they were harder to get information from – would not get a straight answer. The training helped, understood it all – useful for them.

Partner	General Comments	
	Programmatic	Financially
	Managed to keep programme running even when pools were closed by doing fitness training activities	
Port Dunford OVC Centre	<p>They surprised the whole team – when enrolled they were at low level in all levels – workplan, budget, admin but through the coaching and mentoring and capacity building and review of monthly and financial reports they improved a lot. Huge success in development and growth. They grew strong in all areas - governance and HR policies, management. AFSA is very happy with them. They surpassed expectations</p> <p>They were the most improved organisation and demonstrate the true success of the programme.</p>	<p>Very good reporting as they accounted for all the money very accurately.</p> <p>The AFSA team were very impressed with them.</p> <p>They started at very low capacity but have learnt and grown showing great progress.</p>
Shap Shap Cinemas	<p>They were harder to work with and at times difficult</p> <p>They had the capacity and resources and so AFSA was to just assist and straighten things out, and yet there was lots of follow up needed with no replies to emails</p> <p>Leadership was a let-down as they were not willing to listen and learn and work with AFSA and so AFSA had to enforce things.</p> <p>The coordinator allocated for this project had too many other responsibilities and so did not give SPSF enough attention.</p> <p>Achieved all in the plan – even with COVID – reached 90% of the targets</p>	<p>Reporting - slacking a lot. Last 2 reports Jan and Feb required a lot of follow up by sending emails, and they had poor response times.</p>
On Eagles' Wings	<p>One of the top 2 organisations in Year 2. They performed very well with good running of the organisation and implementation. They went all out – did all the workplan and linked well to other organisations.</p> <p>Managed to do it all with COVID as well as conducting COVID sensitisation with high numbers.</p>	<p>They were very good at reporting and being accountable. They always made sure all supporting docs were there. They grew in capacity through the year by being open to learning from AFSA.</p>
Masivuke Community Development	<p>There were no challenges with Masivuke, they were very responsive to AFSA and had a good working relationship</p> <p>They had very effective programming and reports were always on time. They were the best organisation for AFSA to work with in Year 2.</p> <p>They were always willing to learn and covered the programme even though changes due to COVID</p>	<p>Started on very high level and were very impressive with financial reports in on time, but towards the end they slacked a bit, but they know what to do.</p>

4.2.2 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.

4.2.2.1 Key successes

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

All the organisations achieved very well under the circumstances imposed by COVID-19.

4.2.2.1.1 Inkunzi Isematholeni

- Organisational Development has improved the sustainability of the organisation
- Increased visibility and improved standing in the community for Inkunzi Isematholeni. The organisation coordinated a silent march in Pietermaritzburg in December 2020 which was very successful and increased their visibility and respect of stakeholders for the organisation.
- The role and the contribution of Inkunzi Isematholeni has become much more recognised by state institutions, and specifically, the Department of Health (DOH), Department of Social Development (DSD), KZN Office of the Premier (OTP), uMgungundlovu District Municipality and uMsunduzi Municipality. The District Director of Department of Health confirmed the DOH collaboration with Inkunzi Isematholeni and that a collaboration agreement in the form of a memorandum of understanding (MOU) is at an advanced stage. Inkunzi Isematholeni also now collaborates with other non-state institutions such as the South African Red Cross Society (SARCS), Siyasindisa Academy (for swimming lessons) and Mayors Walk Shelter for Street Kids.
- The beneficiaries (boys) confirmed that they have experienced behaviour change in several areas, such as, their stance against GBV, improved self-esteem and confidence, informed career choices and resilience against peer pressure
- According to the district director in the Department of Health, Inkunzi Isematholeni is the only organisation in the province that specifically addresses GBV from the angle of boys:
 - Boys are actively engaged (and at a forefront) in GBV activities in their respective communities.
 - Boy are heavily engaged in GBV dissemination activities (and distribution of pamphlets and flyers)
 - Boys engage in hot debates about GBV before the start of their sporting event, and in particular soccer practices
- The incorporation of COVID-19 interventions into their existing programmes.
- Improved record keeping and financial management.
- increased networking with state and non-state institutions
- Improved funding proposal development. Funding proposals have been submitted to Community Chest and Solidarity Fund.
- The capacity building support of AFSA improved the project planning and execution, the narrative and financial reporting skills, the ability to stick to approved budgets, and/or where required, make necessary motivations for budget alterations.
- The Project Facilitator expressed gratitude as his public address and workshop facilitation skills were improved. He has gained confidence in addressing a crowd. He is more logical in presenting the subject matter to the participants.

4.2.2.1.2 Port Dunford OVC Centre

- Organisational Development has improved the sustainability of the organisation
- Through the AFSA funding, the Centre was able to provide meals to the OVCs for 5 days. Before, they were only able to provide meals only for 3 days. During COVID-19 lockdowns, OVCs were only allowed to collect meals as part of observing the pandemic protocols.
- Children with improved pass rate. Out of 117 children, 115 children passed and moved to next grade. This was an improvement on previous years.
- There was a decrease in teenage pregnancy - no teenage pregnancy was reported in 2020/21 for the OVCs benefiting from the services of the Centre.
- There was a decrease in drug and substance abuse - no incidents of drug and substance abuse were reported amongst OVCs attending the Centre in the 2020/21 period
- Some vegetables such as spinach, onions and beans were produced and sold to the formal market and vegetables were provided to supplement the requirement at the centre.
- Improved project management and organisational management and specifically for the senior co-ordinator
- Improved record keeping, bookkeeping, budgeting (and sticking to budgets), cash-flow management and financial discipline, report writing and networking skills. Specifically, the project team was happy that they have learnt to deal with impromptu buying habits. They have also learnt to motivate for budget diversions for savings that they have made.
- The project team have been exposed to critical thinking and specifically regarding writing project reports.

4.2.2.1.3 On Eagles' Wings

- All the projects they set out to roll out have been implemented.
- Numerical targets have been either met or exceeded. Their Sanitary Pack Distribution Project, for example, had a target of 20 girls. However, in the event observed by the researcher-evaluator, more than 100 Matric girls went home with a Sanitary Pack on 17 February 2021 and, from the performance records examined, that was one of many days when the target was exceeded.
- Beyond the numbers, On Eagles' Wings interventions have indeed brought about tremendous meaningful change in the lives of their beneficiaries, the beneficiaries' families and ultimately the communities around them. Take the example of their Teen Parenting Programme and the value of having parents being equipped with the skills and techniques to build and maintain positive relations with their children. Think of the value of having parents - just by applying those skills - being able to bring up children who turn out to be young adults (and later adults) who believe in themselves, who are all-round competent, who approach challenges with a winning attitude and who are generally happy and content. If half the population of the world were like that, the world would surely be a better place.
- Responding to the question about what, in his view, was the most notable success of the On Eagles' Wings Ukusekela Programme, a staff member said, "It is the behaviour change that comes as a function of the interventions – beneficiaries becoming active agents of change."
- The Boys' Mentoring project is another of On Eagles' Wings initiatives with a great potential for changing the direction the boy participants' life paths for the better.

- Looking at the materials (Manuals, etc.) and guest presenters that On Eagles' Wings uses for their workshops, it is obvious that they take the quality of their programmes quite seriously. This is one of the reasons why members of the community, in particular parents, encourage their children to participate in their programmes.
- On Eagles' Wings workshops tend to be highly interactive and participatory. In addition, whenever possible, they seek the services of professionals and experts on the content in order to ensure that the workshops are of a high standard. Often, special guests who have personal stories to share on the topics are invited in order to enhance the effectiveness of the workshop and add an element of authenticity to the content. For example, for workshops on Substance Abuse, recovering (former) addicts would be invited to tell their stories – how they got started, how they got hooked, how addiction affected them and how it ended up destroying their lives and their relationships and harming their families.
- Going through the Monthly Reports that On Eagles' Wings was submitting to AFSA earlier on in the programme, one cannot help but marvel at the improvement in the quality of the reports submitted towards the end of 2020.
- On Eagles' Wings seems not to have any problems establishing new linkages and creating new partnerships. The observed success and expansion that their Sanitary Pack project has been enjoying is as a result of this unique ability to attract support. In this regard, they have received support from the National Department/Ministry of Social Development, PEP Stores and Woodlands Dairy.

4.2.2.1.4 Masivuke Community Development

- Masivuke was able to effectively implement more than 90% of the activities they had planned to carry out as part of the Ukusekela programme – even with all the challenges of COVID-19.
- For the most part, the participation targets Masivuke had set were exceeded.
- The envisaged outcomes were largely achieved. Participant and community accounts indicate that Masivuke was able to make a significant difference with regard to the reduction in hate crimes, including murders. According to one stakeholder, “One year, I think it was 2018, we had 5 transgender women killed – 5 in one year - just because they were transgender!”
- The GBV campaign conducted by Masivuke received media attention which built their brand. There were clips about the campaign on Radio stations and articles in newspapers.
- Masivuke was able to strengthen working relations and partnerships with other NGOs who advocate for the rights of LGBTIQ+ people. A good example of this is their partnership with S.H.E. in collaboration with whom they organized and facilitated the Community Dialogue observed by the researcher-evaluator.
- The programme contributed to the enhancement of Masivuke skills in project management, record keeping and reporting.
- A reduction in mild hate crimes directed at LGBTIQ+ people and murders in areas where the programme was implemented.
- Parents being more accepting and supportive of their LGBTIQ+ children.

4.2.2.2 Key Challenges

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

4.2.2.2.1 Overall Challenges

Some challenges faced by all the Ukusekela partners included:

- The delay in transferring monthly tranches to partners from AFSA. This created stress for them in management of funding.
- All partners had to adapt to the 2020 COVID-19 challenges by having to comply with some trying and spirit-dampening COVID -19 conditions as well as adhere to the COVID-19 protocols.
- A challenge now faced by all the supported organisations is that of where to get funding to replace that provided by AFSA post March 2021
- As shown above some organisations were very responsive to AFSA and reported well while some others seemed to start well but slack off in terms of their reporting to AFSA regarding their project.

RECOMMENDATION

Find ways to ensure continued commitment to reporting by the partners throughout the year

Partners should be made well aware of reporting requirements at the beginning of their project support and should face penalties if they are not reporting adequately during the project period. These penalties could include restrictions on their office support costs provided by AFSA.

4.2.2.2.2 Siyasindisa Academy

This organisation was hit the hardest due to COVID-19. Their plan was to teach swimming in local swimming pools but due to lockdown restrictions this could not take place. Instead, they adapted well and conducted daily exercising and other activities for the beneficiaries, to maintain and build their strength for when the pools could open. They ensured good participation of beneficiaries through this difficult period for them.

4.2.2.2.3 Inkunzi Isematholeni

- The organisation could not conduct all the planned activities at the Mayors Walk shelter due to the COVID-19 restrictions on group sizes. This affected their achievement of targets.
- Limited timeframe to implement this project.
- The project has been unable to meet the demand mainly from communities that fall outside their catchment as a result of limited financial resources. Project reach has been limited to three areas, namely, the shelter in Mayors Walk, iMbalu Stage 18 and KwaNxamalala.

4.2.2.2.4 Port Dunford OVC Centre

- The project team battled to get suppliers that were willing to do cashless transaction with them (as required by the Ukusekela Programme). The team spent a lot of time to secure suppliers that were happy with electric funds transfer (EFT) payment system. One of them was Phoenix.
- Registration for Unemployment Insurance Fund (UIF) with the Department of Employment and Labour is still outstanding.

- Setting up bank authorisation is still outstanding.
- The project team wished to have had at least three satellites centres in Dengeni, eSkhaleni and Sawumbe, but this was not possible yet, mainly due to financial and COVID-19 limitations.
- Children are provided with a meal for 5 days. It has been a historical challenge that the OVCs are not provided for during weekends. It is feared that the number of vulnerable children will increase resulting from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

4.2.2.2.5 On Eagles' Wings

- Staffing challenges hamper the work of On Eagles' Wings. They struggle to complete planned activities due to a shortage of staff. This is also related to funding challenges.

4.2.2.2.6 Masivuke Community Development

- Masivuke is severely short staffed, and this created a challenge in terms of their ability to conduct all the planned activities and report adequately on them.
- Urgent funding is needed for the continuation of the Ukusekela Programme, and also for the maintenance of the "Soup Kitchen" or Feeding Scheme for the destitute which was the primary project when the organisation was established.
- Masivuke has inadequate linkages or working relations with critical institutions such as government institutions. This impacts on their ability to do the work and raise adequate funding.
- Masivuke has work infrastructure challenges. Masivuke does not have sufficient workspace. There are no offices. The Masivuke Community Development centre comprises two large rooms and so privacy for administration is a challenge.

4.2.3 Lessons Learned in the Ukusekela - SPSF Project

Several lessons have been learnt in the Ukusekela - SPSF project as outlined below.

A key general lesson learnt is that smaller NGOs need a lot more project management, project administration, financial management and professional skills support related to their area of work than it is realized. The demand for capacity building is very large and must be emphasised more fully in the next year of the Ukusekela Programme. However, the COVID-19 restrictions did affect the implementation of the planned activities for Capacity Building in Year 2.

4.2.3.1.1 Inkunzi Isematholeni

1. Depression amongst beneficiaries resulting from an unsuccessful grade 12 is a reality. It is recommended that GBV interventions in schools should seek to widen career options especially for those boys (and girls) that may not make it through. Not having a grade 12 certificate is not the end of the world. Preparing the youth for skills development that are not dependent on grade 12 certificate is a critical component on the intervention because of the importance of skills to increasing employment opportunities post COVID-19 pandemic.

4.2.3.1.2 Port Dunford OVC Centre

2. Children that receive the most appropriate career guidance are linked to a network of organisations that support child and youth development

3. The inclusion of advocacy initiatives for the children would improve the bouquet of services available to them and their ability to succeed.

4.2.3.1.3 *On Eagles' Wings*

4. When working with people it is important that the programmes speak to them, in other words, be open to beneficiaries' input so that they feel like they are part of the programme and are able to "own" it.
5. Communicate your programme to stakeholders (gatekeepers) and involve them, then they'll be more likely to support your initiatives.
6. If your role involves teaching/training others, you had better know your content or else get content experts – no compromise.
7. Do not judge people and rush to attach unfavourable labels on them, rather seek to understand their situation first and focus on finding a way to help them.

4.2.3.1.4 *Masivuke Community Development*

8. The LGBTIQ+ people need more than just acceptance and tolerance; they also need psychosocial or mental health support – not to change who they are – but to help them cope.
"LGBTIQ people are among the most marginalized and excluded members of society and are particularly vulnerable to stigma, violence and discrimination owing to their sexual orientation and gender identity."
"Everyone, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity, deserves equal access to opportunities and services and their safety should be protected."
9. Ideally, NGOs (like Masivuke) working with LGBTIQ+ people need either a Social Worker or a Psychologist on their teams so that they are able to offer mental health / psychosocial services to their beneficiaries. Alternatively, their service provisioning should include referrals to such professionals.

4.2.4 Positive unintended outcomes

Some key positive outcomes that were unintended include:

4.2.4.1.1 *Increased donations*

As the organisations that were supported by AFSA became more recognised in their communities due to the Ukusekela activities, they also received more donations to support their work. For example, On Eagles Wings received donations to distribute masks and sanitary products into their community.

4.2.4.1.2 *Improved community recognition*

The increased recognition from local community stakeholders was a pleasant and added spin-off from the support by AFSA. This was especially enhanced due to the partner responses to COVID-19 and to Gender Based Violence (GBV).

4.2.4.1.3 *The increased demand for the GBV programmes*

Sadly, the lockdown increased the cases of GBV in the communities. As the partners addressed GBV issues in their programming, this led to an increased demand for their services. GBV was initially not a key priority of the Ukusekela programme but the partner organisations were asked

to take a stand on this issue on their Social Media platforms and others added it to their community programmes.

4.2.4.1.4 Ability to work during COVID-19 lockdown

The supported organisations were able to continue their work (albeit in a restricted way) during lockdown. This made them 'lights in the community'. They were available to help with GBV issues in their communities.

4.2.4.1.5 Improved relationships of partners with their suppliers

The partners were able to develop stronger relationships with their suppliers as they had to negotiate terms of payment due to the delays in payments from AFSA. This allowed them to take resources for implementation when they were needed so that the programming could continue undisturbed. This was an important learning process for several of the partners and will benefit them in the future.

4.2.4.1.6 Increased community involvement

At Masivuke, community members (other than the trained Ambassadors) took it upon themselves to educate and contribute to changing the negative attitudes of their family members.

4.2.4.1.7 Involvement of Religious Leaders around LGBTQI+ issues

An undisputable indication of the new ground that the Masivuke programme had been able to break within a period of less than one year was the support to the programme from religious leaders who previously had considered the LGBTQI+ people as an abomination. Prior to their participation in Masivuke programmes, they were not concerned about the LGBTQI+ people's rights, nor were they concerned about what happened to them or their lives.

4.2.4.1.8 Increase in self-esteem for LGBTQI+ people

There has been a marked increase in self-esteem among LGBTQI+ people participating in the programme, in particular, the transgender women who now feel freer and safer to openly express their sexuality. This is due to improved community perceptions (as planned) but also to the improved self-esteem of the LGBTQI+ participants themselves (unplanned).

4.2.4.1.9 Evolving the programmes to suit the needs

At its inception, the now Menstrual Hygiene and Sanitary Dignity Management Programme of On Eagles' Wings was referred to as simply the "Sanitary Towel Programme." However, by the time of the evaluation, the programme had started evolving, not in name only, but also in essence. In addition to distributing only a pack of sanitary towels, the beneficiaries are now receiving Sanitary Packs which include some sanitizer and body soap.

In addition, before the Sanitary Packs are distributed, the girls are now also exposed to personal development and girl focused SRHR motivational talks which include an additional "R." The additional "R" stands for "Responsibility," not only with regard to the exercise of one's rights, in particular, sexual rights (the irresponsible exercise of which might lead to a range of undesirable - if not untimely - consequences) but for the girls to also take the responsibility to consider the day-to-day decisions and choices they make about what they do (or do not do), which might have implications for the quality of their lives in future.

4.2.5 Possible Negative outcomes

Some key outcomes that could have negative implications were:

4.2.5.1.1 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.

4.2.5.1.2 Increased dependency on the organisations

As the partner organisations were providing emergency services in the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic in South Africa, some stakeholders may expect these services from the partners going forward. The partners may not have the resources to continue providing these services going forward, so they need to ensure that beneficiaries are linked to other suppliers, such as other organisations or Government Departments that will provide these services going forward.

4.2.5.1.3 Exposure and vulnerability of LGBTIQ+ people in the communities

Masivuke management and staff expressed commitment to continuing with their work aimed at the realization of the human rights of LGBTIQ+ people and the creation of safe spaces for them even after the end of AFSA's Ukusekela Programme funding in March 2021. However, one of the programme beneficiaries expressed the fear that if the programme were to be discontinued, the level of acceptance they were enjoying as a result of the programme's interventions might be reversed. "Eish, I don't know, but I think our safety in the neighbourhood would be threatened again..." she said.

The programme may have made it easier for LGBTIQ+ to 'come out' in the community but if the programme was not continued then it could leave them in a vulnerable and 'exposed' position. It is therefore imperative that the programme continues.

4.2.6 The value and the Social Return on overall investment in the Ukusekela - SPSF Project

The Ukusekela - 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.

4.2.6.1 Social

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

- Through Inkunzi Isematholeni young boys have asserted their role in GVB, sexual education and teenage pregnancy. This programme is creating ambassadors and platforms (social learning settings) for the community to discuss GBV.
- Port Dunford OVC Centre – this project which provided nutritional and educational support to children encouraged improved learning and lifeskills (through sports and classes). These activities had a big social impact on the children involved, increasing their chances of lifelong success and with this, their self-esteem and communication skills.

- Masivuke – the project greatly enhanced the social standing of LGBTIQ+ people in the community. This also included their safety and protection. This is a very significant benefit for this marginalised and persecuted group.
- On Eagles’ Wings provided teaching on sexual and reproductive health, relationships, substance abuse and GBV all of which have a large social impact on the beneficiaries and those that they interact with. The project showed achievement of outcomes and so these social benefits will be realised.

4.2.6.2 Economic

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

- Inkunzi Isematholeni has experienced increased public awareness and capacity in raising resources so it is hoped this will lead to increased economic benefit for the project.
- Port Dunford OVC centre 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. The children will benefit economically through improved education and lifeskills.
- Masivuke – it is hoped that as the project improves the community understanding around the rights of LGBTIQ+ people in the community, then their opportunities for gainful employment will improve, leading to economic benefit. It was too early to see this outcome at this stage.
- On Eagles’ Wings – the changes in behaviour that are encouraged by the project will lead to improved economic benefit for the participants and they make improved life choices.

4.2.6.3 Environmental

The environmental return on investment for some of the evaluated projects are outlined below:

- Port Dunford OVC centre developed the garden project, by growing seedlings into vegetables. The garden was looked after more carefully and production increased.
- Masivuke did not address environmental issues.
- On Eagles’ Wings did not address environmental issues.

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.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are some of the key recommendations as the Programme goes into Year 3:

1. The project aims to provide a 'kick-start' to projects over a short period with targeted funding. It contributes towards long term sustainability of the project or organisation (full sustainability is not possible in this timeframe, and probably not even after 3 years of funding). However, the foundations have been laid in this time, through the support and capacity building provided by AFSA, 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. This support has encouraged the longer-term sustainability of the partner projects.
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.
2. 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.
3. The AFSA Ukusekela - SPSF team should continue to ensure (as they did in Year 2) that the Approvals Committee be kept informed on an ongoing basis, 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. It is also recommended that there is one meeting with BftW, SPSF staff and the approval committee members per year.
4. The Ukusekela Programme should, in Year 3, with at least 17 organisations being selected, make selections around certain themes, so that the programme is easier to manage and understand for the AFSA staff who will be stretched to capacity.
5. Not enough time was given to fundraising capacity building for the organisations in the training that was provided. It would be beneficial if they received help to put together a proposal with a logframe. It is important that it is a logically connected proposal. 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.

6. Publish the calls for applications on the Ukusekela website instead of the AFSA website. Application formats and documents should be downloadable from the Ukusekela website. There can be a reference to this website at the AFSA website but the main promotion of the Ukusekela SPSF should be done via the new Ukusekela website. Further, suitable information about capacity building, webinars, networking events etc. for the Ukusekela SPSF partner organisations should be published on the website. Develop a dashboard on the website plotting all the organisations that the Ukusekela Programme has partnered with over the 3 years of the pilot. This would allow existing and potential funders to see the reach of the project and some of the outcomes.
7. AFSA must ensure that financial reporting challenges do not occur in Year 3 and to this end must ensure that the staffing and systems are all in place and monitored on a regular basis.
8. AFSA is going to need an increase in personnel capacity or should relook at current duty segregation in order to support more Partners in Year 3 as the targeted number of Partners is 17. This is to avoid compromising on the quality of support given to partners. Further to this, to ensure that the application process is efficient and timely, temporary staff will need to be considered for the duration of the applications screening.
9. 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.
10. An annual networking meeting (with other communications throughout the year) between the Ukusekela - SPSF partners organisations in South Africa, Brazil and Sierra Leone, would build the skills and knowledge base of the SPSF programme in these countries
11. Work with organisations early on in Year 3 to see who they could network with (using a Stakeholder analysis) and then spend the whole year helping them with links for this relationship so that networking is an even greater priority in Year 3.
12. Find ways to ensure continued commitment to reporting by the partners throughout the year. Partners should be made well aware of reporting requirements at the beginning of their project support and should face penalties if they are not reporting adequately during the project period. These penalties could include restrictions on their office support costs provided by AFSA.
13. 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 (and AFSA) must focus great effort to help them to develop and maintain these linkages
14. Continue to work to accrue increased and ongoing benefits from the Ukusekela - SPSF Project. As shown the partner organisations have benefited greatly from the Ukusekela - 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.

6 CONCLUSION

The COVID-19 pandemic has made this a year like no other. The Ukusekela programme AFSA team would have gone into the year feeling prepared and having learned good lessons from Year 1 of the programme. The outbreak of COVID-19 in March 2020, just as Year 2 was about to begin, changed everything for the team, and they had to adapt quickly to ensure that the programme could continue at all. They have done remarkably well to support the partner organisations, build capacity and improve their networking during this year, using virtual learning platforms and emails rather than the planned and preferred physical visits and interactions.

The programme team also experienced financial management challenges which were not caused by them but the higher level financial systems of AFSA. Again as a team they had to adapt and adjust how they worked to allow the programme to continue. This involved clear communication with the donor and the partners about the situation as well adapting systems so that partners could be paid on time.

The way the staff team handled these above challenges to ensure the programme kept operating is commendable and bodes well for their ability to implement Year 3, despite there being many more partners involved.

The Ukusekela partners once again were very appreciative of the fact that they had been selected into this programme and also adapted greatly to the challenges of COVID-19 and the financial challenges. Despite lockdown restrictions and lack of supplies at times, they were able to adapt their programming and reach most of the set targets. They were able to negotiate terms with vendors, until they received their tranches from AFSA.

The Ukusekela programme proved to be relevant, effective and put partners on the road to sustainability with improved internal capacity and networking skills and linkages. The restoration of hope that is evident remains a critical factor in the empowerment and development of the target communities. Women hold key positions for implementation and management in the partner organisations which shows how they continue to be on the frontlines in embracing community centred approaches for the development of their communities.

Lessons are being learned along the way for AFSA and BftW, as well as the partners. These lessons will help to refine the programme, as a true pilot, for future cycles beyond 2022. It is hoped that BftW will be encouraged by the very positive results of this programme, to fund into the future, but also that the results shown will attract other donors to join the programme for the benefit of many more partner organisations and the communities they serve for many years to come.

7 ANNEXES

7.1 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 4: Breakdown of those interviewed from BftW and AFSA

Category of the participants	Gender of participants	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	10 March 2021
Charlene Donald AFSA HIV Prevention Program Manager	1 female	1 in-depth telephonic interview	1	10 March 2021
Snegugu Vilakazi Ukusekela - SPSF Programme Coordinator	1 female	1 in-depth interview	1	09 Feb 2021
Vuyolwethu Dlamini – Ukusekela - SPSF Project Officer	1 male	1 in-depth interview	1	11 Feb 2021
Mildred Nomonde Mkulisi – Grant Accountant and Ntombifikile Ngiba Finance Officer Ukusekela - SPSF Finance Team	2 females	1 in-depth interview (an in-depth interview was conducted with 2 staff together)	2	12 March 2021
Lindiwe Dlamini Approvals Committee member	1 female	1 in-depth telephonic interview	1	11 March 2021
Damon Greville Approvals Committee member	1 male	1 in-depth telephonic interview	1	12 March 2021
			Total 8	

Table 5: Table of those interviewed from Inkunzi Isematholeni

Name	Organisation	Role
Zikhona Nyathi	Inkunzi Isematholeni	Project Co-ordinator
Nhlanhla Zuma	Inkunzi Isematholeni	Project Facilitator
Sphehile Makhaye	Inkunzi Isematholeni	Beneficiary
Nkululeko Zondi	Inkunzi Isematholeni	Beneficiary
Mpilwenhle Madonsela	Inkunzi Isematholeni	Beneficiary
Zanele Ntombela	Department of Health	uMgungundlovu District Director

Table 6: Table of those interviewed from Port Dunford OVC Centre

Name	Organisation	Role
Busisiwe Mathaba	Port Dunford OVC Centre	Centre Co-ordinator
Thembisile Mthembu	Port Dunford OVC Centre	Child Co-ordinator
Nokwanda Mthembu	Port Dunford OVC Centre	Child Co-ordinator
Lindokuhle Makwakwa	Community	Paralegal Officer
Lorraine Nkwanyana	Community	Community Member
Mr M Mngadi	Mkhwanazi Traditional Council	iNduna
Muziwakhe “Mzwakhe” Buthelezi	Ward 18 Committee / Operation Sukuma Sakhe	Chairman of Operation Sukuma Sakhe

Table 7: Table of those interviewed from On Eagles’ Wings

CATEGORY OF RESPONDENTS	RESPONDENT(S) (No. & gender)	DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUE USED	DATE
Management: Director-Founder	1 Female	Key Informant Interview	16 Feb. 2021
Staff: Facilitator and Fieldworker	1 Male	Key Informant Interview	
Staff: Fieldworker (Intern)	1 Female	Interview	
Beneficiaries	8 Females 2 Males	FGD	17 Feb. 2021
Stakeholders - Partner Organisation	1 Male	Interview	
Stakeholder: Municipal Councilor	1 Male	Interview	
Beneficiaries	112 Females	Observation	
Stakeholder – Educator at Partner School	1 Female	Questionnaire	5 – 11 March 2021

Table 8: Table of those interviewed from Masivuke

CATEGORY OF RESPONDENTS	RESPONDENT(S) (No. & gender)	DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUE USED	DATE
Management: Programme Coordinator	1 Female	Individual interview	18 Feb. 2021
Community members	5 Males 7 Females	Observation of Community Dialogue and individual interview (with one female community member)	
Staff – Administrator and Safe Space Facilitator (including 3 volunteers)	1 Male (Staff) 2 Males 1 Female (Volunteers)	FGD	
Beneficiary	1 Male	Interview	

Community Leader/Stakeholder:	1 Male	Interview	
Member of School Governing Body	1 Male	Interview	
Community members	5 Males 20 Females	FGD	19 Feb. 2021
Community Leader (Ward Councillor)	1 Female	Interview	
Representative of Partner Organisation	1 Male	Interview	
Management	-	E-mail and Telephonic Follow-up	4-6 March 2021 March

7.2 Timeline of COVID-19 Progression through Year 2

The global COVID-19 pandemic has affected the operations of the Ukusekela - SPSF programme as the country went into total lockdown in **March 2020** with an alert level of 5 resulting in a halt to operations as all citizens excluding those that were classed as involved in essential services were restricted to their homes for 21 days. The Ukusekela - SPSF preparing for Year 2 due diligence visits to prospective partners at this time. Whilst the lock-down restrictions were gradually lifted over the ensuing months, the country has still not returned to normality. This has required on-going planning and reactivity to the operational work of the Ukusekela - SPSF.

April 2020: As a means to flatten the curve the nationwide lockdown alert level 5 that had been imposed from 26th March 2020, President Cyril Ramaphosa extended the 21 day lock-down for a further 2 weeks.

June 2020: President Cyril Ramaphosa announced a further easing of South Africa's coronavirus lockdown from June 1, allowing the vast majority of the economy to return to full capacity from level four to level three of its five level lockdown system. The easing of the lockdown restrictions to level 3 amongst other things saw the lifting of the alcohol ban, this created uncertainty among government's integrity to control the spread of the virus as alcohol is normally associated with reckless/irresponsible behaviour. Consequently there was a noted spike in cases of Gender Based Violence (GBV) and femicide in the country.

July 2020: Despite a young population, South Africa became particularly vulnerable to COVID-19 due to high levels of poverty, unemployment, and a large immune-compromised population due to high incidences of HIV and tuberculosis. Initial panic buying during level 5 led to stock shortages. Organisations funded under the Ukusekela - SPSF programme had difficulty securing bulk quantity orders for food relief parcels as stores constantly ran out of essential foods.

August 2020: The country moved to Level 2 saw the tourism industry opening its gates for the very first time in 4 months and allowed for interprovincial travel for all residents. This allowed for the Ukusekela - SPSF team to be able to conduct more site visits to organisations outside KwaZulu-Natal. In South Africa August is known as Women's Month, where the focus is regrettably but rightfully on GBV. GBV is a profound and widespread problem in South Africa,

impacting on almost every aspect of life. Lockdown contributed to a surge in the cases of femicide amongst women and children. President Cyril Ramaphosa referred to the scourge of GBV as “A war being waged against the women and children of our country.” The Ukusekela - SPSF funded partners under Component 1 embarked on GBV awareness campaigns in their localities where their programme beneficiaries advocated against the abuse and killing of women and children.

September 2020 On 16 September, the President made a national address where he announced the further lowering of restrictions to level 1, beginning from 21 September 2020. The national state of disaster was extended by one more month.

November 2020 On 11 November, President Ramaphosa addressed the nation where he announced extension of the state of disaster by another month until 15 December 2020. Relaxation of international travel, shop trading hours restrictions along with continued COVID unemployment support were announced

Second wave: December 2020 – March 2021

December 2020 On 3 December, the President addressed the nation. He noted a resurgence of COVID-19 in some districts of the Eastern and Western Cape provinces. Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality was identified as a coronavirus hotspot; restrictions were tightened for this area. The national state of disaster was extended until 15 January 2021.

On 9 December, the Minister of Health announced that the country had entered the second wave of infections.

On 14 December, the President announced in an address to the nation, the closure of some beaches, lowering of the number of people that can attend gatherings and the tightening of other measures to curb the second wave.

On 27 December, the number of confirmed cases reached 1 million.

On 28 December 2020, President Cyril Ramaphosa addressed the nation again and announced that the country would go back into a partial lockdown level 3 for 14 days to reduce the speed of the second wave during the festive season.

January 2021 A vaccine rollout strategy was announced on 3 January 2021, with doses for 10% of the population already secured and more on the way. During the first phase, frontline healthcare workers were to be vaccinated.

February 2021 On February 1, President Ramaphosa announced the arrival at O. R. Tambo International Airport of the first batch of COVID-19 vaccines produced by the Serum Institute of India. Although South Africa would remain at alert level 3, easing of restrictions effective the next day was announced because the peak of the second wave had passed.

March 2021 On 5 March 2021, the number of people fully vaccinated against COVID-19 surpassed 100,000 in the country.

7.3 Interview Instruments

7.3.1 AFSA Staff

1. Did BftW or AFSA initiate the Ukusekela - 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. What are your thoughts on the selection and approval processes for the initiatives selected for the Ukusekela - SPSF project?

4. What are your thoughts on sustainability regarding the different initiatives that are funded through the Ukusekela - SPSF project?
5. Has the project achieved the planned objectives?
6. What do you think have been key successes and challenges with the Ukusekela - SPSF project?
7. 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?
8. Are you aware of any potential linkages or networks which could be drawn upon to benefit AFSA?
9. 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 Ukusekela - SPSF project?

7.3.2 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?

7.3.3 BftW Representative

1. Did BftW or AFSA initiate the Ukusekela - 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 Ukusekela - SPSF project?
5. What are your thoughts on sustainability regarding the different initiatives that are funded through the Ukusekela - 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 Ukusekela - 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 Ukusekela - SPSF project?