EVALUATION MATRIX - RELEVANCE			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ1. To what extent have the mix of actions undertaken by the IWRM programme reflected the SA government's objectives of introducing IWRM, redressing the past, that of reducing poverty, achieving MDG targets and fulfilling Constitutional obligations of Government and those enshrined in international conventions	1.1. The mix of projects of projects undertaken reflect the government priorities as reflected in the National Water Act and the Accelerated Growth Plan and related MDG Targets	1. Government policy priorities 2. Reference to consultation with government partners in planning documents 3. Reference to consultation with community organisations 4. Reference to Constitution and International Conventions in planning documents	1. Strategic and annual planning documents 2. Stakeholder workshops 3. Interviews with key stakeholders at different levels of Government 4. Analytical documents that support the approach adopted
	1.2. The extent to which there has been consistency between the actions taken at project level and those envisaged in IDPs and other government (national & regional strategic planning documents	1.2.1. Reference to consultation with municipal IDP managers during planning and/or inception phases 1.2.2. Evidence of assessment of DWAF priorities in the WMA in relation to establishing institutions	1. Reference to consultation with municipal managers and other appropriate actors in project documents and/or project management meetings 2. Selected analysis of IDPs and regional planning documents to determine consistency between individual project goals and those in the planning documents

EVALUATION MATRIX - RELEVANCE			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ 1 (cont.) To what extent have the mix of actions undertaken by the IWRM programme reflected the SA government's objectives of introducing IWRM, redressing the past, that of reducing poverty, achieving MDG targets and fulfilling Constitutional obligations of Government and those enshrined in international conventions	1.3. The extent to which the intervention designs were appropriate for meeting the goals of empowerment of marginalised communities, particularly in relation to their participation in WMIs	1.3.1. Evidence of an assessment of the project beneficiaries and their potential participation in WMIs	1. Analysis of DWAF stakeholder databases 2. Analysis of procedures for the identification of projects in the three WMAs
	1.4. The extent to which the modalities adopted were appropriate for working towards MDG Goals and Targets at community level.	1.4.1. The extent to which the design of the programme incorporated mechanisms to address the needs of the marginalised communities in terms of meeting their needs and the implementation models, including the use of technologies.	1. Analysis of method for contracting communities 2. Analysis of capacity building approaches 3. Analysis of the technological choices

EVALUATION MATRIX - RELEVANCE			
EVALUATION QUESTION	**JUDGEMENT CRITERIA**	**INDICATORS**	**MEANS OF VERIFICATION**
EQ 2 To what extent has the programme contributed <u>addressing community priority issues</u>	1. Evidence that communities have bought into the process	1. Communities recognise that the process has been "bottom-up" 2. Communities collaborating fully with processes 3. The experiences of individual projects are being shared with a broader group of secondary beneficiaries in the community.	1. Structured interviews 2. Examination of project reports 3. Examination of attendances at IWRM programme meetings 4. Examination of meeting minutes
	2. Evidence that the range of projects respond to a broad spectrum of community needs such as food security, health and welfare	1. Selected projects have responded to specific need s in communities	1. Structured interviews 2. Examination of project descriptions and alignment with issues that may have been raised in other forums by communities

2.3. Evidence that the projects selected aim to support the communities longer term ambitions for sustainable livelihoods	2.3.1. Selected projects have been designed to support the longer term ambitions of communities whether from the point of view of products, markets or natural resource security 2.3.2. The programme design incorporated support mechanisms to assist communities in achieving these ambitions	1. Structured interviews 2. Examination of support mechanisms to communities that were incorporated in the design of projects 3. Examination of the level of resources allocated and the extent to which these were appropriate to meet (immediate) levels of ambition

EVALUATION MATRIX - EFFECTIVENESS			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ 3 To what extent has the approach of the programme led to an improvement in a <u>cooperative governance</u> at a local level.	1. The extent to which government departments at national and provincial level have been engaged in the programme cycles	1. Evidence of participation in planning meetings 2. Evidence of financial contribution to programmes 3. Evidence of commitments to adopt and engage in similar processes in the future	1. Workshop government stakeholders 2. Workshop community stakeholders 3. Individual interviews 4. Analysis of key documentation e.g. minutes of meetings
	2. The extent to which municipalities have been involved in the full programme cycle	1. Evidence of participation in planning meetings 2. Evidence of financial contribution to programmes 3. Evidence of commitments to adopt and engage in similar processes in the future	1. Workshop government stakeholders 2. Workshop community stakeholders 3. Individual interviews 4. Analysis of key documentation e.g. minutes of meetings

	2.3. Design of immediate annual plans of government departments and municipalities incorporate the projects that have been initiated under the IWRM programme	2.3.1. Evidence that the programmes incorporated into annual and strategic plans incorporate the approach of IWRM improving livelihoods and community well-being 2.3.2. Evidence that the proposed programmes include WRM issues that were introduced into the projects 2.3.3. Evidence that the programmes have inherent dimensions of intra-governmental collaboration	1. Analysis of IDPs 2. Analysis of project proposals if available 3. Statements made by local and national politicians

EVALUATION MATRIX - EFFECTIVENESS			
EVALUATION QUESTION	**JUDGEMENT CRITERIA**	**INDICATORS**	**MEANS OF VERIFICATION**
EQ 4 To what extent have government stakeholders <u>understood the empowerment approach to development</u> (rights-based approach)	3.1. The extent to which government officials (all tiers) express an appreciation of the approaches adopted	1. Increased participation in programme meetings 2. Increased willingness to meet with the PM team and/ or coordinators to discuss the programme and possible up-scaling	1. Correspondence between Regional Coordinators DWAF Regional Offices and other government departments and municipalities 2. Minutes of meetings 3. Attendance registers 4. Structured Interviews
	3.2. The extent to which government officials who have been exposed to the programme understand their obligations as duty bearers in promoting the empowerment of marginalised groups	1. Officials demonstrate an endorsement of the approach through active engagement and commitment 2. Marginalised communities recognise a difference in the approaches of government officials	1. Correspondence between Regional Coordinators DWAF Regional Offices and other government departments and municipalities 2. Minutes of meetings 3. Attendance registers 4. Structured Interviews 5. Workshop with communities
	3.3. The extent to which government departments have taken steps to introduce the empowerment model into their plans and made the necessary financial provisions	3.3.1. Evidence of incorporation into annual plans	1. Analysis of documents

EVALUATION MATRIX - EFFECTIVENESS			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ 5 To what extent has the programme contributed to the <u>empowerment of communities</u> to what extent has the programme <u>contributed to communities understanding the benefits of local level IWRM</u>	1. The extent to which communities feel competent to engage in public debate concerning issues related to water management and related issues that impact on their communities' wellbeing	1. Existence of members from marginalised communities on management committees of local water management institutions 2. Members of marginalised communities able to articulate their rights 3. Duty bearers and other stakeholders respond to the requests of community members	3. Structured interviews with stakeholders 4. Questionnaire 5. Examination of minutes of meetings WMIs 6. Examination of regional PMG minutes 7. Workshop with stakeholders (option)
	4.2. The extent to which communities understand IWRM issues and apply them in practice	2. Community project members understand various aspects of IWRM 3. Community projects applying aspects of IWRM in their projects	1. Structured interviews with stakeholders 2. Questionnaire 3. Analysis of regional coordinators M&E reports

	4.3. The extent to which have embraced skills to manage the project cycle of projects of a similar nature.	1. Community members understand various aspects of financial management, reporting and conflict management 2. Community members applying these skills to manage their projects	1. Structured interviews with stakeholders 2. Questionnaire 3. Analysis of regional coordinators M&E reports 4. Workshop with stakeholders (optional)
	4.4 The extent to which women have been empowered at a project level	4.4.1 Women are part of the decision making and have access to resources at a project level	1. interviews with projects beneficiaries 2. focused group discussion

EVALUATION MATRIX - EFFICIENCY			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ 6 To what extent have the <u>organisational structures, implementation modalities and procedures</u> throughout the full project cycle affected the capability of the parties to achieve the expected results?	1. The extent to which the three implementation modalities (Proto CMA, NGO, Municipality) have contributed to projects achieving their immediate objectives	1. Decision making processes of the three models adopted 2. Appropriateness of the three models in an eventual up-scaling process 3. The financial efficiency of each of the three models	1. Structured interviews with stakeholders 2. Examination of reporting systems (institutional memory) 3. Examination of budgets- contracts 4. Stakeholder workshops
	2. The extent to which the procurement mechanisms have been appropriate to meet the needs of the methodology for project implementation (i.e. contracting of communities	1. Cost effectiveness of the procurement system adopted 2. Procurement and disbursement speeds more appropriate to community needs	1. Examination of budgets and contracts 2. Structured interviews 3. Stakeholder workshops (optional) 4. Examination of payment flows
	3. The extent to which M & E systems have been effective in identifying existing or potential problems	1. The monitoring systems have been able to identify a broad spectrum of problems 2. Transparency of the systems	1. Analysis of M& E systems 2. Analysis of response to problems identified by M&E 3. Structured interviews with stakeholders

	4. The extent to which financial control mechanisms have contributed to the PCM of the entire programme	1. Evidence of financial management system that tracks expenditure at appropriate intervals to adjust the direction of the programme	1. Analysis of financial management system 2. Examination of decision making processes based on the financial system

EVALUATION MATRIX – SUSTAINABILITY			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ 7 How far have the measures adopted for the programme and individual projects addressed <u>cross-cutting issues</u> such as gender, human rights, the environment and poverty.	1. The extent to which cross-cutting issues have been incorporated into the projects supported by the programme	7.1.1. Evidence of incorporation of issues and analysis at design stage of the individual projects and the overall programme design	1. Analysis of documents 2. Base-line studies 3. Analysis of stakeholder databases vis-à-vis project beneficiaries 4. Structured interviews.
	2. In specific terms the extent to which gender issues have been addressed at a programme and project level	1. Evidence of gender specific initiatives within the programme and projects	1. Analysis of documents 2. Base-line studies 3. Analysis of stakeholder databases vis-à-vis project beneficiaries 4. Structured interviews.
	7.3 In specific terms the extent to which environmental issues have been addressed at a programme and project level	7.3.1. Evidence of environmental specific initiatives within the programme and projects	1. Analysis of documents 2. Base-line studies 3. Analysis of stakeholder databases vis-à-vis project beneficiaries 4. Structured interviews.
	7.4. In specific terms the extent to which the programme has addressed the issues of communities understanding their rights	7.4.1. Evidence that rights issues have been incorporated into the programme and project design	1. Analysis of documents 2. Base-line studies 3. Analysis of stakeholder databases vis-à-vis project beneficiaries 4. Structured interviews.
	7.5. The extent to which the programme has addressed the issue of poverty alleviation	7.5.1. Evidence that an assessment of poverty levels had been undertaken at the commencement of the programme or projects.	1. Analysis of documents 2. Base-line studies 3. Analysis of stakeholder databases vis-à-vis project beneficiaries 4. Structured interviews.

EVALUATION MATRIX - SUSTIANABILITY			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ 8 To what extent has the programme been implemented to <u>complement the actions –strategies of other government</u> departments	8.1. Projects have been implemented with co-funding from other public sources	8.1.1 Evidence of project level support to projects with other public sources	1. Documents and budgets of public sources 2. Interviews with stakeholders
	8.2. Projects have been supported by other public institutions to complement IWRM and other strategies of government	8.2.1 Evidence of the type of support from other stakeholders at a project level	1. Analysis of documents detailing support and type 2. Interviews with the different stakeholders

EVALUATION MATRIX - IMPACT			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ 10 What has been the positive and negative impact, primary and secondary medium term effects produced by the programme's intervention, directly or indirectly	10.1. Projects can see an improvement in household and community well being and livelihoods	10.1.1 Evidence of improvement in household livelihood and community well being	1. Analysis of livelihood improvement using baseline 2. Self assessment of project beneficiaries through structured interviews 3. Stakeholder assessment of improvement of livelihoods
	10.2 Projects have a better understanding of their constitutional rights and exercise it	10.2 Evidence of projects or community exercising their constitutional rights	1. Interviews with projects beneficiaries 2. Interviews with stakeholders and spheres of government
	10.3 Projects engage effectively within water management institutions and other sphere of government	10.3.1 Evidence of improvement in the participation of projects in water management institutions and other spheres of government	1. Analysis of documentation such as minutes and reports 2. Interviews with stakeholders and project beneficiaries

EVALUATION MATRIX - IMPACT			
EVALUATION QUESTION	JUDGEMENT CRITERIA	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
EQ 11 The extent to the project has improvement the position of women and youth involvement	11.1 Women effectively participating in projects and share within the decision making	11.2 Evidence of improved role of women in terms of participating and decision making	1. Analysis of project documentation 2. Interviews with project beneficiaries
	11.2 Youth involvement have been fostered and they are actively part of the project	11.2.1 Evidence of youth involvement and participation within the project	1. Analysis of project documentation 2. Interviews with project beneficiaries and stakeholders

	11.3 The extent to which gender issues and youth involvement have been implemented at a project level	11.3.1 Evidence of initiatives at project level to involve youth actively within the project	1. Interviews with project beneficiaries