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# Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANBI</td>
<td>South African National Biodiversity Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Host Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Project Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Project Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>Project Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPS</td>
<td>South African Police Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Groen Sebenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>Northern Cape Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITW</td>
<td>Intention to Withdraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARD</td>
<td>Association for Water and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESSA</td>
<td>Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDS</td>
<td>National Skills Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASA</td>
<td>South African Sugar Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBSA</td>
<td>Development Bank of Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Personal Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Skills Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CETA</td>
<td>Controlled Environment Testing Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Executive Summary

1.1 Purpose of this document

This document outlines the results of the final evaluation study (“Study” or “Evaluation”) conducted on the Groen Sebenza Programme (“the Programme”). The Evaluation was based on data gathered and consultations conducted between January 2013 and February 2016 by Redflank, on behalf of SANBI.

1.2 Background of the Groen Sebenza Programme

The Groen (“Green” in Afrikaans) Sebenza (“Work” in isiZulu) Programme was conceived and implemented in order to address the capacity and capability constraints faced by the Biodiversity Sector in South Africa. The President’s Jobs Fund allocated money to this Programme in order to assist previously disadvantaged youth from rural and or urban distressed areas from around the country to obtain relevant work experience, as well as break into the job market.

1.3 Evaluation Study Approach

The Evaluation used as its point of reference the Results Chain for the Programme, represented conceptually below.

```
Inputs  Activities  Outputs  Outcomes  Impacts
```

The Results Chain (also referred to as the Logical Model), describes the process whereby specific activities are conducted to convert inputs into outputs which then translate into outcomes, that result in intended impacts. The Results Chain thus defines the elements that contribute to the delivery of Programme results, in a chain of causality, from inputs to impacts.

The Results Chain for the Groen Sebenza Programme covers this chain of causality for each of the three key Programme objectives (together with its sub-objectives).

The Evaluation focused on assessing the actual results for the Programme against the expected results as defined by the Programme’s Result Chain. As may be expected, more immediate results (such as outputs and outcomes) are easier to assess than longer term results (viz. impacts).

The Study based its findings on data gathered through surveys, interviews, focus groups, document review, and data collection (via data templates, data requests etc.) over the 2013 to 2016 period. This included 1068 survey responses, 19 focus groups, and more than 100 interviews/ workshops; covering 9 provinces and various pioneer demographics, organisational types and sectors.
1.4 Summary Findings

Viewed holistically, the Programme has been evaluated as having largely achieved its objectives, with all areas either partially or fully meeting the expectations of programme stakeholders. This is summarised in the figure that follows.

Figure 1: Evaluation of the Programme’s Objectives against the Evaluation Areas

This assessment is expanded upon below.

1.4.1 Evaluation of Overall Delivery Against Objectives

With regard to delivering against its 3 key objectives, the Programme has been evaluated as having Met, Partially Met, and Exemplarily Met expectations, based on the effectiveness of delivery of outputs, outcomes, and impacts. The details are set out in the table below:

Table 1: Overall Delivery against Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outputs</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outcomes</th>
<th>Evaluation of Impacts</th>
<th>Overall Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the above depicts a favourable view of Groen Sebenza within the context of its specific objectives, it bears noting that perceptions of the success of the Programme are mixed, e.g. the Job Funds’ view of Groen Sebenza as an inappropriate model for high-volume job creation that is measureable in the short to medium term.
1.4.2 Assessment in Terms of Key Evaluation Areas

With regard to the assessment of the key evaluation areas, relevance has been evaluated as Exemplary, with impact and sustainability as having Met Expectations, and efficiency evaluated as having Met Expectations, though on a qualified basis.

1.4.2.1 Relevance

The Programme has been assessed as being Exemplary relevant to the needs of the sector and the Programme’s intended beneficiaries, within the broader developmental objectives of the country.

1.4.2.2 Effectiveness

Programme Effectiveness has been assessed at a holistic level to have Met Expectations, given the mix of largely Exemplary and Met (coupled with Partially Met on exception) evaluation result ratings across Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outputs</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outcomes</th>
<th>Evaluation of Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.2.3 Efficiency

Programme Efficiency has been assessed as having Met Expectations, based on the perspective of efficiency of activities as per Programme stakeholders, though this needs to be qualified based on inconclusive findings regarding cost efficiency.

1.4.2.4 Impact

Programme Impact has been assessed as having Met Expectations, given the mix of 2 impacts Meeting Expectations and 1 Partially Meeting Expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Related Impact</th>
<th>Evaluation Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Employed Pioneers</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Additional Jobs Created</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Replication of Aspects of Groen Sebenza Model</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.2.5 Sustainability

Programme Sustainability has been assessed as having Met Expectations, given the mix of 2 of the programmes objectives Meeting Expectations and 1 of the Programme’s objectives assessed as having done so on an Exemplary basis.
### Table 4: Assessment of Sustainability of the Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.4.3 Assessment Results Depicted Against the Results Chain

The following figure depicts the results delivered by the Programme within the context of the Results Chain for the Programme. The Results Chain indicates the activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts required to deliver against the Programme’s objectives.

In the figure below the extent of achievement of Programme results are reflected through a heat map representation: green indicates successful delivery, red indicates unsuccessful delivery, and amber partial delivery. The darker green areas indicate exceptional aspects of the Programme. The percentages indicate the proportion of stakeholders that rated the Programmes contribution for the relevant area as significant to extensive (as opposed to minimal to not at all).

*Figure 2: Summary assessment against key evaluation criteria*
Lessons learnt from Groen Sebenza are articulated within the context of the Programme’s delivery model (“Delivery Model”) and its governance and management model (“Governance and Management Model”). It is expected that framing the lessons learnt within these models will facilitate insightful use of these lessons by those interested in building on the Programme’s successes and in avoiding its pitfalls.

A key lesson learnt, relevant to both the Delivery Model and the Governance and Management Model is to ensure a high degree of alignment in the interests and understanding of programme stakeholders.

Groen Sebenza suffered from significant misalignment between certain stakeholder groups. Some areas of stakeholder misalignment were at a strategic level, while others were more tactical in nature. Programme Management and Host Institutions’ view of Groen Sebenza as a strategic initiative intended to catalyse capacitation of the sector; was somewhat at odds with the Jobs Funds’ focus on job creation that can be measured in the short to medium term. Jobs Fund stakeholders consulted have indicated that the Groen Sebenza model is not an ideal delivery vehicle for job creation within the Jobs Fund context. They also agree that an incubation-centred job creation model is probably more aligned to strategic industry capacitation than job creation that can be measured in the short to medium term (which is required in the Jobs Fund context).

It is the view of the Evaluation team that such strategic and tactical misalignment (as highlighted above) between stakeholders contributed significantly to instances of strained relationships and frustrated delivery, during and post the Programme. The lesson learnt here being to identify and resolve such misalignment early on.

1.5.1 Programme Delivery

The Groen Sebenza Delivery Model (as per figure below) describes the mechanisms that contributed to the delivery of the Programme’s objectives. These mechanisms consist of Core Delivery Models, together with the Support Structure affected through SANBI.
Conceptually, the Programme targeted capacitating the sector (with required skills and ways of operating) in the long term, enabled through employed pioneers in the medium term and capacitated (skilled and job ready) pioneers in the short term.

Key lessons to be learnt from the Groen Sebenza delivery model are as follows:

- Potential piloting of the delivery model prior to full implementation; with due consideration of the trade-off between extent of delivery risk and timing of scale of delivery;
- Many of the delivery mechanisms (e.g. training, mentoring) of the Groen Sebenza Incubation Model proved effective and efficient. However, similar programmes should note the challenges around job rotation, and the need for advance planning and capacitation;
- Stakeholders have reported a number of successful partnerships that had arisen during the course of the Programme. Though probably born out of necessity (e.g. the need to combine resources in cost effectively delivering the same training to pioneers at different host institutions), these collaborations have proven worthy of replication;
- Job Placement enabled through an Incubation Model (as was the case with Groen Sebenza) is unlikely to translate into high-volume job creation measurable in the short to medium term. Incubation-driven job creation is therefore recommended for sectors requiring industry capacitation through skills development; to be used with caution in those sectors more focused on high-volume job creation in shorter time frames;
Late or no focus (e.g. due to lack of advance planning and capacitation) on the delivery mechanisms for job placement (e.g. job placement guarantees, pioneer placement skills, job analysis and placement, programme visibility and marketing) led to difficulty in meeting Groen Sebenza targets and the institution of the ITW by the Jobs Fund. Similar programmes are advised to ensure early planning for delivery of these job placement mechanisms;

Measurement of fulfilment and replication effects (as indicated in the above model) are critical to confirming broader programme impact. While some of this measurement can be undertaken during the programme, provision also needs to be made for a later track and trace study;

Programme stakeholder perceptions of the ITW instituted by the Jobs Fund, as reported to the Evaluation Team, were typically negative. Although some reluctantly affirmed that the ITW did aid job placement, most Programme stakeholders have expressed the view that the ITW tainted the otherwise positive image of Groen Sebenza, and suspended funding at a time when it was sorely needed to consolidate programme successes. The Jobs Fund, however, has stressed that the ITW was necessary, given high cost-per-job figures at the time the decision was taken to implement the ITW.
1.5.2 Programme Governance and Management

The figure below describes the governance and management structures for Groen Sebenza. Items in blue indicate structures dedicated to the Programme; those in grey indicate structures involved in, but not dedicated to, Groen Sebenza. Circled numbers indicate number of staff in each Programme Management function; those in green indicate areas considered adequately staffed, those in red areas that were considered understaffed.

Groen Sebenza encountered significant governance and management challenges that should prove instructive for similar programmes. These challenges and the key lessons to be learnt are as follows:

- According to stakeholders consulted, governance arrangements for the Programme would have been more effective if:
  - The Funder, namely the Jobs Fund, was represented on the Programme Steering Committee, as this would have helped the Jobs Fund better understand the programme context, and would thus have reduced differences of opinion between the Funder and Programme stakeholders.

![Figure 4: Governance and Management Structures of Groen Sebenza](image-url)
Greater interaction at senior management and leadership levels between SANBI and National Treasury (as indicated conceptually by the arrows in the figure above), to improve alignment between the Funder (the Jobs Fund) and the Programme

Greater, and earlier, involvement from Host Institution CEOs in the Programme. It was reported that Host Institution representatives felt that they sometimes did not have the active support of their senior leadership, without which the effectiveness of some programme activities was reduced. Host Institution senior leadership involvement was naturally key to the Programme’s desired sectoral impacts.

The key lessons to be learnt from the management of Groen Sebenza relate to ensuring adequate capacity and capability, early programme planning and capacitation, and appropriate reporting resources.

1.6 Key Findings and Recommendations

The following table outlines key findings from the evaluation as well as associated recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Finding</th>
<th>Similar Programmes</th>
<th>Groen Sebenza</th>
<th>Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groen Sebenza has established an Incubation Model that has proven to be</td>
<td>Skill development initiatives, both within and outside the sector, are encouraged</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Groen Sebenza Skills Development Model and a</td>
<td>Encourage other funded internships to adopt the Groen Sebenza Incubation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceptionally effective for skills development through work experience,</td>
<td>to emulate training, mentoring, work exposure, and networking practices of</td>
<td>Collaboration Model be appropriately documented, and disseminated.</td>
<td>Model, where relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training, mentoring and networking; and which shows promise with regard to</td>
<td>Groen Sebenza. Similarly for sector collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funders need to bear in mind that with regards to job creation, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sector collaboration and job creation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Groen Sebenza model is not geared towards high-volume outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs created by Groen Sebenza in the short term are viewed as modest in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measurable in the short to medium term. The model is therefore more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number, with more substantial job creation expected in the medium to long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relevant to capacitation of emerging sectors (such as Biodiversity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>than job creation in more established sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groen Sebenza Programme Governance worked effectively enough to deliver</td>
<td>Review the lessons learnt section of this document for key learnings regarding</td>
<td>Ensure Funder representation on key programme governance committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme results, but suffered from lack of alignment of key stakeholder</td>
<td>governance as input to programme planning and delivery, e.g. ensuring early</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests, and inadequate involvement from some stakeholders.</td>
<td>involvement of senior leadership from partner organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Key Finding

### Groen Sebenza Programme Management was hamstrung by a lack of capacity, funding for early planning and capacitation, and areas of insufficient skills. On the positive side, flexible, responsive programme management and administration contributed to the Programme’s successes.

- Ensure programme management functions are planned early, and fully capacitated.
- Adopt a flexible, responsive approach to managing pioneering programmes.

### Job Placement (as articulated in the Job Placement Model), though achieved in the end, would have benefited from advance planning and capacitation.

- Plan and capacitate for Job Placement early in the programme’s life cycle.

### The ITW instituted by the Jobs Fund (given higher than planned cost metrics), though contributing to delivery of job placement targets has resulted in negative perceptions of Groen Sebenza and the Jobs Fund by Programme and sector stakeholders.

- Be mindful of the possibility of ITW-type mechanisms being instituted by Funders, and avoid such situations arising.

### The Fulfilment and Replication components of the Programme Delivery Model are demonstrating some early successes, but require further work to realise the biodiversity sectors original objectives in this area. In other words the catalytic nature of the Programme cannot be realised and measured in the short term.

- Look to replicate effective Groen Sebenza practices, as highlighted in this document, to continue the Programme’s successes.
- Investigate continued support to Pioneers post the end of the Programme, to ensure ongoing contribution from Pioneers to the sector.

### Recommendations for Relevant Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Finding</th>
<th>Similar Programmes</th>
<th>Groen Sebenza</th>
<th>Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groen Sebenza Programme Management was hamstrung by a lack of capacity, funding for early planning and capacitation, and areas of insufficient skills. On the positive side, flexible, responsive programme management and administration contributed to the Programme’s successes.</td>
<td>Ensure programme management functions are planned early, and fully capacitated. Adopt a flexible, responsive approach to managing pioneering programmes.</td>
<td>Allow room for negotiation on required Programme Management capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Placement (as articulated in the Job Placement Model), though achieved in the end, would have benefited from advance planning and capacitation.</td>
<td>Plan and capacitate for Job Placement early in the programme’s life cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure job placement planning and capacitation is planned and budgeted for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ITW instituted by the Jobs Fund (given higher than planned cost metrics), though contributing to delivery of job placement targets has resulted in negative perceptions of Groen Sebenza and the Jobs Fund by Programme and sector stakeholders.</td>
<td>Be mindful of the possibility of ITW-type mechanisms being instituted by Funders, and avoid such situations arising.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply ITW, or similar mechanisms, with caution, and with full consideration of potentially harmful impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fulfilment and Replication components of the Programme Delivery Model are demonstrating some early successes, but require further work to realise the biodiversity sectors original objectives in this area. In other words the catalytic nature of the Programme cannot be realised and measured in the short term.</td>
<td>Look to replicate effective Groen Sebenza practices, as highlighted in this document, to continue the Programme’s successes. Investigate continued support to Pioneers post the end of the Programme, to ensure ongoing contribution from Pioneers to the sector.</td>
<td>Consider publicising the Programme’s successes, to:  - encourage take-up of the Incubation Model  - to disseminate learnings from this Programme  - to encourage further delivery against Groen Sebenza’s goals</td>
<td>Consider convening a Track and Trace study in a couple of years’ time, to more fully assess the Programme’s impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Introduction

2.1 Document Purpose
This document outlines the results of the evaluation study (“Study” or “Evaluation”) conducted on the Groen Sebenza Programme (“the Programme”). The Evaluation was conducted by Redflank, on behalf of SANBI, based on data gathered between January 2014 and February 2016.

2.2 Introduction to the Groen Sebenza Programme
The Groen (“Green” in Afrikaans) Sebenza (“Work” in isiZulu) Programme was conceived and implemented in order to address the capacity and capability constraints faced by the Biodiversity Sector in South Africa. The President’s Jobs Fund allocated money to this Programme in order to assist previously disadvantaged youth from rural or previously distressed areas within South Africa obtain relevant work experience. The Programme therefore acts as a lever for graduates and matriculants into the job market.

2.2.1 Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope
Monitoring and Evaluation of projects funded by the Jobs Fund are conducted primarily for the following reasons:

- To find out whether a particular job creation intervention is effective. This determines whether the new sustainable jobs created were as a result of the Jobs Fund grant, and what, if any, change has occurred in the economy to stimulate the growth and job creation.

- To inquire how a particular project, in this case, Groen Sebenza, has been able to catalyse growth, and the reasons the outcomes were successful? Furthermore, how sustainable a particular initiative will be once the grant from the Jobs Fund has elapsed. Lastly, it seeks to determine whether the model used may be replicated by other sectors or initiatives of a similar nature.

Apart from the above objectives, specific objectives for Monitoring and Evaluation for Groen Sebenza, as defined by programme management (in conjunction with the Monitoring and Evaluation Task Team) were aligned to the following questions:

- Is the project delivering as per contractual agreement?
- Are the project processes supporting or hindering project success?
- Is the biodiversity sector’s capacity to create jobs improving?

2.2.2 Programme Background
The Groen Sebenza Programme was conceived as a vehicle to address skills shortages in the Biodiversity sector. It was expected that “incubating” appropriate graduates and matriculants at organisations (“host institutions”) would capacitate these “pioneers” with the skills and experience to formally enter the Biodiversity sector. Stakeholders in the sector were concerned that a shortage of skills supply would leave posts open that could otherwise have been filled. The Programme was also viewed as contributing to transformation in the sector.

The Groen Sebenza Programme was spearheaded by SANBI, working in conjunction with other Biodiversity sector stakeholders.

The Programme had three broad objectives:

1) To enhance employability in the Biodiversity sector
2) To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities and
3) To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development.
The figure below outlines key activities and milestones over the Programme’s duration.

Figure 5: Timelines throughout the Projects Life
2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation Context

Monitoring and evaluation of the Programme was initiated through the establishment of a Monitoring and Evaluation Task Team. The Task Team commissioned an early evaluation of the Programme, followed by the appointment of a service provider, to formally undertake monitoring and evaluation of the Programme.

The Pilot phase of these M&E activities focused on establishing an evaluation framework, data gathering and reporting mechanisms, consultative processes, and an initial monitoring and evaluation report. Subsequent phases have seen the production of a number of monitoring and evaluation reports, leveraging a number of surveys, interviews, and focus group consultations.

This Evaluation Report is the culmination of the above, in particular consultations undertaken, and data gathered in the October 2015 to March 2016 period.

2.4 Document Structure

Findings are presented top-down, and are structured as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>The Results Chain for the Programme, which was used as a point of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>Summary Findings for the Programme (visually illustrated using a Heat Map)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5</td>
<td>An outline of the relevance of the Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td>The impacts that are discernible for the Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7</td>
<td>Effectiveness of the Programme across all Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td>Efficiency of the Programme observed across all Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 9</td>
<td>Sustainability of aspects within the Programme found to be of importance beyond the Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 10</td>
<td>The lessons learnt from sections 6 to 9 which could be taken forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 11</td>
<td>Recommendations that should be considered going beyond the programme. This section highlights report findings and provides a synopsis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.1 Typical Convention used in depicting graphs

Graphs used in this document are depicted according to the following convention (see the graph that follows for a sample graph):

- Figures are obtained from surveys conducted with Host Institutions, Mentors, Pioneers, Programme Steering Committee members and sector CEOs
- Sources are references to where the relevant data was gathered from, with “n” depicting the sample size used
- Where results have been averaged additional footnotes have been used to provide further explanation
- Questions enclosed within text boxes indicate the relevant question posed in the survey
Mentors and HIs were asked: “To what extent has the programme contributed to pioneers securing permanent positions within the sector, the creation of additional jobs and the improvement of processes and systems within the sector.”

2.4.2 Convention for Text Boxes

Text boxes used in this document are depicted to mean the following:

- Text boxes with shades of white indicate questions posed to the various stakeholders in surveys sent out during the course of the Programme.
- Text boxes with shades of grey are indicative of success stories of pioneers. These showcase the accomplishments of the pioneers over the three years of the Groen Sebenza Programme.
- Text boxes with shades of blue or green indicate anecdotal evidence gathered from focus groups conducted. The comments are from mentors, host institution coordinators as well as pioneers, depicting their reflections of the Programme.

---

2 These figures are an average of the results obtained from the Mentor & HI Coordinator surveys. The sample size for these participants were 44 and 25 respectively.
2.5 Project Stakeholder Map

A variety of stakeholders have been involved throughout the three-year Programme period. The following figure outlines the key stakeholder involved. The Jobs Fund, currently operating under the auspices of National Treasury, previously formed part of the DBSA.

*Figure 7: Stakeholders involved in the Groen Sebenza Programme*

The project stakeholders involved in the Groen Sebenza Programme are detailed in the table below.

*Table 7: Project Stakeholders*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Organisation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Team</td>
<td>The following Task Teams were set up to assist the Project with implementation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incubator Task Team (Mentoring and Training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruitment, Selection and Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Steering Committee</td>
<td>The Programme was governed by a Project Steering Committee which consisted of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members selected based on agreed criteria (as not all 43 HI’s had representatives in PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Committee</td>
<td>The Programme Management Committee played the oversight function for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Unit</td>
<td>The Programme Management Unit was responsible for day-to-day management and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administration of the Programme and consisted of the following staff members:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A National Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PA to the above two positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Finance Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Three Regional co-ordinators for the nine provinces in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• HR officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Payroll Clerk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group/Organisation | Description
--- | ---
National Treasury (Jobs Fund) | The Presidents Jobs Fund was launched in June 2011, with the aim of co-financing projects in the public, private and non-governmental spheres of the economy. These funded projects address the current unemployment issues facing the country at the moment.

The Jobs Fund does not tackle structural causes of low growth, it merely operates as a catalyst driving innovation and investment which is what the Groen Sebenza was essentially seen as, an innovative project in the Biodiversity Sector.

The Jobs Fund, currently operating under the auspices of National Treasury, previously formed part of the DBSA.

Pioneers | Pioneer is the term used to denote a graduate or matriculant recruited to join the Groen Sebenza Programme as an intern, hosted at a Host Institution.

Host institutions | Host Institutions were Government, NGO, and private sector organisations that joined the Groen Sebenza Programme as hosts to Pioneers. Host Institutions played a key partnerial role on the Programme.

Service Providers | A Monitoring & Evaluation and Marketing & a Communications service provider were brought on board to assist with the Programme.

### 2.6 Evaluation Study Approach

The Evaluation used as its point of reference the Evaluation Guidelines as defined by the Jobs Fund and the Results Chain for the Programme, represented conceptually below, and in more detail in the section that follows.

![Results Chain Diagram](image)

The Results Chain (also referred to as the Logical Model), describes the process whereby specific activities are conducted to convert inputs into outputs which then translate into outcomes, that result in intended impacts. The Results Chain thus defines the elements that contribute to the delivery of Programme results, in a chain of causality, from inputs to impacts.

The Results Chain for the Groen Sebenza Programme covers the chain of causality for each of the three key Programme objectives (together with its sub-objectives).

The Evaluation focused on assessing the actual results for the Programme against the expected results as defined by the Programme’s Result Chain. As may be expected, more immediate results (such as outputs and outcomes) are easier to assess than longer term results (viz. impacts).

The following figure highlights the specific areas evaluated, within the context of the Results Chain (represented here as the Project Delivery Model).
As described in the above figure\(^3\), the evaluation focused on a number of key areas (indicated by the red blocks) each using as its point of reference the Programme Objectives (depicted in blue) and the Results Chain for the Programme (highlighted in green).

The methodology and approach adopted for the evaluation of each of the areas above is described at the start of each of sections 3 to 7 below.

The Study sourced required data through surveys, interviews, focus groups, document review, and data collection (via data templates, data requests etc.) over the 2013 to 2016 period. This included 1068 survey responses, 19 focus groups, and more than 100 interviews/workshops; covering 9 provinces, various pioneer demographics, organisational types and sectors.

The table below provides further details on the surveys conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Survey Response Count at Various Stages during the Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Phase Survey (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Phase Survey (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Meeting 2015 (Standard Phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Meeting 2016 (Final Phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Meeting 2016 (Final Phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Meeting 2016 (Final Phase)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7 Results Chain

The Results Chain for the Groen Sebenza Programme, introduced in the section above, is depicted in detail below:

![Figure 8: Detailed Results Chain](image-url)
3 Detailed Evaluation: Relevance

This section evaluates the extent to which the objectives of Groen Sebenza address:
- Identified needs of target beneficiaries
- Local and country socio economic priorities

In addition to the above objectives, this section also addresses the following key questions:
- To what extent have stakeholders been involved in the planning and implementation of Groen Sebenza?
- Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects of the Jobs Fund?

3.1 How does this Study evaluate Relevance?

Relevance is assessed by comparing each of the Programme’s 3 key objectives to beneficiary needs and socio economic priorities.

Additional commentary is provided on the key questions outlined above.

3.2 Summary Evaluation of Relevance

The Programme has been evaluated as having a high degree of relevance to the South African context, with particular relevance to the biodiversity sector (also referred to as the green economy), and to the programme’s intended beneficiaries.

The detailed evaluation supporting this summary assessment is outlined in the sub-sections that follow. The graph below indicates that the assessed high degree of relevance of the Programme is supported by perception in the industry, as illustrated by the following graph.

*Figure 9: Relevance of the programme in responding to biodiversity and other priorities in South Africa*

Industry CEO’s were asked: “How relevant is the Groen Sebenza programme in responding to Biodiversity and other priorities in South Africa?”
### 3.3 Extent to which Groen Sebenza objectives address socio economic priorities

The Groen Sebenza programme was conceived as an initiative to address key priorities in the Biodiversity sector. Given that these priorities were themselves articulated through various developmental policies (e.g. NSDS III), objectives for Groen Sebenza, by the nature of the Programme’s inception, align to national socio economic priorities; including skills development, employment creation, transformation and growth.

These socio economic priorities are articulated through the following:

- The National Development Plan (2012)
- National Skills Development Strategy (2011)
- The Green Economy Accord (2011)
- New Growth Path (2010)
- South Africa’s commitment to international green economy initiatives, viz. Sustainable Development Goals 2030 (SDGs), Paris Climate Change Agreement, Incheon 2030 Education Accord (which emphasises education for sustainable development).

The following table maps the Programme’s key objectives to the above socio economic priorities:

**Table 10: The Extent to which Groen Sebenza aligns with Developmental Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Policies</th>
<th>Programme Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Enhance Employability within the Biodiversity Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Development Plan (2013)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senior posts that better reflect the country's racial, gender and disability makeup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment of young people in the green economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 300,000 additional direct jobs being created through the green economy by 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanding training programmes linked to the skills needs of the green economy and to ensure that the new programmes take into account the requirements for the green economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Skills Development Strategy III (2011)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Green skills for a green economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Projects that are in alignment with the National Skills Development Strategy and support ... skills to support the green economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sector Skills Plan for South Africa (ESSA, 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving environmental sector skills development planning and implementation within the national education, training and skills development system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Extent to which Groen Sebenza objectives address needs of target beneficiaries

The target beneficiaries of Groen Sebenza were:

- Pioneers; as potential employees in the Biodiversity sector
- Employers in the Biodiversity sector, including Host Institutions
- The Biodiversity Sector, represented by its stakeholders

The table below confirms that the Programme aligns closely to the needs of sector stakeholders. This is to be expected, given that the Programme was originated specifically to address the skills development and job placement needs of the sector.

Table 11: Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objectives</th>
<th>To Enhance Employability within the Biodiversity Sector</th>
<th>To Enhance Capabilities of the Sector to Create Employment Opportunities</th>
<th>To Develop a Replicable Model for Job Creation &amp; Skills Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work exposure that enables access to jobs that require work experience</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building of capabilities that improve skills and work readiness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to skills development and jobs for previously disadvantaged individuals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Beneficiary Needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Industry Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Human resources with necessary skills to fill vacant posts</td>
<td>• To strengthen and diversity human capital within the biodiversity sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to build skills relevant to workplace requirements</td>
<td>• Access to proven models for skills development in the biodiversity sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To develop skills to meet the medium and long term needs of the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>• Access to proven models for job creation the biodiversity sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.5 **Key questions related to the evaluation of Relevance**

This section addresses the additional key questions raised at the start of this section

3.5.1 **To what extent have stakeholders been involved in the planning and implementation of Groen Sebenza?**

Various sector stakeholders were involved in the planning of Groen Sebenza, including during the funding and inception phase. Stakeholders involved in the early stages of the Programme include SANBI, Green Matter, WWF and WESSA. Stakeholders involved in the implementation phase included various host institutions and pioneers.

3.5.2 **Are the activities and outputs of the Programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects of the Jobs Fund?**

For the purposes of this comparison, the Programmes objectives have been employed as proxies for its activities and outputs; given the direct link between Programme objectives and results through its results chain.

The table below links the Jobs Fund’s intended effects and impacts to associated Project objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objectives</th>
<th>To Enhance Employability within the Biodiversity Sector</th>
<th>To Enhance Capabilities of the Sector to Create Employment Opportunities</th>
<th>To Develop a Replicable Model for Job Creation &amp; Skills Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended Jobs Fund Effects and Impacts</td>
<td><img src="http://example.com/yes.png" alt="Yes" /></td>
<td><img src="http://example.com/yes.png" alt="Yes" /></td>
<td><img src="http://example.com/yes.png" alt="Yes" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Intended Jobs Fund Effects and Impacts

These funding interventions will seek to overcome some of the barriers to job creation that have been identified. Some of these relate to demand for labour, some to the supply of labour and some to the broader institutional environment.

The impact it seeks, is to contribute toward achieving positive systemic impact on poverty reduction, through the catalytic projects the Fund supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objectives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Enhance Employability within the Biodiversity Sector</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Enhance Capabilities of the Sector to Create Employment Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Develop a Replicable Model for Job Creation &amp; Skills Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Detailed Evaluation: Impact

This section evaluates the extent to which the actual impacts of Groen Sebenza align to its intended impacts. This includes the positive and negative, intended and unintended changes and consequences produced by the programme; including social, economic, environmental, and other relevant developmental areas.

In addition to the above objective, this section also addresses the following key questions:

- To what extent were the Job Fund targets met?
- Which innovative elements of the Programme present scope for replication?
- What catalytic effects has the Programme had on job creation within and outside the sector?

4.1 How does this Study evaluate Impact?

Impact was assessed by comparing each of Groen Sebenza’s intended impacts (as per its Results Chain) to actual impacts. Given that the Programme had only just concluded at the time of this evaluation, impact was assessed based on available empirical evidence at the time.

Additional commentary is provided on the key questions outlined above.

4.2 Summary Evaluation of Impact

The Programme’s 3 impacts have been evaluated as either Met or Partially Met, as per the Evaluation Results Scale employed by this Study.

This is summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Related Impact</th>
<th>Evaluation Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Employed Pioneers</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Additional Jobs Created</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Replication of Aspects of Groen Sebenza Model</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Assessment of the Impact of the Programme’s Objectives
The figure below outlines the extent to which the Programme is perceived as contributing to each of its 3 key impacts. As can be observed from the graph, the Programme is viewed as contributing either significantly, substantially or extensively to each of the three expected impacts by at least half of survey respondents. The greatest perceived impact of the Programme is the improvement of processes and systems within the sector.

**Figure 10: Extent of Programme’s Contribution to Impacts**

![Graph showing the extent of Programme’s contribution to impacts.](image)

The greater perception of the Programme’s contribution to Pioneers securing permanent positions in the sector, as opposed to the creation of additional jobs, is consistent with the focus afforded to the associated Programme objectives by Programme Management and Groen Sebenza Host Institutions.

The figures below, which outline the industry's perception of Groen Sebenza's impact on the biodiversity sector, and the perception of Programme Steering Committee members regarding the extent of delivery of the Programme objectives, aligns to the perspective above.

---

* These figures are an average of the results obtained from the Mentor & HI coordinator surveys. The sample size for these participants were 44 and 25 respectively.
Industry CEO's were asked: “What degree of impact do you believe the Groen Sebenza programme has had on the biodiversity sector?”

PSC Members were asked: “To what extent do you believe Groen Sebenza has achieved its objectives?”
4.3 Impact Evaluation: Employed Pioneers

The impact Employed Pioneers has been assessed as **Met**, for the following reasons:

- 67% of stakeholders consulted indicated that the Programme contributed significantly to extensively to this impact (as indicated in Figure 10 above)
- Around 80% of the originally targeted 800 pioneers have secured jobs (see section below for details)
- The bulk of pioneers (70%) that secured job placements did so through leads introduced through the programme (see figure below for details)

The bulk of pioneers (70%) that secured job placements did so through leads introduced through the programme.

*Figure 13: Means by which Pioneers Managed to Secure Placement Opportunities*

Pioneers were asked: “**How did you secure this job?**”

Aside from the delivery against job placement targets, the Programme has also made a significant difference to individual pioneers. The following testimonials are cases in point of how the Programme has contributed to entry into the sector, both for the unemployed, as well as those that have taken other second-choice jobs.

**From Policeman to Chief Marine Conservation Inspector**

“I have a qualification in Environmental Management, but because I could not find employment in the sector, I joined the South African Police Service, where I learnt many skills that stand me in a good stead in my current position. I moved from the SAPS to NCC when I saw the advertisement to join the GS programme, as I saw it as an opportunity to pursue my real passion. I am currently employed as a Chief Marine Conservation Inspector at the Department of Agriculture in Cape Town, after having been a Groenie at the NCC until August 2014, when I successfully applied for this post.”

(Groen Sebenza Pioneer)
From Unemployed Youth to Middle Management

I graduated Bachelor of Environmental Sciences Honours in 2003 and Bachelor of Environmental Science in 2000. I was appointed as a Land User officer Intern in 2007 by the Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries and that was my only opportunity to be appointed in the relevant sector. In May 2013 I was lucky to be in the first group of Groen Sebenza intake at SANBI, KNB Gardens, and employed as Groen Sebenza intern Multi-Disciplinary project Manager (Land reform). This was a turning point in my career after spending 13 years as an unemployed graduate.

The Groen Sebenza programme is the best thing that has ever happened in my career path, it gave me hope because of its duration. It gave me the opportunity to diversify my skills and knowledge (I was involved in the LRBS, NRM and Agric support work). I received good mentoring … I had the opportunity to network, to do short courses, to attend capacity building workshops, exposure to the work environment, skills development and work experience and to meet specialists in the environmental sector.

As part of my learning I took over when a colleague left in consolidating the conservation sector inputs into the agricultural sector draft policy on Sustainable Range and Forage in SA. I was in the team which organised a very successful LRBSI learning exchange which had the largest attendance since the inception of this programme.

I had the opportunity to interact with the parliamentary portfolio committee of Environmental Affairs and to sit in NRM MINTECH Working Group for DAFF representing SANBI to identify possible links between the two institutions.

I am currently employed by SANBI as a Project Officer: NRM support. If I were to recommend GS to others I would definitely do so considering the cruelty of the world out there. I had the opportunity to be called for several interviews. In the past 4 months I had 3 jobs offer. Because of GS internship and for the first time in my career I had to turn down a job offer. I am currently serving my notice period at SANBI to join the Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries on a permanent position at a middle management level.”

(Groen Sebenza Pioneer)
Data gathered during the course of the monitoring and evaluation of Groen Sebenza suggest the pioneers enhanced employability stemmed from both an improvement in confidence and attitude as well as an increase in skills and capabilities; as indicated in the figures below.

**Figure 14: Pioneers perceptions of how they view themselves after been on the Groen Sebenza Programme**

![Graph showing perceptions of how pioneers view themselves after being on the Groen Sebenza Programme.]

Source: Standard Pioneer Survey 2015, n=63

Pioneers were asked: “How do you see yourself as a future employee in the Biodiversity sector now that you are part of the Groen Sebenza Programme?”

The following figure provides a graphical illustration of the perceived improvement in pioneers skills and capabilities during Groen Sebenza.

**Figure 15: Perceived Level of Confidence and Capability in Pioneers**

![Pie chart showing the perceived level of confidence and capability in pioneers.]

- Poor: 29%
- Fair: 3%
- Good: 22%
- Very Good: 44%
- Excellent: 3%
Mentors were asked: “Rate the increase in the skills and capabilities of your pioneers over the duration of the Groen Sebenza Programme thus far.”

### 4.4 Impact Evaluation: Additional Jobs Created

The impact Employed Pioneers has been assessed as **Partially Met**, for the following reasons:

- 50% of stakeholders consulted indicated that the Programme contributed significantly to this impact (as indicated in Figure 10 above)
- A large proportion of Programme and industry stakeholders believe Groen Sebenza has contributed to job creation through specific Programme activities, outputs, and outcomes (see figures below)
- Anecdotal evidence has been put forward by Programme stakeholders to illustrate instances of job creation.

While the number of jobs created by virtue of the Programme has not been actively tracked, the perception of such an impact from the Programme is fairly widespread. The following figure outlines the extent to which activities spawned by the Programme are viewed as contributing to the creation of additional jobs.

**Figure 16: Extent to which Job Creation was Enabled through Impacts of Groen Sebenza on Host Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The launch of programmes inspired by Groen Sebenza</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Job Creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in organisational activities due to presence of pioneers</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup organisations made possible by Pioneers or the Programme</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New projects made possible by the presence of pioneers</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional capacity made available by Pioneers</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are an average of the results obtained from the Mentor & HI coordinator surveys. The sample size for these participants were 11 and 25 respectively.
Mentors and HI Coordinators were asked “To what extent has Groen Sebenza contributed to job creation through: The additional capacity made available by pioneers, indirect job creation, increase in organisational activities due to the presence of the pioneers, start-up organisations made possible by pioneers or the programme, new projects made available by the presence of pioneers and additional capacity made available by pioneers.” The positive perception from the biodiversity sector (as outlined in the figure below) of the Programme’s contribution to job creation through stronger partnerships, aligns to the perception from Programme stakeholders (as indicated in the figure above).

**Figure 17: Impact on job creation in the sector as a result of stronger partnerships**

![Impact on job creation in the sector as a result of stronger partnerships](image)

Source: Industry Survey Responses 2015, n=19

Industry CEO’s were asked: “What do you believe will be the impact on job creation in the sector as a result of stronger partnerships?”

### 4.5 Impact Evaluation: Replication of Aspects of the Groen Sebenza Model

While the extent of replication of aspects of the Programme that may be observed, so soon after its closure, is limited, perceptions of the likelihood of such replication is shared by the bulk of stakeholders consulted. See figure below for details.
Mentors and HIs were asked: “To what extent are each of the following aspects of Groen Sebenza likely to be replicated by other programmes. The options included; incubation, mentoring, networking of juniors, collaboration between biodiversity stakeholders, programme support processes and systems, priority skills development and continuous project development.”

**4.6 Key questions related to the evaluation of Impact**

This section addresses the additional key questions raised at the start of this section.

**4.6.1 To what extent were the Job Fund targets met?**

The following table outlines programme delivery against Jobs Fund targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Area</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of beneficiaries employed in permanent positions</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beneficiaries employed in permanent positions with project partners</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beneficiaries employed in permanent positions beyond project partners</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new short term jobs during of the grant funding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures are an average of the results obtained from the Mentor & HI coordinator surveys. The sample size for these participants were 44 and 25 respectively.*
At the time of writing the Programme had reported to the Jobs Fund that 648 (81%) of the pioneers had secured permanent positions. The Programme has reported in excess of the 80% (640) target set out by the Jobs Fund at the outset of the Programme. This is against the context of reduced government employment and economic instability.

4.6.2 Which innovative elements of the Programme present scope for replication?

Innovative elements of the Programme that present scope for replication include the following:

- Innovative approaches to training, mentoring, work experience, and pioneer networking, within the broader Programme Incubation Model and collaboration between stakeholders (as described by the Delivery Model, under the Lessons Learnt section below; and in the relevant subsections, under the Detail Evaluation: Effectiveness section below)
- Continuous project development, priority skills development, and programme support processes and systems (as highlighted in the section above).

Though not an innovative component of the Programme, rather innovation resulting from the work capacity and work exposure enabled through the programme, the following makes for interesting reading.

### Sector Innovation Enabled by Groen Sebenza Pioneer

“Anelile Gibixego was a Groen Sebenza intern based at GroundTruth. She assisted and supported the bio-monitoring programmes known as the miniSASS (the Stream Assessment Scoring System) which GroundTruth were implementing in partnership with WESSA, the WRC, DWS and DST. Working with scientists Anelile helped ensure that the data from this citizen science water monitoring programme could be uploaded onto a live Google Earth data-base at www.minisass.org. Anelile managed the website and verified the data that was submitted for uploading.

This remarkable system works well in southern and Eastern Africa and hundreds of entries have been made. Since similar families of invertebrates occur all over the world it was soon found to work in other countries and Anelile soon reported that data was coming in from places such as India and Australia. This system thus provides baseline data on the quality of rivers and streams, world-wide!

Such was the competence that Anelile developed that she was soon offered a consulting position with a Johannesburg Environmental Consulting company. She is now a Graduate Aquatic Scientist with the Engineering and Environmental Consulting division of Jeffares & Green (Pty) Ltd.

Despite leaving the project Anelile is proud to know that her work is now being applied and adapted in Lesotho, India, Mexico, Canada and Northern Ireland! Indeed a mobile phone App has also been developed to support the process.”

(Groen Sebenza Mentor)

4.6.3 What catalytic effects has the Programme had on job creation within and outside the sector?

Job creation stemming from the Programme, both as a direct impact (through jobs introduced by virtue of the Programme) and as an indirect impact (by virtue of processes, systems, and initiatives spawned in the wake of the Programme) are covered in the section above.

Job creation outside the sector has not been actively tracked, through anecdotal evidence exists that this is occurring in some instances.
5 Detailed Evaluation: Effectiveness

This section assesses the extent to which the objectives of Groen Sebenza have been met.

In addition to the above objective, this section also addresses the following key questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Section Where Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are reasons for achievement or non-achievement of the Programme’s objectives?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective have each of the project interventions been?</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have outputs been transformed into outcomes?</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What adjustments were made to the project implementation process, the target indicators and why?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the Programme succeeded in mainstreaming gender equality and youth development in its areas of work?</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the management and governance arrangements of the Programme been appropriate?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the management and governance arrangements of the Jobs Fund been supportive of the implementation process of the Programme?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 How does this Study evaluate Effectiveness?

The Programme’s effectiveness is evaluated by assessing the extent of delivery of the Programme’s objectives. Delivery of these objectives is assessed against the associated Programme’s results, viz. outputs, outcomes, and impacts, as per the Results Chain for Groen Sebenza (outlined earlier in this document and depicted conceptually below).

With regard to the evaluation of Programme impacts, this is covered in the section above. This section thus focuses on the assessment of outputs and outcomes produced by the Programme. Additional commentary is provided on the key questions outlined above.

5.2 Summary Evaluation of Effectiveness

The following table summarises the effectiveness of the Programme, against each of its key objectives.
Table 16: Effectiveness Assessed against Programme’s Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outputs</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outcomes</th>
<th>Evaluation of Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by the table, the Programme may be considered to be effective in producing its intended outputs and outcomes, in some cases exemplarily so. Given the anticipated time lag from outcome to impact, the successes at output and outcome level do not appear to have translated into impacts to the same extent yet.

The following section examines the Programme’s outputs and outcomes in more detail.

### 5.3 Detailed Evaluation: Programme Outputs and Outcomes

As indicated above, the Programme is evaluated as being effective in its production of outputs and outcomes.

The following figure details stakeholder’s perceptions of the extent to which Groen Sebenza contributed to each of the Programme’s planned outputs and outcomes. Percentages indicate the proportion of respondents that viewed the Programme’s contribution to an item (output or outcome) as significant to extensive (as opposed to not at all or minimal).

As may be observed from the figure the greater majority of respondents view outputs and outcomes as effective. Development of a Model for Programme Support Processes is not viewed as positively at other areas. Using our Evaluation Results Scale, it would rate as Partially Met on effectiveness. All other areas may be rated as either Met or Exemplary.

**Figure 19: Extent of Programme’s Contribution to Objective’s Stated Outputs & Outcomes**
Mentors, HIs and pioneers were asked: “To what extent has the programme contributed to…?”

The following subsections focus on the following objectives in particular:

- **Areas rating as Highly Effective**  
  (viewed as significantly to extensively effective by at least 90% of respondents)
  - Training of Pioneers
  - Mentoring of Pioneers
  - Providing Pioneers with Networking Opportunities
  - Providing Pioneers with Relevant Work Experience
  - Responding to Transformation Challenges Facing the Biodiversity Sector
  - Development of an Incubation Model for the Biodiversity Sector

- **Areas rating as Adequate, but Open to Improvement**  
  (viewed as significantly to extensively effective by at least 33% of respondents, but less than 66%)
  - Establishment of Systems and Processes to Create Jobs
  - Development of a Model for Programme Support Processes

For the sake of deriving lessons learnt from the above, we shall consider those areas rating as Highly Effective as worthy of emulation. Similarly, those areas rating just as Adequate, but Open to Improvement, as indicative of areas to be assessed for potential improvements. These areas will be explored in more detail in the sections that follow.

### 5.4 Programme Practices viewed as Highly Effective

This section explores those Programme practices that may be viewed as Highly Effective, as introduced in the section above.

The following table highlights those practices that have contributed to the perception that each of the following areas were Highly Effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Effective Practices</th>
<th>Section where addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Training of Pioneers | • A high degree of training penetration  
                        • Results oriented training, facilitated through training focused on building job-related skills, use of training plans etc.  
                        • Multiple training delivery mechanisms (by type and geography)  
                        • Responsive training planning | 5.4.1.1  
                                                                                5.4.1.2  
                                                                                5.4.2  
                                                                                5.4.3 |
| Mentoring of Pioneers | • Training of mentors | 5.5.1 |

---

These figures are an average of the results obtained from the Mentor & HI coordinator surveys. The sample sizes for these participants were 44 and 25 respectively.
### Programme Objective | Effective Practices | Section where addressed
--- | --- | ---
**Pioneers** | • Allocating mentors from within the Pioneers work environment  
• Islands of mentoring excellence | 5.5.2  
5.5.3

**Providing Pioneers with Networking Opportunities** | • Pioneer access to other Pioneers and to sector stakeholders | 5.6.2

**Providing Pioneers with Relevant Work Experience** | • Allocation of pioneers to actual jobs  
• Allocation of pioneers to roles aligned to the sector, and to their interests | 5.7.1  
5.7.2

**Responding to Transformation Challenges Facing the Biodiversity Sector** | • Recruitment of pioneers with specific target demographics  
• Providing pioneers with skill development opportunities  
• Fostering pioneer access to job placement opportunities | 5.8.1  
5.8.2  
5.8.2

**Development of an Incubation Model for the Biodiversity Sector** | • Demonstrating a working Individual Incubation Model, operating effectively through use of the mechanisms described above | 8.2.2

The following subsections explore these effective practices in more detail. With regard to the workings of the Incubation Model, this is covered under the Lessons Learnt section below.

### 5.4.1 Training as a Highly Effective Programme Practice

As indicated in the figure below, training was perceived as effectively contributing to skill development, by pioneers, mentors and HI coordinators. The comment that follows the figure underlines the common perception amongst stakeholders that pioneer skills developed through training were relevant to workplace.

*Figure 20: Perceived Effectiveness of Training*

| Percentage of Respondents |
|---|---|---|
| Pioneers | 84% |  |
| Mentors | 91% |  |
| HI's | 100% |  |

Mentors, pioneers and HIs were asked: “To what extent had Groen Sebenza contributed to opportunities to grow the pioneer’s skills through training?”

“Groen Sebenza gave pioneers the edge over thousands of others, organizations preferred to go with Groen Sebenza candidates because of the structure of training they received” (Mentor)

5.4.1.1 Effective Training Practice: A High Degree of Training Penetration

Extensive pioneer training was conducted; both informal (e.g. on the job training) and formal.

92% of Pioneers were exposed to some form of training, out of which 75% were exposed to at least 2 training interventions (Pioneer Survey, 2015, n=69).

The training provided appears to have translated into generally positive impressions from mentors with regard to adequacy in meeting pioneers’ training needs, as per figure below. While the 20% of mentors that viewed training (measured roughly two thirds of the way into the Programme) represent an area for improvement, the 80% of mentors that viewed the training provided as adequate presents a positive view of training coverage.

Figure 21: The Adequacy of Training Received

Source: Mentor Survey 2015, n=11

Mentors were asked: “Do you believe that the training pioneers were receiving was sufficient and adequate?”

5.4.1.2 Effective Training Practice: Results oriented training, facilitated through training focused on building job-related skills, use of training plans

Reports from both pioneers and mentors indicate that training was often focused on the building of skills and capabilities related directly to the pioneer’s job at their Host Institution. This would have contributed to the pioneer’s professional development within the HI (and assuming the pioneer’s role was sector relevant) and Biodiversity context.

“The training that I attend and the tasks that I do at my day to day job is preparing me to the permanent job without a doubt.” (Pioneer)

“All the pioneers that I am mentoring went for training that they requested and seeing them resigning for better growth makes me to be proud and seeing it as a success” (Mentor)
While training plans could have been used more widely, where employed they did help align pioneer training delivery to skill development needs.

5.4.2 Multiple training delivery mechanisms (by type and geography)

Feedback via surveys, interviews and group consultations indicate that pioneer skills development was accorded focus and priority. This attitude translated into mentors, HI coordinators, pioneers and programme management exploring various types and delivery mechanisms for training.

The following figure outlines the types of training initiatives that were undertaken during the course of the Programme.

Figure 22: Types of Training Pioneers Have Been Exposed To

![Chart showing types of training](chart.png)

Source: Pioneer Survey, 2015, n=66

Pioneers were asked: “What types of training have you attended?”

Training was delivered nationally, regionally, and at HIs, to allow for effective access, given the geographically dispersed location of pioneers.

5.4.3 Responsive training planning

Both programme management and Host Institutions, instituted training interventions based on needs that emerged during the course of the Programme, e.g.

- Arrangement of mentor training by PMU, once the need for this training became apparent.
- Collaboration between HIs to arrange specific training interventions, based on common role-based training needs.

5.5 Mentoring of Pioneers as a Highly Effective Programme Practice

Feedback from sector and Programme stakeholders on mentoring has been generally positive. This perception, coupled with the positive results stemming from mentoring, highlight underlying Programme practices worthy of replication. Feedback from stakeholders indicates that the sector would benefit from adopting mentoring on a more pervasive basis, as demonstrated by the Programme.
The effective mentoring practices are expanded upon below. We also make note of opportunities to raise the bar on mentoring, to account for those pockets of mentoring experience on the Programme that could have been improved.

5.5.1 Effective Mentoring Practice: Training of Mentors

Mentor training, delivered by Programme Management, was viewed as effective in helping mentors better understand their responsibilities, and in picking up effective mentoring practices, tools and techniques. The need for mentor training was determined post inception of the Programme, and in hindsight, would have benefitted from earlier delivery.

“The preparation and willingness of the mentor was vital and critical to the success of the programme.” (HI Coordinator)

5.5.2 Effective Mentoring Practice: Allocating Mentors from within the Pioneers’ Work Environment

Allocating mentors from within the pioneer’s work environment allowed for the mentor to play a coaching role that was immediately relevant to the work context. This provided the opportunity for the development of pioneer skills that the pioneer could relate to the work at hand, thus ensuring practical skills development, with resulting skills that the pioneer could refine and leverage in executing his day to day responsibilities.

This approach would have contributed to practical mentoring, focused on skills development, as opposed to what may otherwise have been a theoretical exercise.

“My mentor was great in understanding the content of the work…” (Pioneer)

“Mentoring helped us to realise a direction in what we wanted to do going forward.” (Pioneer)

5.5.3 Effective Mentoring Practice: Islands of Mentoring Excellence

While mentoring was viewed positively by stakeholders as a general rule, there are instances of exemplary mentoring (“Islands of Mentoring Excellence”) within Groen Sebenza. As to be expected, this was often a function of the competence and attitude of the mentor, coupled with the reception from the pioneer, in a mentor-mentee pairing. Such Islands of Mentoring Excellence proved to be highly effective in accelerating pioneer skill development, work readiness, and job placement.

Such mentoring proved to be inspirational to the pioneer beneficiary, as well as to programme stakeholders. Similar programmes would be well advised to encourage and showcase such Islands of Mentoring Excellence.

“We had very good mentors and had very good relationships with them. They believed in us and gave us projects to manage without supervision.” (Pioneer)

“The mentors were very knowledgeable and experienced. We learnt a lot from them.” (Pioneer)

“Mentoring was fantastic.” (Pioneer)

“The mentors were always there when we needed them.” (Pioneer)

5.5.4 Opportunities to Raise the Bar on Mentoring Practices
While mentoring was generally viewed as effective, the following highlights opportunities to improve mentoring, based on Groen Sebenza experiences:

"Some of us were in charge of a large number of pioneers which made effective mentoring difficult" (Mentor)

- Ensure manageable mentor to mentee ratios
- Ensure mechanisms to identify and correct less-than-ideal mentor-mentee pairings

5.6 Provision of Networking Opportunities as an Effective Programme

"There were mismatches between pioneers and mentors" (HI Coordinator)

Practice

5.6.1 Effective Practice: Pioneer access to other Pioneers and to sector stakeholders

Though undertaken informally, the Programme presented pioneers with significant opportunities to network with each other, with host institution representatives, and with sector stakeholders.

"Training and networking, allowing pioneers to swap between HIs, enabled employment opportunities" (HI Coordinator)

The figure below outlines the underlying stakeholder perspective.

Figure 23: Effectiveness of Networking Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Percentages</th>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>92%</th>
<th>HIs</th>
<th>98%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mentor Survey 2016, n=44 & HI Survey 2016, n=25

Mentors and HIs were asked: “Rate the extent to which pioneers increased their network of people working in the biodiversity sector.”
The National Induction sessions, where pioneers were introduced to the Programme and to each other, provided opportunities for pioneers to build their own communities. These opportunities were also provided at events arranged by host institutions. Networking at host institution and sector level occurred through the pioneer’s job responsibilities, or through mentors encouraging pioneers to attend sector events.

5.6.2 Opportunities to Raise the Bar on Pioneer Networking Practices

The following highlights opportunities to improve pioneer networking, based on Groen Sebenza experiences:

- More formalised support for networking, e.g. more coordinated national and regional networking events
- More social media support, for networking within a geographically dispersed group

5.7 Providing Pioneers with Relevant Work Experience as an Effective Practice

5.7.1 Allocation of pioneers to actual jobs

In terms of allocating pioneers to actual jobs, we can see below that the programme effectively performed this task with over 70% of HI’s and mentors rating it at significant or higher.

“The induction programme was a good platform to communicate from our comfort zone. We able to better communicate with one another after this.” (Pioneer)

“We could arrange for networking internally in the organisation but not between organisations, as much as we would have liked to. A central coordinating mechanism for networking would be good” (HI Coordinator)

“The pioneers wanted to interact with other pioneers across different HI’s. Regional forums could have enhanced their opportunity to do so.” (Mentor)

“Networking was difficult in our organisation, pioneers spent time in the field in some isolation…”
Mentors and HIs were asked: “Rate the extent to which allocating pioneers to roles that provide appropriate work experience contributed to pioneers securing permanent jobs.”

5.7.2 Allocation of pioneers to roles aligned to the sector, and to their interests

In terms of allocating pioneers to roles aligned to the sector, and to their interests, we can see below that the programme effectively performed this task with over 95% of HIs and mentors rating it at significant or higher.

Mentors and HI coordinators were asked: “Rate the extent to which each of the following has contributed to Pioneers securing permanent jobs.” Respondents selected options ranging from not at all to extensive with an emphasis on the range significant to extensive used above. The option
The question which was posed in this instance was “to what extent has the programme contributed to…” with a response including “improved transformation within the Biodiversity Sector.” The responses are rated on an emphasised scale of significant to extensive.

5.8 Responding to Transformation Challenges Facing the Biodiversity Sector

Groen Sebenza is generally perceived as making a positive contribution to transformation within the biodiversity sector. This is supported by the figure that follows.

5.8.1 Recruitment of pioneers with specific target demographics

Meeting transformation objectives requires recruitment of appropriate beneficiaries, a requirement that was built into programme planning at inception. Pioneers were recruited to meet specific demographic and geographic representation targets. It is therefore not surprising that all (100%) Programme stakeholders consulted rated the extent to which Groen Sebenza has contributed to pioneer demographics that meet transformation requirements as significant to extensive, as opposed to not at all or minimal (Host Institution Coordinator Survey, 2016)

5.8.2 Providing pioneers with skill development opportunities and fostering pioneer access to job placement opportunities

In order to reap the benefits of recruiting Pioneers with a transformation agenda in mind, the Programme needed to ensure the Pioneers were presented with skill development opportunities, and job placement assistance, areas of Programme activity covered under the Delivery Model, in the Lessons Learnt section below.
5.9 Programme Practices viewed as Adequate but Open to Improvement

This section explores those Programme practices that may be viewed as Adequate, but Open to Improvement, as introduced in the section above.

The following table highlights those aspects that could be improved upon for each of the areas that may be viewed as Adequate but Open to Improvement.

Table 18: Practices to be Improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>What could have worked better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Systems and Processes to Create Jobs</td>
<td>• The establishment of capabilities to create jobs was a secondary priority, after pioneer skills development and job placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a Model for Programme Support Processes</td>
<td>• Insufficient time and resources were allocated to planning and prior establishment of PMU capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Programme Management Unit was understaffed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The PMU was not designed or capacitated to dynamically adjust to challenges and opportunities that emerged on the fly, as may be expected from a pioneering programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9.1 Establishment of Systems and Processes to Create Jobs

As illustrated in the Delivery Model for the Programme (see section on Lessons Learnt below), achievement of Capacitated Pioneers with job ready skills and experience, and Employed Pioneers, were the primary areas of focus for Groen Sebenza. The need to address programme challenges in delivery of these core objectives, lack of capacity, and lack of budget (including the impact of the ITW) are cited as reasons for less focus, and thus delivery with regard to the establishment of systems and processes to create jobs.

Similar programmes would be advised to plan adequate capacity and time for all areas of Programme delivery, to avoid such pitfalls.

5.9.2 Development of a Model for Programme Support Processes:

Programme support processes were identified as a potential area for improvement.

The following graph outlines the stakeholder perceptions that underline this statement.
Mentors and HI's were asked: “To what extent has Groen Sebenza contributed to systems and processes that serve as a model for the sector?”

While perceptions of the efficacy of the Groen Sebenza Programme Management Unit were mixed, there was common agreement from Programme stakeholders that the function was understaffed, and that it could have benefitted from earlier planning and capacitation.

The mechanisms employed to provide support to Programme participants and opportunities for improvement are outlined in the section on Lessons Learnt below.
6 Detailed Evaluation: Efficiency

This section evaluates the relationship between input and results (outputs, outcomes) for the Programme.
- From a financial perspective this section seeks to determine whether the Programme has achieved good value for money in the realisation of its desired outcomes
- From a practical perspective efficiency measures the extent to which the Programme has been conducted in a well-organized, productive and competent way.

In addition to the above objective, this section also addresses the following key questions:

**Table 19: Key Questions and Sections where they are Addressed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Section Where Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent can the costs of the project be justified by its actual results, taking relevant alternatives into account?</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project been able to build on other initiatives and create synergies with other projects, partners and programmes?</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the technical and financial resources adequate to fulfill the project plans?</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 How does this Study evaluate Efficiency?

Programme efficiency was evaluated through assessing the efficiency of key Programme activities, and through assessing cost effectiveness of Programme expenditure.

Additional commentary is provided on the key questions outlined above.

6.2 Summary Evaluation of Efficiency

The figure below indicates the extent to which relevant Programme activities were perceived as effective.

Five key areas were viewed as relevant to an assessment of efficiency and were evaluated on this basis. Four of the five areas are viewed by the greater majority of respondents (65% or more) as being efficient, with the efficiency of Programme Support Processes (the fifth area) demonstrating potential room for improvement.
Mentors and HI’s were asked: “How efficient were each of the following Groen Sebenza activities?”

The following table highlights efficiency considerations for each of the above areas:

### Table 20: Efficiency of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Efficient Programme Practices</th>
<th>Practices that could be more efficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training of Pioneers</td>
<td>• Needs-based training interventions, which maximizes return against training spend</td>
<td>• Efficiency of the Pay-and-Claim system has been hampered by processing complexities and lack of system support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of national and group training, that leverage economies of scale to support greater training penetration</td>
<td>• Decentralization of planning and contracting of training reduced training efficiency, particularly in the context of onerous government procurement processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Pioneers with Networking Opportunities</td>
<td>• Large pioneer gatherings, e.g. National Inductions, provided efficient opportunities for pioneer networking</td>
<td>• Propagation of Pioneer Networking “Islands of Excellence” would help produce economies of scale for positive networking practices as encouraged by mentors and as demonstrated by pioneers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring of Pioneers</td>
<td>• Regional mentor engagements, including mentor training, helped efficiently disseminate effective mentor practices</td>
<td>• Earlier delivery of mentor training would have contributed to more effective mentoring practices, earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allocating multiple pioneers per mentor introduced economies of scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Pioneers with Work Experience</td>
<td>• Allocating pioneers to host institutions to be placed in actual jobs is a fairly efficient way of providing un-employed</td>
<td>• Greater implementation of job rotation would have increased the span of pioneer work experience,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HI’s were asked: “To what extent were the financial and technical resources available adequate to fulfil Groen Sebenza’s plans?”

Deficiencies with regard to particular Programme technical capacity and skills are expanded upon further in the section on Sustainability.
6.4 Cost Effectiveness of Programme Expenditure

At face value, the average cost per Pioneer of R224,216 (as at Q3 2015) and R316,202 (as at Q3 2016) per Employed Pioneer is below the R500,000 budgeted for the Programme, though higher than the typical R60,000 to R90,000 cost per job for Job Funds funded projects. Given the lack of available benchmarks to undertake a like-for-like comparison, it is difficult for this Study to comment. Key considerations, however, may include the following:

a) How does the average Job Funds project compare to Groen Sebenza in terms of scope, approach, and objectives?

b) Should the above average include jobs created as a result of Programme (directly and/or indirectly) in addition to the jobs taken up by Pioneers?

c) How does each key component of Groen Sebenza spending compare to that of comparable programmes? Does this highlight areas of low/ high efficiency; over/under spending?

The cost effectiveness assessment for Groen Sebenza, at this stage, is thus inconclusive. What follows are some points of comparison, based on available programme data, and anecdotal and point comparisons.

The following table summarises cost per pioneer or as a percentage of total costs for each of the key areas of Programme expenditure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>Cost8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/ Stipends</td>
<td>R 7 100 per graduate per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R 4 200 per matriculant per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management/ Administration</td>
<td>5% of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1% of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Technology</td>
<td>1% of total costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>R 4 703 per pioneer per annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Operational Costs</td>
<td>R 25 732 per pioneer per annum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following subsections provide points of comparison for some of the above costs.

6.4.1 Comparison of Groen Sebenza Stipend Costs to Other Programmes

The following table compares stipends paid by Groen Sebenza to other programmes, for which this study was able to secure data.

As may be observed from the graphs, it would appear that stipend amounts paid by the Programme fall within the top 2 quartiles when compared anecdotally to other programmes. The Jobs Fund has pointed out that incubator initiatives typically do not pay stipends.

---

8 Costs are based on figures supplied by Programme Management for ITD figures as at Q3 2015/16. Average costs per pioneer have been calculated based on 880 pioneers, at an assumed internship duration of 2 years. Stipend figures are based on the standardised stipend amounts paid to graduates and matriculants.
The above figures represent the typical stipends paid to graduates as well as matriculants during internship Programmes. While the costs of the stipends paid on the Groen Sebenza Programme appear to be much higher, it is important to note that conventional internships span a duration of only 12 months. It could be argued that the competences developed were much greater given the length of time allocated to the Programme and these competences were able to supplement the incremental stipends that accrued to pioneers.
6.4.2 Comparison of Groen Sebenza Training Costs to Other Programmes

The average cost of training per pioneer of R4,703 per pioneer per annum may be compared to the average of R34,583 budgeted by the NSF per learner per annum for the 2014/15 to 2016/17 period\(^9\). Furthermore, the Programme is in-line with projected training costs incurred by organisations for interns such as the Controlled Environment Testing Association (CETA). CETA incurred R41 679 in 2015 to train an individual for a year. This shows a much higher amount when compared to Groen Sebenza.

6.4.3 Comparison of Groen Sebenza Management Costs to Other Programmes

Groen Sebenza’s Programme Management/ Administration cost (of between 5% and 7% of total costs) may be compared to the following norms:

Private sector projects appear to range between 8% and 20% of total costs for project management (O’Halloran, 2013; Schroeder, 2010 & Borysowich, 2005).

For charitable undertakings the following norms are suggested by Charity Navigator (n.d.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest Level of Efficiency</th>
<th>Median Level of Efficiency</th>
<th>Lowest Level of Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>0% - 15%</td>
<td>20% - 25%</td>
<td>&gt; 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Banks, Food Pantries</td>
<td>0% - 3%</td>
<td>5% - 10%</td>
<td>&gt; 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Foundations</td>
<td>0% - 10%</td>
<td>15% - 20%</td>
<td>&gt; 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>0% - 17.5%</td>
<td>25% - 30%</td>
<td>&gt; 45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Extent of the Programme’s Collaboration with other Initiatives and Stakeholders

Input from stakeholders indicate that the Programme was conducted as a collaborative exercise within the Biodiversity sector. Programme Management worked closely with the various host institutions as well as industry stakeholders such as Green Matter and the Department of Environmental Affairs. Certain Programme practices, such as mentoring, built on similar practices from other organisations. Programme training practices similarly built on experiences from SANBI. Experiences from other organisations were injected into the Programme operations and management through representation of various sector organisations on management forums such as partner forums, management committees, steering committees, and working groups.

\(^9\) Based on the NSF (n.d.) budget of R8.3bn to train 120,000 new learners over the 2014/15 to 2016/17 period as per National Treasury proposed figures. It is assumed that the budget per learner is spread over a 2 year period.
7 Detailed Evaluation: Sustainability

This section evaluates the extent to which the benefits of the Programme are likely to continue post the end of the Programme.

In other words sustainability is a measure of the extent to which the benefits that the Programme delivered during its lifespan continue and grow beyond its end.

In addition to the above objective, this section also addresses the following key questions:

Table 23: Key Questions and Sections where they are Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key question</th>
<th>Section Where Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the sustainability of the permanent jobs created as a result of the Programme?</td>
<td>7.4 ; 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the skills or infrastructure developed through the Programme sustainable?</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where should the Jobs Fund focus its future interventions in order to achieve sustainable impacts in job creation?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Programme supported by other local or national institutions? Do these institutions demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue to work with the project of replicate it?</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1 How does this Study evaluate Sustainability?

Sustainability is assessed as the extent to which aspects of the programme (results and ways of operating) will outlive the end of the Programme. Programme results refer to outputs and outcomes. Ways of operating refer to the Programme’s Delivery Model and its Governance and Management Model (see section on Lessons Learnt for details on the Programme’s delivery models).

Additional commentary is provided on the key questions outlined above.

7.2 Summary Evaluation of Sustainability

The following table summarises the evaluation of the sustainability of the Programme’s results, indicated by programme objective.

Table 24: Assessment of Sustainability of the Programme’s Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Evaluation of Sustainability of Programme Results
Mentors and HI’s were asked: “To what extent will the following outlive the end of the Groen Sebenza Programme?”

7.4 Programme Sustainability by virtue of Ongoing Employment of Pioneers

The bulk of stakeholders consulted (76%) perceive pioneers as remaining employed for at least 5 years post the end of the Programme. The figure below provides more details.

*Objective 1: To Enhance Employability Within the Biodiversity Sector
*Objective 2: To Enhance Capability of the Sector to Create Employment Opportunities
*Objective 3: To Develop a Replicable Model of Job Creation and Skills Development
Mentors and HI’s were asked: “Based on the capabilities pioneers at your organisation have acquired through Groen Sebenza, how long do you believe they will remain permanently employed, on average?”

### 7.5 Programme Sustainability by virtue of Longevity of Jobs Created due to the Programme

The bulk of stakeholders consulted (83%) perceive jobs created as a result of Groen Sebenza lasting for at least 1 year post the end of the Programme. Close to 2 in 3 stakeholders (62%) believe these jobs will last multiple years. The figure below provides more details.

**Figure 33: Perceptions on How Long Pioneers Will Remain Permanently Employed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Figure 34: Extent to which Additional Jobs Created as a Result of the Groen Sebenza Programme will Outlive the End of the Programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long lasting</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For years</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a year</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For less than a year</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentors and HI’s were asked: “To what extent will additional jobs created as a result of the Groen Sebenza Programme outlive the Programme itself?”

7.6 Programme Sustainability by virtue of Programme serving as a Replicable Model

Stakeholders have reported Programme practices that have been emulated by sector organisations, e.g. mentoring, organisational collaboration, and reporting practices. Stakeholders consulted have also alluded to a number of initiatives that appear to be looking to Groen Sebenza as a role model and/or lessons learnt input provider for their programmes. The following lists such initiatives for which this Study was able to secure details during the evaluation timeframe:

- The Department of Energy is in the process of creating a model that emulates certain aspects of Groen Sebenza. The Department is developing a youth development programme which is similar to the Groen Sebenza Programme, except focusing on a different sector.

- AWARD, the Association for Water and Rural Development, intends to run a variation of the Groen Sebenza delivery model with a water and biodiversity focus. AWARD intends to pilot a variation of the Groen Sebenza incubator concept on a smaller scale. The initiative is planned to employ a flexible government-civil society partnership focussed intensively on the career and competency development of interns and young professionals in Water and Biodiversity related careers.

- The DG Murray Trust is a private foundation based in Cape Town, their focus is on the development of a child rights with a specific focus of connecting post-school youth (inclusive of school dropouts) to opportunities, whether it be further education or some type of work experience. The DG Murray Trust commented that “there are very few organisations operating at a larger scale and so I was interested to hear how we could learn from your programme”.

SANBI is also in collaboration with a number of Organisations (e.g. WESSA, Wildlands Trust etc.) with regards to initiatives that build on the Groen Sebenza experience.
8 Lessons Learnt

8.1 How does this Study present the Programme’s Lessons Learnt?

Lessons learnt from Groen Sebenza are articulated within the context of the Programme’s delivery model (“Delivery Model”) and its governance and management model (“Governance and Management Model”). It is expected that framing the lessons learnt within these models will facilitate insightful use of these lessons by those interested in building on the Programme’s successes and in avoiding its pitfalls.

8.2 Lessons Learnt: Framed within the Programme Delivery Model

8.2.1 Outline of the Groen Sebenza Delivery Model

The Groen Sebenza Delivery Model (as per figure below) describes the mechanisms that contributed to the delivery of the Programme’s objectives. These mechanisms consist of Core Delivery Models, together with the Support Structure effected through SANBI.
While not conceived as such at Programme inception, the above model does describe the way in which the Programme operated and was intended to achieve its intended results.

The Delivery Model consists of the following components:

- **Incubation Model**
  *which refers to the skills development model at the core of the Programme, serving to incubate pioneers within an environment providing access to training, mentoring, and work experience; varied through job rotation;*

- **Job Placement Model**
  *which refers to the mechanisms for helping secure permanent placement for Pioneers, only some of which were implemented;*

- **Fulfilment Model**
  *which refers to the catalytic effect capacitated, employed pioneers were expected to enable in the Biodiversity sector, leveraging their skills to enable business growth with all the associated positive spinoffs (e.g. employment creation)*

- **Replication Model**
  *which refers to those initiatives inspired by, or otherwise spinning off from the Groen Sebenza Programme, thus replicating or extending the Programme’s results.*
• Support Structures
  which refers to support provided to programme participants, primarily through the
  Programme Management Unit, with support from various governance units
  (e.g. the Programme Steering Committee).

Conceptually, the Programme targeted capacitating the sector (with required skills and ways of
operating) in the long term, enabled through employed pioneers in the medium term, and
 capacitated (skilled and job ready) pioneers in the short term. This is reflected in the timeline
component of the Delivery Model.

The following subsections describe the lessons learnt relating to Programme delivery, articulated in
the context of the above model.

Stakeholders have commented that the programme could have benefitted from an initial, more
contained pilot that would have helped hone programme delivery and governance structures in
advance of a full implementation. This lesson learnt needs to be viewed in context of the trade-off
between extent of delivery risk and timing of scale of delivery.

8.2.2 Incubation Model

While the incubation model was not widely communicated and understood as such, many of its
delivery mechanisms proved both effective and efficient (as evidenced in the evaluation of these
areas in the sections on Effectiveness and Efficiency above). The novelty of the incubation
concept, as applied to an internship, contributed to a lack of widespread recognition within the
programme, as well as the need to adopt a “learning by doing” approach to establishing the
Programme’s incubation mechanisms.

Similar programmes have the opportunity to emulate Groen Sebenza’s successes through its
Incubation Model, noting the challenges around job rotation, and the need for advance planning
and capacitation.

8.2.2.1 Training, mentoring, and work experience exposure

As pointed out above, training, mentoring, and work experience exposure provided to Pioneers
proved to be largely efficient and effective. Initiatives looking to emulate Groen Sebenza’s skill
development and work readiness successes may look to replicate the Programme’s practices
(some of which are described in the sections above) in this regard.

8.2.2.2 Job Rotation

Job rotation was originally conceived by the Programme’s founders as a core component of the
Incubation Model. In practice, job rotation proved to be difficult logistically as well as contrary to
some of the Programme’s intended skill development goals. The management overhead of
tracking pioneer preferences, assignments, reporting structures etc. presented significant logistical
challenges. Loss of developed relationships, and settling in times for Pioneers with the continual
introduction of new environments were viewed as contrary to the Programme’s skill development
objectives. However, while implemented to a limited extent within Groen Sebenza (for the above
reasons), there are a number of success stories with regard to Pioneer job rotation on the
Programme.

8.2.2.3 Networking

Networking by pioneers, both amongst themselves, and with industry stakeholders, was generally
viewed as successful. Given that this was not part of the original incubation concept underpinning
the Programme, formal programme support for pioneer networking was not included in the initial
programme plan. Lack of planned programme resources thus limited structured support for pioneer
networking. However, the pioneer induction sessions, pioneer access to sector stakeholders
through their roles at host institutions, and attendance at sector events helped pioneers establish
networks within the sector.
An unplanned, though welcome, consequence of pioneer networking, was its contribution to pioneers job placement.

Initiatives looking to learn from Groen Sebenza would benefit from replicating the above practices, and additionally looking to formalise networking training and support provided to interns through such activities.

8.2.2.4 Host Institution Incubation

Groen Sebenza appears to have acted as a catalyst for collaboration, and process and system development amongst host institutions.

Stakeholders have reported a number of successful partnerships that had arisen during the course of the Programme. Though probably born out of necessity (e.g. the need to combine resources in cost effectively delivering the same training to pioneers at different host institutions), these collaborations proved effective. Stakeholders consulted refer to such collaborations with warmth and pride; often referring to them as “firsts” in the sector.

The Programme has also spawned various practices and systems of operating (e.g. tracking of the organisation’s contribution to a funded programme) that have been reported as anticipated to be beneficial to host institutions going forward.

While the incubation model of Groen Sebenza was focused on pioneer development, it would appear that the programme has also contributed to development within Host Institutions as well. Such positive consequences of internship incubation programmes may be considered as part of its planned benefits and structured mechanisms going forward.

8.2.3 Job Placement

As reported above, Groen Sebenza has a Pioneer job placement rate that would appear to compare well to other internship programmes. However, similar programmes would benefit from heeding the lessons learnt through the process of delivering these job placements.

It must be stressed that Job Placement enabled through an Incubation Model (as was the case with Groen Sebenza) will not translate into rapid-results, high-volume job creation. Such an approach is therefore recommended for sectors requiring industry capacitation through skills development; to be used with caution in those sectors more focused on high-volume job creation in the short to medium term.

While Pioneer job placements was a planned and reported upon outcome of the Programme, the practical mechanisms to enable this were either implemented late or not at all. This delay in or lack of implementation may be attributed to the following:

- Programme implementation challenges (e.g. with pay and claim model) that stretched programme resources and capacity through most of its lifespan; and which put the Programme on the back foot for many months post on boarding of pioneers
- Service provider issues, e.g. Marketing Service Provider
- Lack of access to funding, e.g. due to the ITW.

The delivery mechanisms for job placement, with the benefit of hindsight from the Groen Sebenza experience, are as follows:

- Securing of Job Placement Guarantees
- Development of Pioneer Placement Skills (e.g. Job Search)
- Pioneer Networking
- Consideration of Systemic Factors
- Jobs Analysis and Placement Support
- Publicity and Marketing Support.
The points above are expanded upon below. The sections below also address the ITW instituted by the Jobs Fund, as well as the disincentive to place Pioneers stemming from the potential perception (by Host Institutions) of them as “free resources”.

Programme stakeholders have also pointed to the difficulty in getting the Job Fund to acknowledge some Pioneer job placements, given differences of opinion with regard to definitions of “job” as well what jobs fall within the biodiversity sector. The Jobs Fund, on the other hand, has stressed the importance of ensuring that job placements relate to sector-specific jobs, as opposed to relating to “generic occupations”.

8.2.3.1 Securing of Job Placement Guarantees

Job Placement guarantees proved to be a contentious topic for Groen Sebenza. Job placement guarantees were secured from some Host Institutions by Programme Management at the inception of the Programme. However, most host institutions indicated an inability to make such commitments, potentially due to organisational limitations (e.g. NGOs not being able to commit associated budgets so far in advance of potential job placements). Regardless of the reasons, not having such guarantees in place proved problematic in the delivery of Pioneer job placement targets. The Jobs Fund has stressed the criticality of such guarantees, and highlighted the problems that the lack of such guarantees posed for job placement in the case of Groen Sebenza. Similar initiatives are advised to ensure such guarantees are planned, negotiated, and finalised early in the Programme.

8.2.3.2 Development of Pioneer placement skills

Interventions to develop Pioneer job-seeking skills were commenced late in the Programme, and were thereafter discontinued due to the ITW instituted by the Jobs Fund. Such skill development initiatives have the potential to improve interns’ abilities to search for appropriate jobs, secure interviews, prepare for interviews and tests, and obtain permanent positions.

8.2.3.3 Pioneer networking

Networking amongst pioneers and between Pioneers and Programme and sector stakeholders have been reported to be instrumental in assisting Pioneers secure jobs. This is underlined by 70% of pioneers that were placed in jobs having been referred to the job, in one way or another, through the Programme.

8.2.3.4 The influence of systemic factors

Programme stakeholders have expressed the opinion that job placement targets should have been adjusted for lower than planned demand for jobs stemming from systemic factors arising post inception of the Programme. These factors include the downturn in the economy, and the job freeze instituted within the public sector.

8.2.3.5 Jobs Analysis and Placement Support

Programme Management had planned an Employment Officer role to assist with demand-side analysis, and to provide assistance to pioneers in securing permanent positions. Delays with
recruiting and inability to access funding due to the ITW resulted in this position not being filled. Feedback from stakeholders, including Pioneers, indicate such assistance would have been useful in helping pioneers secure permanent positions.

It has also been pointed out that although demand research findings available prior to programme inception indicated adequate demand to meet Programme job placement targets, that future initiatives in the sector would benefit from more up-to-date and accurate demand figures.

8.2.3.6 Publicity and Marketing

Programme stakeholders have expressed the opinion that Pioneers’ involvement in Groen Sebenza should have positioned them preferentially at job interviews. They believe this would have been the case had the Programme enjoyed greater visibility in the sector. This may have been promoted by greater publicity and marketing of the Programme, which did not transpire given lack of delivery from the appointed service provider, coupled with inaccessibility of funding later in the Programme due to the ITW.

8.2.4 Fulfilment

Although too early to measure definitively, as indicated in the detailed evaluation of sustainability above, indications are that the trend is that the Programme has resulted in enhanced sector capabilities, sector growth, and job creation. The programme has also triggered related initiatives, as described in the section below.

Similar programmes are encouraged to budget for the active tracking of job creation during the programme, as well as post the programme (e.g. through track and trace studies). The Jobs Fund has also stressed the importance of assessing whether job placement relates to new positions or previously-existing positions.

8.2.4.1 Trust and patience

Programme stakeholders relating individual organisations experiences regarding the presence of a Pioneer resulting in the launch of a new project, or the creation of a new job, almost seemed surprised to see such impacts emerging during the course of the Programme, as opposed to emerging on completion of the programme.

This points to the lesson that such early emergence of impacts should not be discounted by other similar programmes.

8.2.4.2 Impact of the ITW

Programme stakeholder perceptions of the ITW instituted by the Jobs Fund, as reported to the Evaluation Team, were typically negative. Although some reluctantly affirmed that the ITW did aid job placement, most Programme stakeholder have expressed the view that the ITW has tainted the otherwise positive image of Groen Sebenza. They have indicated that the ITW resulted in the suspension of funding at a crucial time for the Programme, at a point when key Pioneer training needed to be conducted, when job placement support activities were required, and when the Programme needed to consolidate and publicise its successes.

The negative perspective introduced by the ITW, has been reported by stakeholders as irreparably impacting Groen Sebenza’s image and legacy.

The Jobs Fund, however, has stressed that the ITW was necessary, given high cost-per-job figures

“Our figures were not at the right stage, but it was increasing when ITW came in”
(Programme Steering Committee Member).

“When the funding from National Treasury became an issue some of the best pioneers left and we were sometimes forced to employ the 2nd or 3rd best pioneers. Overall these issues had a negative impact on the sector.”
(HI Coordinator)
at the time the decision was taken to implement the ITW.

8.2.5 Replication

As pointed out in the section on sustainability above, the Programme appears to have spawned other initiatives that replicate or extend its focus. The lesson here is that these programmes may learn from the challenges and success of Groen Sebenza, as documented in this report, and as may be secured from those involved in the Programme. For initiatives such as Groen Sebenza, planned as a catalyst for sectoral growth and capacitation, it is key to ensure that subsequent initiatives build on such lessons learnt, and that these initiatives continue where the original initiative left off.

8.2.6 The need for Alignment between Stakeholders

This evaluation study has highlighted areas of misalignment between various stakeholder groups. Some such areas of stakeholder misalignment are at a strategic level, while others are more tactical in nature. Programme Management and Host Institutions’ view of Groen Sebenza as a strategic initiative intended to catalyse capacitation of the sector; is somewhat at odds with the Jobs Funds’ focus on job creation that can be measured in the short to medium term.

While Programme Management acknowledges the job placement targets agreed with the Jobs Fund, many Programme stakeholders on the ground saw this as a secondary objective to skills development of Pioneers, which they viewed as the primary focus of the Programme.

Jobs Fund stakeholders consulted have indicated that the Groen Sebenza model is not an ideal delivery vehicle for job creation within the Jobs Fund context. They also agree that an incubation-centred job creation model is probably more aligned to strategic industry capacitation than job creation that can be measured in the short to medium term (which is required in the Jobs Fund context).

It is the view of the Evaluation team that such strategic and tactical misalignment (as highlighted above) between stakeholders contributed significantly to instances of strained relationships and frustrated delivery, during and post the Programme. The lesson learnt here being to identify and resolve such misalignment early on.

8.3 Programme Governance and Management

The figure below describes the governance and management structures for Groen Sebenza.
Groen Sebenza Evaluation Report

Items in blue indicate structures dedicated to the Programme; those in grey indicate structures involved in, but not dedicated to, Groen Sebenza. Circled numbers indicate number of staff in each Programme Management function; those in green indicate areas considered adequately staffed, those in red areas that were considered understaffed.

Groen Sebenza encountered significant governance and management challenges that should prove instructive for similar programmes. These challenges, and the key lessons to be learnt, are outlined below.

8.3.1 Governance

As reported by stakeholders consulted, governance arrangements for the Programme would have been more effective if:

- The Funder, namely the Jobs Fund, was represented on the Programme Steering Committee, as this would have helped the Jobs Fund better understand the programme context, and would thus have reduced differences of opinion between the Funder and Programme stakeholders.

- Greater interaction at senior management and leadership levels between SANBI and National Treasury (as indicated conceptually by the arrows in the figure above), to improve alignment between the Funder (the Jobs Fund) and the Programme.

- Greater, and earlier, involvement from Host Institution CEOs in the Programme. It was reported that Host Institution representatives felt that they sometimes did not have the
active support of their senior leadership, without which the effectiveness of some programme activities was reduced. Host Institution senior leadership involvement was naturally key to Programme’s desired sectoral impacts.

From the above, it would appear that the key lesson learnt from Groen Sebenza’s governance experiences is the importance of the collaborative involvement of senior stakeholders from each stakeholder group (fundisers, programme management, and participant organisations) in relevant governance structures.

8.3.2 Management

The key lessons to be learnt from the management of Groen Sebenza relate to ensuring adequate capacity and capability, early programme planning and capacitation, and appropriate reporting resources.

8.3.2.1 Adequate Capacity

Reports from Programme Management, Host Institutions and Pioneers indicate that the Programme Management Unit (which was responsible for providing HR, Finance, implementation and other forms of programme support) was understaffed. At face value, this would appear to be supported by the Programme Management costing norms included in the section of Efficiency.

Regional coordinators, critical to the effective and efficient running of the Programme, were also introduced only in the second year of the Programme.

8.3.2.2 Early programme planning and capacitation

Early planning and capacitation is key to ensuring a programme is prepared for the introduction of its participants. In the case of Groen Sebenza creation of programme operational and governance structures occurred in parallel with the on boarding of Host Institutions and Pioneers. This resulted in the Programme starting on the back foot, and continuing in this situation for some time. The Jobs Fund has expressed its view that this situation contributed to poor job placement figures evident at the time of the institution of the ITW.

8.3.2.3 Depth of skills

Reports from Programme Management and Host Institutions indicate that the Programme Management Unit lacked certain key skills. This relates particularly to job analysis and placement, and marketing and publicity.

8.3.2.4 Reporting

Reporting is a key management tool for any Programme. Given the size and geographic distribution of the Programme, coupled with the Job Funds reporting requirements, this was even more so the case for Groen Sebenza. The key lesson learnt from challenges in this area is the need to ensure sufficient capacity and appropriate system support. Capacity is required both for capture at source, as well as processing at the reporting end. Core system support is key as use of
productivity tools (e.g. MS Office) for reporting purposes is cumbersome, ineffective and inefficient for a programme the size of Groen Sebenza.

### 8.3.2.5 Key lesson to be learnt from the Programme Management of Groen Sebenza

Programme management is an overhead that Programme leadership and funders are reluctant to spend money on. It is typically at best viewed as a necessary evil, at worst an unnecessary cost. For a programme to function effectively it is critical that it is planned, designed, and delivered with adequate capacity and capability in the same way that any other critical business function would be. The lack of capacity in particular for programme support functions, and system support in the case of reporting, are issues likely to plague any programme, so similar initiatives would be well advised to ensure early planning and capacitation for these areas.
9 Key Findings and Recommendations

This section summarises the Evaluation Studies summary and key findings, and proposes associated recommendations for the Groen Sebenza Programme (to be considered as part of its wrap up), similar programmes and associated funding organisations.

9.1 Summary Findings

Viewed holistically, the Programme has been evaluated as having largely achieved its objectives, with all areas either partially or fully meeting expectations. This is summarised in the figure that follows.

**Figure 37: Evaluation of the Programme’s Objectives against Evaluation Areas**

This assessment is expanded upon below.

9.1.1 Evaluation of Overall Delivery Against Objectives

With regard to delivering against its 3 key objectives, the Programme has been evaluated as having Met, Partially Met, and Exemplarily Met expectations, based on the effectiveness of delivery of outputs, outcomes, and impacts; details as follows:

**Table 25: Overall Delivery against Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outputs</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outcomes</th>
<th>Evaluation of Impacts</th>
<th>Overall Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.1.2 Assessment in Terms of Key Evaluation Areas

With regard to the assessment of the key evaluation areas, relevance has been evaluated as Exemplary, with impact and sustainability as having Met Expectations, and efficiency evaluated as having Met Expectations, though on a qualified basis.

9.1.2.1 Relevance

The Programme has been assessed as being exemplarily relevant to the needs of the sector and the Programme’s intended beneficiaries, within the broader developmental objectives of the country.

9.1.2.2 Effectiveness

Programme Effectiveness has been assessed at a holistic level, to have Met Expectations, given the mix of largely Exemplary and Met (coupled with Partially Met on exception) evaluation result ratings across Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts.

Table 26: Effectiveness Assessed against Programme’s Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outputs</th>
<th>Evaluation of Outcomes</th>
<th>Evaluation of Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.2.3 Efficiency

Programme Efficiency has been assessed as having Met Expectations, based on the perspective of efficiency of activities as per Programme stakeholders, though this needs to be qualified based on inconclusive findings regarding cost efficiency.

9.1.2.4 Impact

Programme Impact has been assessed as having Met Expectations, given the mix of 2 impacts Meeting Expectations and 1 Not Meeting Expectations.

Table 27: Assessment of the Impact of the Programme’s Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Related Impact</th>
<th>Evaluation Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Employed Pioneers</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Additional Jobs Created</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Replication of Aspects of Groen Sebenza Model</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.2.5 Sustainability
Programme Sustainability has been assessed as having Met Expectations, given the mix of 2 of the programmes objectives Meeting Expectations and 1 of the Programme’s objectives assessed as having done so on an Exemplary basis.

Table 28: Assessment of Sustainability of the Programme’s Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1.3 Assessment Results Depicted Against the Results Chain

The follow figure depicts the results delivered by the Programme within the context of the Results Chain for the Programme. The Results Chain indicates the activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts required to deliver against the Programme’s objectives.

In the figure below the extent of achievement of Programme results are reflected through a heat map representation: green indicates successful delivery, red indicates unsuccessful delivery, and amber partial delivery. The darker green areas indicate exceptional aspects of the Programme. The percentages indicate the proportion of stakeholders that rated the Programmes contribution for the relevant area as significant to extensive (as opposed to minimal to not at all).

Figure 38: Summary assessment against key evaluation criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmes objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1: To enhance employability within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To train pioneers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To mentor pioneers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To provide networking opportunities to pioneers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To provide relevant work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2: To enhance capability of the sector to create employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To foster partnerships across the biodiversity sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To drive innovation within the biodiversity sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To increase project development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To improve systemic development and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: To develop a replicable model for job creation and skills development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To respond to transformation challenges facing the biodiversity sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To develop an incubation model for the biodiversity sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To develop a model for sector collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To develop a model for programme support processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating Scale: Programme Delivery against expectations

- Not Met: <33%
- Partially Met: 33%-66%
- Met: 67%-79%
- Exemplary: >79%
## 9.2 Key Findings and Recommendations

The following table outlines key findings from the evaluation as well as associated recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Finding</th>
<th>Recommendations for Relevant Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similar Programmes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Groen Sebenza</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groen Sebenza has established an Incubation Model that has proven to be</td>
<td>Skill development initiatives, both within and outside the sector, are encouraged to emulate training, mentoring, work exposure, and networking practices of Groen Sebenza. Similarly for sector collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceptionally effective for skills development through work experience,</td>
<td>It is recommended that the Groen Sebenza Skills Development Model and a Collaboration Model be appropriately documented, and disseminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training, mentoring, and networking; and which shows promise with regard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to sector collaboration and job creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs created by Groen Sebenza in the short term are viewed as modest in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number, with more substantial job creation expected in the medium to long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Groen Sebenza Programme Governance worked effectively enough to deliver</td>
<td>Review the lessons learnt section of this document for key learnings regarding governance as input to programme planning and delivery, e.g. ensuring early involvement of senior leadership from partner organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme results, but suffered from lack of alignment of key stakeholder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests, and inadequate involvement from some stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Groen Sebenza Programme Management was hamstrung by a lack of capacity,</td>
<td>Ensure programme management functions are planned early, and fully capacitated. Adopt a flexible, responsive approach to managing pioneering programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding for early planning and capacitation, and areas of insufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills. On the positive side, flexible, responsive programme management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and administration contributed to the Programme’s successes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Job Placement (as articulated in the Job Placement Model), though</td>
<td>Plan and capacitate for Job Placement early in the programme’s life cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved in the end, would have benefited from advance planning and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Key Finding

**The ITW instituted by the Jobs Fund (given higher than planned cost metrics), though contributing to delivery of job placement targets has resulted in negative perceptions of Groen Sebenza and the Jobs Fund by Programme and sector stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for Relevant Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similar Programmes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Be mindful of the possibility of ITW-type mechanisms being instituted by Funders, and avoid such situations arising | Consider publicising the Programme’s successes, to  
- encourage take-up of the Incubation Model  
- to disseminate learnings from this Programme  
- to encourage further delivery against Groen Sebenza’s goals | Apply ITW, or similar mechanisms, with caution, and with full consideration of potentially harmful impact |

**The Fulfilment and Replication components of the Programme Delivery Model are demonstrating some early successes, but require further work to realise the biodiversity sectors original objectives in this area. In other words, the catalytic nature of the Programme cannot be realised and measured in the short term.**

| **Look to replicate effective Groen Sebenza practices, as highlighted in this document, to continue the Programme’s successes Investigate continued support to Pioneers post the end of the Programme, to ensure ongoing contribution from Pioneers to the sector** |
| **Consider convening a Track and Trace study in a couple of years’ time, to more fully assess the Programme’s impacts** |

Look to replicate effective Groen Sebenza practices, as highlighted in this document, to continue the Programme’s successes Investigate continued support to Pioneers post the end of the Programme, to ensure ongoing contribution from Pioneers to the sector

Consider publicising the Programme’s successes, to  
- encourage take-up of the Incubation Model  
- to disseminate learnings from this Programme  
- to encourage further delivery against Groen Sebenza’s goals

Consider convening a Track and Trace study in a couple of years’ time, to more fully assess the Programme’s impacts
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