Report

Guidelines and good practices for evidence-informed policy-making in a government department

Alf Wills, Mapula Tshangela, Louise Shaxson, Ajoy Datta and Bongani Matomela

November 2016

ODI

environmental affairs
Department:
Environmental Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Overseas Development Institute
203 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NJ

Tel. +44 (0) 20 7922 0300
Fax. +44 (0) 20 7922 0399
E-mail: info@odi.org.uk

www.odi.org
www.odi.org/facebook
www.odi.org/twitter

Department of Environmental Affairs
Republic of South Africa
Environment House, 473 Steve Biko Road
Arcadia, Pretoria 0083

Tel. +27 (12) 399 9000
E-mail: callcentre@environment.gov.za

www.environment.gov.za
https://twitter.com/environmentza

Cover photo: Project beneficiaries building a gabion in Sterkspruit © Lavinia Engelbrecht/Department of Environmental Affairs, Republic of South Africa, 2013. Reproduced with permission.

Contents

List of boxes

Boxes

About this report

This is the third in a series of documents that have been developed as part of the VakaYiko Consortium project, supporting the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) in South Africa as it embeds and enhances an evidence-informed approach to policy-making. It has been jointly produced by a team from DEA and from the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in the UK, working with the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), the Department for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) and the Department for Science and Technology (DST).

Other documents in the series include:

- a report that synthesises the team's observations on evidence-informed policy-making in DEA
- a paper outlining an approach to help government departments diagnose their evidence-informed approach to policy.

The VakaYiko consortium project runs over three years and involves five organisations working primarily in three countries: Ghana, Zimbabwe and South Africa. This project is funded by the Department for International Development (DFID) under the Building Capacity for the Use of Research Evidence (BCURE) programme. Consortium members are the Ghana Information Network for Knowledge Sharing (GINKS), Zimbabwe Evidence Informed Policy Making Network (ZeipNET), HSRC, ODI, the Parliament of Uganda and INASP.

For more information about the VakaYiko Consortium, contact us at vakayiko@inasp.info.

Acknowledgments

Acronyms and abbreviations

CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DPME	Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
DPSA	Department of Public Service and Administration
DST	Department of Science and Technology
HSRC	Human Sciences Research Council
MINMEC	Minister and Members of the Executive Committee

NDP	National Development Plan
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act
NSSD	National Strategy for Sustainable Development
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
RD&E	Research, Development & Evidence
UCT	University of Cape Town
UK	United Kingdom

1 Introduction

1.1 Who is this report for?

This report intends to prompt discussion within South Africa's Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and across the environment sector in South Africa. It proposes five guidelines and sets of good practice that could underpin a systematic and phased approach to improving evidence-informed policy-making within a government department. It derives from work done in DEA between 2014 and 2016, and builds on many good practices identified across the department. The guidelines could also inform other departments that may wish to explore a more evidence-informed approach to policy, and wider stakeholders interested in supporting such an approach.

1.2 Context

1.2.1 Evidence in policy decisions

Evidence is only one input into decision-making. Government policy-makers have to exercise considerable judgement about what evidence to seek out, when and from whom; and about how to ensure it informs decisions effectively and in a timely manner. They need to manage the proportion of their budgets they can use for evidence as wisely as possible.

There is no single approach to evidence-informed policy-making: policy work in DEA is very varied and different branches within the department, each of which addresses many specific policy issues, will use evidence in different ways at different times. This means an evidence-informed approach must be flexible and pay equal attention to the quality of the processes through which evidence is sourced and used, as well as the quality of the evidence itself. There is, however, a set of concerns that all branches share: to use the full range of high-quality evidence that is available; to use budgets as efficiently as possible; to build relationships and ensure wide participation across the sector (with citizens, stakeholders and other players); and to anticipate future evidence needs as well as responding to immediate pressures.

These guidelines have been written to help each branch determine what may be most appropriate at any given time, while ensuring a common and consistent approach to evidence across all the issues DEA faces.

1.2.2 Consistency with other key policy documents

The proposed guidelines are consistent with the broader principles set out in the National Development Plan (NDP), the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the National Strategy for Sustainable Development (NSSD):

- Chapter 5 of the NDP sets out 14 principles to guide South Africa through the transition to an environmentally sustainable low-carbon economy.
- The NEMA of 1998 describes another set of principles: decisions must take into account all forms of knowledge, including traditional and ordinary knowledge; the participation of all interested and affected parties in environmental governance must be promoted; all people must have the opportunity to develop understanding; and development must be socially, environmentally and economically sustainable.
- The NSSD states a set of fundamental principles relating to human rights, a set of substantive principles that underscore a systems approach to sustainable development and a set of process principles on implementing sustainable development.

Annex A provides a detailed list of these principles and shows how the individual guidelines relate to them.

1.3 Structure of this document

Section 2 sets out the five guidelines. They are not presented in order of importance and there is a degree of overlap between them. Each guideline is accompanied by suggestions on how it could be put into practice, embedded and scaled up – though it will be up to DEA managers to work out how best to interpret them and apply them to their particular situation.

Section 3 outlines what DEA could do to monitor their effectiveness and ensure accountability in their implementation.

2 Five guidelines and suggested good practices

Guideline 1. Use a broad definition of 'robust evidence'

Effective policy decisions will be based on a broad definition of evidence that includes research, statistical and administrative data, evidence from citizens and stakeholders, and evidence from evaluations. The robustness of the processes through which each type of evidence is sourced and used is as important as the technical robustness of the evidence itself.

Types of evidence

Environment is a function that cuts across various sectors. DEA's evidence base therefore needs to be broad enough to address all its policy goals for the environment, society and the economy.

Having a broad range of evidence will help DEA diagnose, develop, implement, monitor and evaluate its policies, and report on outcomes. DEA's Research, Development & Evidence (RD&E) Framework[1] recognises that the evidence policy teams require is not only research evidence; other types of evidence are equally important to inform the decisions that need to be taken throughout the policy cycle of diagnosis, formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The following types of evidence are proposed:[2]

- **statistical and administrative data**, whose purpose is to paint a picture of where we are now. This might include trend data on greenhouse gas emissions, the performance of landfill sites, regional water quality or the distribution of endangered species.
- **analytical (research) evidence**, whose purpose is to explain causal relationships, enrich our understanding of complex issues or challenge received wisdom. This primarily includes evidence from engineering, natural science and social science research.
- **evidence from citizens, stakeholders and players**, whose purpose is to inform policy-makers of what different groups of people value and what they consider legitimate. This type of evidence may be collected using research methods, but inclusive and participatory processes of engagement are equally important.
- **evidence from evaluations**, whose purpose is to tell us what has worked in the past, for whom, how and why. This includes evidence from detailed evaluations that can be conducted of a specific policy or programme.

Considering these four types of evidence as distinct but overlapping categories will help DEA manage its overall evidence base more effectively to support all the decisions it needs to make.

It is important to ensure that all types of evidence are technically robust, so that it meets the quality standards of whichever disciplines it emerges from (social science, economics, natural science, engineering etc).

---

1   Available at www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/environmental_research_framework.pdf.

2   Legal expertise may be needed to help develop or amend regulations, and to formulate legislation. We do not see this as a separate form of evidence, but as knowledge of how to use the evidence that already exists and to define what other evidence may be required.

Existing good practices in defining evidence

There are many good practices in DEA, regarding, for example, the four types of evidence. These include:

- **statistical and administrative data:** municipal-level data on chemicals and waste management, via the air quality reporting system and via the Environment & Culture Expanded Public Works Programme process
- **research evidence:** the South African National Biodiversity Institute's work to develop biodiversity offsets for wetlands, the earth systems science approach to policy development in the Oceans & Coast theme and the trends analysis done for the South Africa Environment Outlook (State of Environment)
- **evidence from stakeholders and citizens:** consultation around standards for waste collection in municipalities for poor households; the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan; and the National Climate Change Response White Paper, which combined citizen, stakeholder and scientific evidence
- **evidence from evaluations:** the report on environmental governance in the mining sector and the monitoring report for the NSSD.

Using Guideline 1 to enhance existing practices

These types of good practices could be reinforced and enhanced by:

- DEA senior management explicitly recognising the different types of evidence so as to more effectively manage the overall evidence budget (see Guideline 3)
- ensuring appropriate training is given in how to appraise the quality of each type of evidence, supported by appropriate guidance. This would include appraising the quality of the processes through which evidence is sourced and used as well as the technical quality of the evidence.
- devising a transparent framework for planning and prioritisation of evidence requirements to more effectively respond to statutory obligations, long-term strategic goals or short-term applied policy needs.

Guideline 2. Link evidence needs to policy priorities

Policy-makers' primary responsibility is to deliver a department's policy priorities to address South Africa's pressing environmental, social and economic challenges. There should therefore be a 'line of sight' between a department's evidence base and its statutory responsibilities and short- and long-term policy goals. Showing what evidence is needed to address individual policy priorities will help engage a wide range of people in discussions about how to fulfil those needs. These links should be updated regularly to ensure the evidence remains relevant as policy topics and priorities change. However, foundational evidence that underpins our understanding of long-term processes is as important as evidence that helps frame immediate policy decisions.

Taking an evidence-informed approach to policy-making does not mean simply searching for evidence to confirm predetermined decisions. Evidence can also explain complex relationships, enrich our understanding of an issue, challenge received wisdom, help identify new questions, clarify risks and assist in scoping opportunities for change or for achieving results at scale. There is a wide range of stakeholders, citizen groups and other players with interests in how environmental policy is formulated and implemented. They will be able to contribute ideas about what evidence is required, and why it is required, to help ensure DEA's evidence base is as robust as possible well into the future.

It is the responsibility of DEA policy-makers to begin this process by being open and clear about why they think evidence is needed and for what purpose, who they will engage with to ensure the right questions are being asked, and how the evidence will be collected and interpreted to inform decision-making.

Using Guideline 2 to enhance existing practices

These good practices could be reinforced and enhanced by (for example):

- expanding the work on the National Biodiversity Research Development and Evidence Strategy to other themes, to ensure DEA's whole evidence base is able to respond to all policies' needs as effectively as possible. This could be done in a way that automatically informs departmental planning and budgeting processes (see Guideline 3).
- sharing experiences of Operation Phakisa, to adapt lessons learnt from this 'big, fast results' approach to other relevant policy processes (see Guideline 5).
- aligning work to strengthen DEA's evidence base with other government priorities, such as the development of South Africa's research and innovation capacity.

Existing good practices in linking evidence to policy priorities

DEA has in place processes which engage stakeholders in discussions about how best to link evidence needs to policy priorities:

- DEA's RD&E Framework, approved by the Environment Minister and Members of the Executive Committee (MINMEC) in 2012, complements and draws on initiatives led by the Department of Science and Technology (DST) to devise a departmental approach to evidence-informed policy-making.
- The National Biodiversity Research and Evidence Strategy (approved by the minister in 2015) describes the short-, medium- and long-term evidence needs for the sector against the policy priorities set out in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. It also puts in place an annual process for updating DEA's evidence needs. The biodiversity theme builds good practical context for all other themes as DEA embeds and scales its systematic approach.

Guideline 3. Link an evidence-informed approach with business planning, budgeting and reporting

While it is appropriate for each theme to manage its evidence base separately, at a departmental level it is important to have a common and consistent understanding of the overall prioritisation and pattern of spending on evidence. This will encourage an evidence-informed approach to become 'business as usual', allowing senior managers to monitor how much is being spent on evidence and to judge whether the department's overall evidence budget is being spent as effectively as possible to help it meet its policy goals.

Linked to Guideline 1 – if the types of evidence are considered different but related categories – this guideline will help DEA work out how to prioritise its spending on each of them so that, with limited budgets, it is best able to use evidence throughout the policy cycle (diagnosis, formulation, implementation, reporting and monitoring and evaluation).

There may be opportunities to think about additional ways of categorising evidence, such as whether it responds to statutory (legal) requirements, helps monitor progress towards defined goals, helps current policy development and implementation, or helps anticipate likely future issues.

Using Guideline 3 to enhance existing practices

More detail regarding the use of evidence could help in managing evidence at theme and department level, including by:

- actively managing evidence as clearly defined line items in the departmental budget
- developing branch-level budgets for evidence that differentiate between the different types of evidence and the purpose for which they are needed
- developing a transparent approach to prioritising proposed bids for evidence budgets
- reporting on the planned and actual expenditure on evidence in the departmental annual performance plan.

Existing good practices in linking an evidence informed approach with business planning, budgeting and reporting

DEA is building up its growing monitoring capacity in order to more effectively report on progress towards its goals. Reporting against national-level Outcomes is a significant activity for any department. DEA has developed reporting indicators whose technical specifications have been praised for their depth, detail and rigour.

Specific evidence requirements are expressed in DEA's annual performance plans. It includes budget line items for evidence in its annual budget vote.

Guideline 4. Ensure evidence processes are inclusive and participatory

Evidence is not simply a service provided to DEA policy-makers. In any democracy there are multiple competing social values at stake in policy decisions. This means that different people will place different emphasis on the relevance and importance of pieces of evidence in the processes of developing policy positions, monitoring implementation and reporting on progress towards goals. An inclusive and participatory approach means actively involving as many of these voices as possible throughout the processes of developing and submitting policies for approval, monitoring and reporting on progress.

It is helpful to distinguish four related processes in relation to evidence:

- **jointly framing the issue and scoping the questions:** working with the full range of stakeholders to understand what they believe is relevant and important, to set the agenda for key policy issues and to identify and define all the policy questions that need answering
- **assembling existing evidence:** reviewing what is already known to reduce the danger of reinventing the wheel. This is particularly appropriate where time is limited
- **procuring new evidence:** where time is available, collecting new evidence through individually commissioned work
- **jointly interpreting the evidence to inform decisions and reframing the issue:** working across the evidence–policy interface to ensure both sides share an understanding of what the evidence means within the current policy context and whether the issue needs to be reframed in light of what is now known.

An inclusive and participatory approach to each area covers internal and external relationships. Internally, it means facilitating links between DEA staff who specialise in policy development, evaluation and policy implementation, and between DEA and other departments. Externally, it means strengthening relationships with a wide range of organisations and citizen groups – from government entities to civil society organisations, the private sector, non-governmental organisations, academia, think tanks, research councils, advocacy groups and others (see also Guideline 5). These evidence providers can contribute to both inclusive and participatory approaches by engaging with policy processes to understand DEA's priorities and specific challenges. This will help increase the policy relevance of the evidence they generate.

Disagreement is an integral part of a process of inclusive and participatory development, not something to be ignored or swept under the carpet. Policy-making approaches that welcome a wide range of opinions do more than just help improve the quality of the evidence base. They also help strengthen the department's legitimacy in the eyes of its stakeholders and of civil society.

While there are time and resource costs to promoting inclusiveness and participation processes, strengthening evidence processes in these ways is key to building mutual trust, long-term commitment and shared respect.

Existing good practices to ensure inclusive and participatory evidence processes

Participation involves different stakeholders and happens to different degrees across all DEA's policy and evidence processes. The financial, human and time resource requirements for an inclusive and participatory approach will vary from issue to issue. In some cases, they may be significant. It will be up to individual themes to decide what proportion of their resources, and how much time, to allocate to inclusive and participatory processes as guided by policy priorities. Examples of good practice include:

- DEA's Extended Public Works Programme such as the People and Parks, Working for Water and Working For Fire programmes
- development of the White Paper on Integrated Pollution and Waste Management in 2000 organised many early-stage stakeholder workshops to foster discussions around priorities
- the RD&E Framework, and the subsequent National Biodiversity Research Development and Evidence Strategy, developed through a range of participatory consultation processes.

Using Guideline 4 to enhance existing practices

Inclusive and participatory processes could be enhanced by:

- building in sufficient time for an inclusive and participatory approach. Where time is limited, it will be important to recognise whose voices are not being heard and how this will affect the outcomes of the discussions
- ensuring resources are explicitly allocated to developing and running inclusive and participatory evidence processes
- internally, strengthening relationships between people with different expertise at key points in the policy and reporting cycle
- externally, ensuring resources for meaningful participation are built into procurement plans from the outset
- producing specific guidance on how to enhance participation and inclusivity, as the complexity of the sector means different approaches to participation will be needed for different issues.

Guideline 5. Work towards co-design and co-production of evidence and policy

DEA policy officials are responsible for developing and implementing policies that improve the lives of South Africa's citizens and the environment they live in. DEA has a strong natural science evidence base: if this is the only type of evidence used, it could result in an overly technocratic approach to policy development and implementation. DEA could counter this by strengthening its understanding of the lived realities of the people whom its policies affect.

It is essential to have a good technical understanding of the challenges facing the environment, economy and society. However, a deep understanding of the problems citizens face, and our collective ability to design and implement sustainable solutions, comes from working on local issues with many different groups simultaneously. This approach focuses on enhancing mutual understanding, balancing priorities, learning from others and thinking of innovative solutions that are not driven by a single group but rather are co-owned. It encourages constant reflection on what progress is being made and the responsibilities, costs and benefits to all involved. The most dominant group does not impose its views on what evidence is needed to define the problem, develop and implement the solution or monitor progress. Instead, the evidence is co-designed and co-produced by all the different groups throughout the process.

This guideline may be difficult to implement within DEA's established processes. It may require pilot cases to establish the key lessons over time and to determine what good practice looks like. However, it is worth acknowledging its potential for improving an evidence-informed approach to policy-making and the science–policy interface.

Using Guideline 5 to enhance existing practices

Similar to Guideline 4, the financial, human and time resource requirements for co-design and co-production of evidence and policy will vary from issue to issue. Specific activities that could help include:

- identifying and prioritising appropriate policy priorities that could be approached through proactive and carefully managed processes of co-production and action–research. These are likely to be local rather than national issues and could follow the principles of strategic adaptive management
- jointly conceptualising, co-designing and co-producing the resulting projects, to ensure their relevance and long-term sustainability.

Existing good practices for the co-design and co-production of evidence and policy

As with Guideline 4, this Guideline is already embedded to different degrees throughout DEA's policy and evidence processes. Example good practices include:

- The Operation Phakisa approaches for the Oceans Economy and the Biodiversity Economy that involve stakeholders from across the sector in co-designing the questions, the search for evidence and the policy approaches to be trialled.
- DEA is the national focal point for the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, created to provide policy-relevant knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services to inform decision-making and which involves both national and international stakeholders in co-production of policy priorities.
- In 2006, the University of Cape Town led a multi-stakeholder team consisting of people from government, research, business and civil society to develop long-term mitigation scenarios in support of South Africa's policy response to climate change.
- The VakaYiko consortium project that produced these guidelines was co-designed and co-produced by officials from DEA and other government departments (DPME and DST), and participants from other spheres of government, and national and international research institutions (CSIR, HSRC, UCT and ODI).

3 Implementing the guidelines and good practices

Embedding and scaling the implementation of the guidelines and good practices can help build confidence that DEA is taking an evidence-informed approach to all its policy-making and reporting. A strategy for implementation could show how the guidelines are being adopted and any adaptations that are necessary; set out who is accountable; and describe how their implementation will be monitored to ensure they are having the intended effects.

DEA is a complex department working in a complex environment. A one-size-fits-all template will therefore be inappropriate. Implementing the guidelines will take time and a flexible approach. It may be necessary to make trade-offs between the speed and the depth at which the guidelines can be implemented and good practices scaled up.

Individual thematic areas within DEA will be responsible for many of the specific measures, but the intention is that these guidelines promote cooperative working between themes within DEA and between DEA and external organisations. They should also help develop a common framework for monitoring progress.

3.1 Promoting the adoption of the guidelines

DEA is responsible for ensuring it continues to use its evidence base as effectively as possible to support achievement of its policy goals. This responsibility is shared widely across all branches in the department. DEA could therefore:

- allocate specific resources to strengthening its evidence-informed approach
- communicate the guidelines and good practices internally and to external stakeholders, discussing their implications for current and future work
- publicise case studies of good practice in the use of evidence in policy-making, implementation and reporting
- ensure appropriate professional development and training programmes for all types of evidence are relevant to all staff, reflecting the spirit of the guidelines.

This could also cover how to build relationships to scope the policy questions, assemble existing and emerging evidence, procure new evidence, and interpret the evidence – framing and reframing issues with stakeholders in an ongoing cycle of interaction.

3.2 Ensuring accountability for implementing the guidelines

The guidelines and good practices are closely linked to departmental planning, budgeting and reporting processes. Over time, they could become embedded and scaled, to become part and parcel of the on-going business of DEA and used throughout the policy cycle of issue diagnosis, policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. This means senior managers will be responsible for ensuring the guidelines are implemented and for sharing learning about good practices. As this may not be a simple process, it may require people learning new skills or changing the way they work. DEA could therefore:

- designate senior managers responsible for the work to strengthen its evidence-informed approach; this could be done through the work to develop evidence strategies and in individual performance agreements
- account for the overall expenditure on evidence in annual budgeting processes at departmental and theme level – showing how budget allocations and actual expenditure on evidence reflect departmental policy priorities
- allow time for the guidelines to embed and changes to happen, encouraging innovation at theme level and scaling up good practice where it emerges.

3.3 Monitoring their effectiveness

Strengthening an evidence-informed approach will take time and resources. It needs to be planned and monitored to ensure the activities that underpin it remain on track and contribute towards continuous improvement. It will be

important to develop a baseline from which progress can be monitored. DEA could:

- develop a strategy for change, based on these guidelines and good practices. This would diagnose the main areas where improvement is needed, set out specific objectives within each area and list the activities to achieve those objectives. On-going and planned activities would all be included as long as they follow the spirit of the guidelines and help scale up good practices. This would form the baseline on which future progress can be assessed

- consult widely on the change strategy, together with these guidelines, to ensure the change strategy is widely shared
- develop a set of indicators of change that can be monitored over time
- share this process with DPME as the department responsible for performance management, with DPSA as the department responsible for improving the public service, and with DST as the department responsible for research evidence.

Annex A. National principles

NDP, 2012: 200	NEMA, Act 107 of 1998	NSSD, 2011: 9

Guiding principles for the transition

The following principles can guide the transition to an environmentally sustainable low-carbon economy, moving from policy, to process, to action:

Just, ethical and sustainable. Recognise the aspirations of South Africa as a developing country and remain mindful of its unique history.

Global solidarity. Justly balance national interests with collective action in relation to environmental risks and existential threats.

Ecosystems protection. Acknowledge that human wellbeing is dependent on the health of the planet.

Full-cost accounting. Internalise both environmental and social costs in planning and investment decisions, recognising that the need to secure environmental assets may be weighed against the social benefits accrued from their use.

Strategic planning. Follow a systematic approach that is responsive to emerging risk and opportunity, and which identifies and manages trade-offs.

Transformative. Address the structural and systemic flaws of the economy and society with strength of leadership, boldness, visionary thinking and innovative planning.

Managed transition. Build on existing processes and capacities to enable society to change in a structured and phased manner.

Opportunity-focused. Look for synergies between sustainability, growth, competitiveness and employment creation, for South Africa to attain equality and prosperity.

Effective participation of social partners. Be aware of mutual responsibilities, engage on differences, seek consensus and expect compromise through social dialogue.

Evidence collection balanced with immediate action. Recognise the basic tools needed for informed action.

Sound policy-making. Develop coherent and aligned policy that provides predictable signals, while being simple, feasible and effective.

Least regret. Invest early in low-carbon technologies that are least-cost, to reduce emissions and position South Africa to compete in a carbon-constrained world.

Regional approach. Develop partnerships with neighbours in the region to promote mutually beneficial collaboration on mitigation and adaptation.

Accountability and transparency. Lead and manage, as well as monitor, verify and report on the transition.

Principle 3. Development must be socially, environmentally and economically sustainable.

Principle 4(a). Sustainable development requires the consideration of all relevant factors.

Principle 4(f). Participation of all interested and affected parties in environmental governance must be promoted.

Principle 4(f). All people must have the opportunity to develop their understanding.

Principle 4(g). Decisions must take into account all forms of knowledge, including traditional and ordinary knowledge.

The NSSD vision is underpinned by a number of principles:

Fundamental principles

The fundamental principles relate to the following fundamental human rights that are guaranteed in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa:

- human dignity and social equity
- justice and fairness
- democratic governance
- a healthy and safe environment.

Substantive principles

The substantive principles are based on the following sustainable development principles that are already enshrined in South African law and that underscore a systems approach to achieving sustainable development:

- natural resources must be used sustainably
- socioeconomic systems are embedded in and are dependent on ecosystems
- basic human needs must be met to ensure the resources necessary for long-term survival are not destroyed for short-term gain.

Process principles

The process principles apply to implementation of the National Framework for Sustainable Development and the NSSD, and include the following:

- integration and innovation
- consultation and participation
- implementation in a phased manner.

These evidence principles relate to the NDP, NEMA and NSSD principles as follows:

	Evidence guidelines				
NDP principles	1	2	3	4	5
Strategic planning. Follow a systematic approach that is responsive to emerging risk and opportunity, and which identifies and manages trade-offs.	✓	✓	✓		✓
Transformative. Address the structural and systemic flaws of the economy and society with strength of leadership, boldness, visionary thinking and innovative planning.	✓				✓
Managed transition. Build on existing processes and capacities to enable society to change in a structured and phased manner.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Opportunity-focused. Look for synergies between sustainability, growth, competitiveness and employment creation, for South Africa to attain equality and prosperity.	✓	✓			
Effective participation of social partners. Be aware of mutual responsibilities, engage on differences, seek consensus and expect compromise through social dialogue.	✓			✓	
Balance evidence collection with immediate action. Recognise the basic tools needed for informed action.	✓	✓			✓
Sound policy-making. Develop coherent and aligned policy that provides predictable signals, while being simple, feasible and effective.		✓	✓		✓
Accountability and transparency. Lead and manage, as well as monitor, verify and report on the transition.		✓	✓		
NEMA principles	1	2	3	4	5
Decisions must take into account all forms of knowledge, including traditional and ordinary knowledge	✓			✓	✓
Participation of all interested and affected parties in environmental governance must be promoted.				✓	✓
All people must have the opportunity to develop their understanding.				✓	✓
Development must be socially, environmentally and economically sustainable.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
NSSD principles	1	2	3	4	5
Democratic governance	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Socioeconomic systems embedded in and dependent on ecosystems	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Consultation and participation	✓			✓	✓

ODI

Cover photo: Project beneficiaries building a gabion in Sterkspruit Lavinia Engelbrecht/Department of Environmental Affairs, Republic of South Africa, 2013. Reproduced with permission.

odi.org