



**rural development
& land reform**

Department:
Rural Development & Land Reform
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



**The Presidency
Republic of South
Department of Performance
Monitoring and Evaluation**

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (CRDP)

RFP / Bid number: 12/409 **Compulsory briefing session**

Date: 5 October 2012

Time: 10.30-12.00pm

Venue: Room 222, East Wing, Union Buildings

Please note that security procedures at the Union Buildings can take up to 30 minutes.

Bid closing date:

12H00 12 October 2012 with provision of an electronic and 6 hard copies.

Version: 27 September 2012

Table of Contents

1. Background information and Rationale	3
1.1 Background to the intervention being evaluated	3
1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation	5
2. Focus of the Evaluation	5
2.1 Key evaluation questions	5
2.2 Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation.....	6
2.3 Scope of the evaluation	7
3. Evaluation Design.....	7
3.1 Sampling.....	8
4. Evaluation Plan	9
4.1. Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation	9
4.2. Activities.....	10
4.3 Time frame for the project	10
5. Budget and payment schedule.....	11
6. Management arrangements.....	11
7. The proposal to be submitted	11
7.1 Structure of the proposal.....	12
7.2. Information for service providers	12
7.2.1 Key background documents.....	13
7.2.2 Pricing requirements.....	13
7.3 Evaluation of proposals	13
7.3.1 Administrative compliance	13
7.3.2 Functional Evaluation	13
7.3.3 Price evaluation: The PPPFA.....	15
7.3.4. General and special conditions of contract.....	15
7.4. Evaluation Team.....	16
7.5. Competencies and skills-set required of the service provider.....	16
8. Intellectual Property	17
9. Enquiries	17

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Users and their use of the evaluation results	6
Table 2: Themes / components of the evaluation.....	7
Table 3: Outline project plan and payment schedule	10
Table 4: Functional evaluation criteria	14

1. Background information and Rationale

1.1 Background to the intervention being evaluated

The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) was approved by Cabinet in July 2009. CRDP is a priority of government linked to section 27 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, which grants citizens the right to property and puts an obligation on that State to "take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis." The programme is also directly linked to the government's outcome 7, namely: *Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security*", outcome 4, namely: "Decent employment through economic growth" and outcome 10: *Sustainable natural resources management*.

CRDP arises from the fact that the estimated 21 million rural people as per StatsSA data for 2001 have a right to basic necessities such as electricity, water, flush toilets, roads, entertainment, sport centres, shopping centres, schools and agricultural production to be able to contribute to food security.

The rationale is to enable rural people to take control of their destiny with support from government, and thereby address rural poverty effectively through the optimal use and management of natural resources. The goal of the CRDP is to achieve social cohesion and development by ensuring improved access to basic services, enterprise development and village industrialisation. The CRDP proposes an approach that addresses the needs of the person, household, community and space. The programme is premised on three pillars, namely: Agrarian Transformation; Rural Development; and Land Reform.

The objectives of CRDP are as follows:

- Mobilising and empowering rural communities to take control of their own destiny with the support of government.
- Create employment of one person per household at each of the CRDP pilot sites for two years through its job creation model.
- Addresses needs of communities in rural areas ranging from running water, sanitation, housing and development support.
- Bring together various stakeholders like other departments, non-governmental organisations business sector and community in order to enhance socio-economic development issues.

The overall success of CRDP will be measured on the realization of the common vision of the Department that is of creating a "vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities" This will be achieved through coordinated and integrated broad-

based agrarian transformation, as well as the strategic investment in economic and social infrastructure that will benefit all members of rural communities. Furthermore, the following specific outputs have been developed to achieve the CRDP outcome:

- Sustainable agrarian reform with thriving farming sector.
- Improved access to affordable and diverse food.
- Improved services to support sustainable livelihoods
- Rural job creation and promoting economic livelihoods enabling institutional environment for sustainable and inclusive growth.

In order to achieve its objectives, the CRDP is premised on three phases, namely:-

- **Phase I** regarded as an incubator or nursery stage of the programme - meeting basic human needs as driver;
- **Phase II** regarded as the entrepreneurial development stage - relatively large-scale infrastructure development as driver;
- **Phase III** is the stage of the emergence of industrial and financial sectors - driven by small, micro and medium enterprises and village markets.

Rural development is a cross-cutting programme that requires partnerships with multiple stakeholders both within and outside government. Budgeting, planning and implementation of these programmes cut across different departments and the three spheres of government. Very few programmes and services have fully decentralized service points which reach into rural communities, which CRDP specifically seeks to address. Consequently a complex set of partnerships are required to ensure that rural development could be achieved. For effective implementation of the CRDP it was necessary to clearly define roles and responsibilities among all role-players including nongovernmental stakeholders that would provide support and contribute to the achievement of different outputs.

The CRDP encompasses public sector agencies to form the core of the Implementation Forum in order to drive the achievement of this outcome, supported by strategic civil society partners. The Implementation Forum consists of the coordination department (DRDLR), and the co-chair is the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) and other core departments. Supporting departments and stakeholders have been identified to form task teams per output. The task teams would include other departments and stakeholders from other outcome forums as and when necessary. The midterm review also raised an issue about DRDLR duplicating work done by other departments and thus compromising collaboration in rural service delivery e.g. DAFF, Department of Energy, and Department of Human Settlements.

The programme started in 2009 by the current administration. Up scaling the CRDP means rolling the programme out to 2 920 rural wards across the country.¹ However during government midterm review of priorities it was found that taking the programme to scale at the level of expenditure (per household,) as was done in the pilot phase, is not viable. For example, in Diyatalawa (a community of 50 households), an estimated 10 million (200 000 per household) was spent on providing housing units, a sporting facility, water, sanitation, schools, community halls, a dairy and irrigation pivots, etc.²The DRDLR together with other sector departments and social partners has made significant progress in the implementation of phase one, but the transition to the second phase, enterprise development has progressed more slowly, meanwhile this is the critical area that will ensure that sustainability of the programme.³ The findings of the evaluation will be used to improve programme performance and the government's priority outcomes by learning from what has been done so far.

1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

This evaluation will assess whether the CRDP is achieving its policy goals and how the programme can be strengthened and up-scaled through learning from what has been done; and whether the institutional arrangements that were set in place to support the implementation of the CRDP, such as political champions, council of stakeholders, and the CRDP technical committee are appropriateness and clear about their roles and responsibilities.

2. Focus of the Evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the implementation process of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme.

2.1 Key evaluation questions

This implementation evaluation will respond to the following questions:

- To what extent were the objectives set for the CRDP achieved / are likely to be achieved in the future?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- The extent to which a program is reaching the appropriate target population?

¹ Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation. 2012. Midterm Review of the Priorities of Government. Pretoria

² Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation. 2012. Midterm Review of the Priorities of Government. Pretoria

³ Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. 2012. Mid-term Review of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, Pretoria.

- Are CRDP projects implemented according to CRDP principles and the CRDP implementation cycle? E.g. whether they are implemented in a coherent/co-ordinated manner?
- How can the work of different departments and spheres of government be aligned around core priorities of rural development?
- Are institutional arrangements that were set in place to support CRDP implementation appropriate and clear about their roles and responsibilities?
- Is value for money being achieved?
- What are the expenditure rates per capita?
- How can the programme be strengthened and up-scaled with less expenditure per household?
- What resources are being expended?
- Are communities benefiting from the CRDP intervention?
- Are there particular problems being encountered or specific barriers experienced with the transition from the first phase to the second and third phases?
- How well is service delivery organised? Whether or not service delivery is consistent with program design?
- How well does the CRDP compare with other countries that have implemented similar programmes?

2.2 Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation

The key potential users of the evaluation results and how they may use it are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Users and their use of the evaluation results

User	Key question	How they may use the evaluation results
Political leadership at national and provincial levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do we need to do to ensure that rural areas are developed • What institutional arrangements are needed to ensure sustainable rural livelihoods? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reprioritise resources • Toughen intergovernmental relations with civil society) around sustainable rural development
All departments and provinces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What interventions are being implemented effectively, which ones are not and where are the gaps? • How to strengthen the role of each department? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcoming bottleneck and improve implementation of programmes
Development partners and NGOs	As above plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are the key gaps where the support can make a difference? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritise funding and support to programmes
Staff at facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What skills and support do we 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate mobilisation

User	Key question	How they may use the evaluation results
or community level	need to ensure we can deliver services appropriately?	and commitment provided <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivating for the support they need to achieve sustainable livelihoods of rural poor
Industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can department's programmes be more appropriate in addressing rural development issues? • What type of support to government is appropriate to promote sustainable livelihoods? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refocusing resources and services

2.3 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the implementation of the CRDP from its inception in 2009 until June 2012.

The following themes/ components will be included /excluded in the evaluation:

Table 2: Themes / components of the evaluation

Themes/components covered	Themes/ components not covered
1. Job creation model	1.
2. Meeting basic human needs	2.
3. Entrepreneurial development stage	3.
4. Establishment of village industries and creation of access to credit facilities	4..
5. Coordination and planning	5.
6. institutional arrangements	6.
7. Implementation of the programme	7.
8. Infrastructure delivered	8.
9. Monitoring and evaluation	9.

3. Evaluation Design

The key elements of the design include:

1. Good literature review to draw together existing research and evaluation (a set of core documents will be provided at the bidders briefing).
2. Review of existing national and provincial policies, regulations and interventions to show how these cohere or not and govern provision.

3. Some comparison with other middle-income countries, especially where data is limited. The countries should be suggested in the inception report.
4. Overview of all the interventions and the progress/not and challenges using secondary data.
5. Four provinces selected for detailed case studies to explain what is occurring and why (including those working well, those working less well). These should cover urban to remote rural communities and facilities, perhaps 6 per province, covering a relatively well performing district and a poorly performing. See Sampling below. A list of all CRDP sites per province will be provided.
6. Some high impact interventions selected for detailed case studies. This should explain and illustrate implementation challenges and proposals to strengthen the programme.
7. Thorough institutional analysis to understand how within and across departmental systems, structures, capacity, organisational culture and leadership are facilitating or limiting outcomes. This will build on the landscape analysis.
8. Recommendations should take a short/medium/long term perspective.

3.1 Sampling

The CRDP sites to be used for the evaluation study should be selected from the list of CRDP sites that will be provided by the Department. The selected sites should be a representative sample in terms various phases of the CRDP and interventions (i.e. education, health, food security and etc.)

A multi-method approach will be used in order to evaluate the effective and efficient implementation of the programme. This will include the following methods:

Data collection and Analysis

- Both observation and interviews will be used collaboratively to collect data. Interviews will be conducted with stakeholders using questionnaire.
- Data triangulation will be considered to have a comprehensive analysis and subsequent recommendations.
- A multi method approach will be used in order to evaluate the effective and efficient implementation of the programme. This will include the following methods:

Systematic Review of Programme and Project Administrative Records

- Collect data on the implementation of CRDP based on the available programme/project administrative records in the department. Sources or documents to be provided will also include:
 - Programme performance reports

- Project monitoring reports
 - Document reviews
 - Case studies and profiling data
- The service provider should analyse documents on the programme, draw conclusions as well as formulate recommendations.

Site visits and Interviews

- Collect data at project level (selected projects) that could not be extracted from programme and project administrative records. This could include site visits to project and interviews with programme and project managers, beneficiaries and other relevant departments / stakeholders (Council of stakeholders, technical committee; etc.).
- Analyse data on the success of the programme, draw conclusions and formulate recommendations.

In addition, the service provider should conduct a basic financial analysis of the CRDP to assess the viability of the programme and whether value for money has been obtained from the delivery of the programme.

4. Evaluation Plan

4.1. Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

The evaluation must produce the key products/ deliverables which must be in the detailed report with findings and recommendations.

The report must include the following core products depending on the complexity of the evaluation:

- **Inception Report** by the service provider as a follow-up to the proposal with a revised evaluation plan, overall evaluation design and detailed methodology and content structure for the final report. This forms the basis for judging performance;
- Literature review;
- Final data collection instruments and other tools;
- Analysis plan;
- Field work report;
- Other technical or process reports, e.g. field work report Reports of engagements with stakeholders involved in implementing CRDP;
- **Draft evaluation report** for review, full and in 1/3/25 format, with findings and recommendations. The report should be submitted to the contact person of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.
- Possibly a workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report;

- The **final evaluation report**, both full and in 1/3/25 format, in hard copy and electronic;
The 1/3/25 rule for evaluation reports should apply to all Government Departments i.e. a one page policy summary of implications for policy, a three page executive summary of the whole report and a 25-page main report (Arial 11 point, single space, exclusive of appendices). The 1/3/25 is what will be distributed widely, but the long report will also be posted onto the website.
- If the CRDP design is found to be inadequate the service provider will need to suggest what revisions to the logic model (outcomes and outputs) are needed, and the theory of change, a rating of progress towards outputs, bottlenecks that hinder the achievement of outputs, reasons underpinning CRDP performance and information for potential replication of lessons for successful projects.
- **Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation** (including interviews) when data is collected.
- **A Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results.**

4.2. Activities

The evaluation approach (above) suggests the type of activities required. In addition to this it is expected that:

- There would be inception meetings and then regular meetings with the Steering Committee, and these stakeholders would also be interviewed as part of the field work.
- The evaluator is expected to provide opportunities for participating departments to be involved in the activities where this will not prejudice the information received from respondents.

4.3 Time frame for the project

The duration of the evaluation will be 8 months. The evaluation will start in August 2012 and should be completed by March 2013. The service provider should produce the project indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 2** below.

Table 3: Outline project plan and payment schedule

Deliverable	Expected milestones	% payment
Inception report	1st November 2012	
Final Inception report	15th November 2012	20%
Literature review		
Final data collection instruments and other tools		
Analysis plan		
Other technical/ process reports e.g. field work report of engagements with stakeholders		

involved in implementation of RADP		
Draft evaluation report for review, full and in 1/3/25 format	4th March 2013	40%
Possibly a workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report	25th March 2013	
Final evaluation report – 1st draft	8th April 2013	
Final evaluation report	29th April 2013	30%
Proposed changes to the intervention design if need- this may be part of the final report		
Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected.	6th May 2013	
Power point or audio-visual presentation of the results.	6th May 2013	10%

5. Budget and payment schedule

Funding for this evaluation will be provided by the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform but payment will be made by the Department of Performance Monitoring & Evaluation. The payment schedule is illustrated as **Table 3** above.

6. Management arrangements

6.1 Role of steering committee

A steering committee comprising DPME, DRDLR, and other relevant stakeholders will be responsible for appointment of service provider; approval of evaluation plan and reports; and oversee the evaluation process. In addition the evaluation process will be externally peer reviewed.

6.2 Reporting Arrangements

The commissioning department is DPME and the evaluation project managers to whom the service provider will report are Ms Thoko Masangu at DRD&LR and Ms Christel Jacob at DPME.

7. The proposal to be submitted

The evaluation and the proposal from the service provider should address the principles as shown in **Box 1** below.

Box 1: Guiding principles in evaluation from the Policy Framework for the GWMES

- Evaluations should be based on the objectives of the programme
- Evaluations should be inclusive of all stakeholders involved in the development
- Methods of evaluations should be programme orientated
- Evaluations should promote learning
- Evaluations should advance Government's transparency and accountability

- Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behaviour, and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process
- Evaluations should consider other relevant programs which have direct influence on RADP (Evaluated programme)

The evaluation should be compliant to the National Evaluation Policy Framework and should follow standard guidelines from DPME

7.1 Structure of the proposal

A structure of the proposal required from the service provider is shown in **Box 2** below.

Box 2: Structure of proposal

The Tenderer must provide the following details. Failure to provide this will lead to disqualification.

1. Understanding of the intervention and the TORs
2. Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation (e.g. literature and documentation review, data collection, tools, sample, suggestions for elaboration or changes to scope and methodology as outlined in the TORs, examples of evaluation questions suggested, process elements)
3. Activity-based Evaluation plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities)
4. Activity-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT)
5. Competence (include list of related projects undertaken of main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, and contact people for references).
6. Team (team members, roles and level of effort)
7. Capacity development elements (building capacity of partner departments and PDI/young evaluators)
8. Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)

Attachments

Example of a land reform and agrarian related evaluation report undertaken
 CVs of key personnel
 Completed supply chain forms, tax clearance etc.

7.2. Information for service providers

A bidders briefing will be held on 5th October 2012 at the Presidency. Tenders should be submitted by 16.00 on 12 October 2012 with 1 electronic and 6 hard copies.

The service providers should provide a proposal following the structure above. In addition shortlisted candidates will be requested to make presentation of their proposals on 19th October 2012 as part of the selection process.

7.2.1 Key background documents

A list of key documents will be provided at the bidders briefing meeting, including:

7.2.2 Pricing requirements

All prices must be inclusive of VAT. All quoted prices should be valid for at least three months from the closing date indicated above. Price escalations and the conditions of escalation should be clearly indicated. No variation of contract price or scope creep will be permitted. Price proposals should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in these terms of reference.

7.3 Evaluation of proposals

7.3.1 Administrative compliance

Only proposals and quotations that comply with all administrative requirements will be considered acceptable for further evaluation. Incomplete and late bids / quotes will not be considered. The following documentation must be submitted for each quote/bid:

- Documents specified in the tender documents (distributed separately from this ToR)
- Any other requirement specified in the ToR

7.3.2 Functional Evaluation

Only bids/quotes that comply with all administrative requirements (acceptable bids) will be considered during the functional evaluation phase. All bids/quotes will be scored as follows against the function criteria indicated below:

- 1 – Does not comply with the requirements
- 2 – Partial compliance with requirements
- 3 – Full compliance with requirements
- 4 – Exceeds requirements

Table 5 below outlines the functional evaluation criteria as applied to the competencies outlined in section 15 which will be used in assessing the proposals.

Table 4: Functional evaluation criteria

Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Minimum
Understanding of land reform, rural development, and entrepreneurial development in the rural sector and the TORs	2			4
Approach, design and methodology	2			4
Quality of activity-based plan (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities)	2			4
Demonstrated high quality experience in at least 5 related projects undertaken in last 5 years by main contractor and subcontractors	5			10
Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good knowledge of government policies, systems and practical implementation issues at national, provincial and local level; 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong understanding of the use of logical frameworks, results chains, and theories of change for planning and M&E; 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good knowledge of evaluation methodologies, and experience in applying them. This would be required in relation to: 				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative research; 	3			6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative research; 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formative & Summative evaluation 	2			4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy analysis and policy evaluation. 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural competence – the ability to deal effectively with the different stakeholders involved in evaluations, including appropriate language skills; 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated experience of building ownership of evaluations and evaluation results, working in ways which build capacity and commitment amongst stakeholders; 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to write short reports (using a 1/3/25 page rule) and to communicate effectively to different audiences; 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong project management skills, including field coordination and 	2			4

implementation where needed;				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income countries. 	1			2
Capacity development elements (building capacity of partner departments)	1			2
Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)	1			2
TOTAL		-----		

Minimum requirement: Service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each element as well as an overall minimum score of 75 % based on the average of scores awarded by the evaluation panel members.

Proposals should clearly address the project description and the functional evaluation criteria mentioned above.

7.3.3 Price evaluation: The PPPFA

Only proposals/quotes that meet the minimum required indicated under functional evaluation above will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. The 90/10 evaluation method will be used for proposals from R1 million. Points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table contained in SBD 6.1 (see attached bid documents).

In the application of the 80/20 preference point system, if all bids received exceed R1 000 000, the bid will be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable bid(s) received are within the R1 000 000 threshold, all bids received will be evaluated on the 80/20 preference point system.

In the application of the 90/10 preference point system, if all bids received are equal to or below R1 000 000, the bid will be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable bid(s) received are above the R1 000 000 threshold, all bids received will be evaluated on the 90/10 preference point system.

7.3.4. General and special conditions of contract

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of a service level agreement between the Department and the successful service provider.

7.4. Evaluation Team

The team must cover the competencies outlined in section 7.5, and must be enough people to undertake the work in the time available (i.e. undertake provincial case studies in parallel). Where relevant specialist skill is required it is highly recommended that service providers sub-contract this. The service provider also needs to demonstrate how it will ensure skills transfer of stakeholders and PDI evaluators. The service provider should specify the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. M&E officials and land reform programme representatives of DRDLR will participate in the evaluation process.

Table 4: Key contacts in related departments

Name	Role	E-mail address
Ms Thoko Masangu Evaluation & Research, DRDLR	Steering Committee member and project manager	TGMasangu@ruraldevelopment.gov.za
Mr Clinton Heinmann CRDP, DRDLR	Steering Committee member and programme manager CRDP	CHeinmann@ruraldevelopment.gov.za
Ms Christel Jacob Evaluation & Research DPME	Secretary of the Steering Committee & project manager	Christel@po.gov.za

7.5. Competencies and skills-set required of the service provider

The following list of generic competencies is required of the service provider:

- Good knowledge of government systems and practical implementation issues in the three spheres of government (may need to specify specific areas in relation to the evaluation focus).
- Strong understanding of the use of log frames for planning and M&E.
- Good knowledge of the Agricultural Sector.
- A good knowledge of evaluation methodologies, and experience in applying them. This would be required in relation to:
 - Quantitative and qualitative research.
 - Conducting of research synthesis, e.g. rapid evidence assessments or systematic reviews.
 - Formative and summative evaluation.
 - Policy analysis and policy evaluation.
- Cultural competence-the ability to deal effectively with different stakeholders involved in the evaluation, including appropriate language skills

- Ability to write short reports (using a 1/3/25 rule) and to communicate effectively to different audiences.
- Strong project management skills, including field coordination and implementation Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice would be an advantage, particularly in middle-income and African countries.
- Demonstrated experience of building ownership of evaluations and evaluation results, working in ways which build capacity and commitment amongst stakeholders.

8. Intellectual Property

In addition to all learning material, DRDLR and DPME will own copyright of the products of this assignment, except prior material in to the assignment or that owned by a third party.

The service provider will not use the material (either in part or whole) without the written permission of DRDLR and DPME.

9. Enquiries

For content enquiries, please contact:

Ms T.G Masangu
DRDLR
E-mail: TGMasangu@ruraldevelopment.gov.za

For commissioning or evaluation process enquiries, please contact:

Ms Christel Jacob
DPME
E-mail: Christel@po.gov.za