



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



rural development
& land reform

Department:
Rural Development and Land Reform
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION OF THE LAND REFORM RECAPITALIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

RFP / Bid number: 12/410

Compulsory briefing session

Date: 5 October 2012

Time: 9.00-10.30am

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	4
2. Focus of the evaluation.....	4
2.1 Key evaluation questions.....	4
2.2 Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation	5
2.3 Scope of the evaluation.....	6
3. Evaluation Design	7
3.1 Sampling	7
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.....	10
6. Management arrangements.....	11
6.1 Role of steering committee.....	11
6.2 Reporting 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.....	16
7.4. Evaluation Team.....	16
7.5 Competencies and skills-set required	17
8. Intellectual Property	17
9. Enquiries	17

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Users and their use of the evaluation results	5
Table 2: Themes/components of the evaluation.....	6
Table 3: Outline the project plan and payment schedule.....	10
Table 4: Functional evaluation criteria	14
Table 5: Key contacts in related departments.....	16

1. Background information and rationale

1.1 Background to the intervention being evaluated

Land Reform programme remains a critical priority for government and one of the central pillars of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP). The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) has over the past years acquired land through various land reform programmes such Settlement and Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG), Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD), SPLAG (Settlement Production Land Acquisition Grant) and PLAS (Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy), Restitution, Commonage. However, most of the land remains unproductive. In recent years, the sustainability of farms acquired through Land Reform programmes has come under critical review both within and outside of government. In order to respond to the aforementioned challenges, the DRDLR introduced the Recapitalization and Development Programme (RADP) in 2010 as a strategic land reform programme.

The Objectives of RADP are:

- to increase production;
- to guarantee food security;
- to graduate small farmers into commercial farmers; and
- to create employment opportunities within the agricultural sector;
- to establish rural development monitors.

These objectives will directly contribute to the achievement of Outcome 7 “Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security for all. Over and above that the RADP also contributes to the achievement of other outcomes namely; outcome 4 which is creation of decent employment through economic growth as well as outcome 10 which ensures sustainable natural resources management. The RADP is implemented in line with the CRDP and is intended to offer a basket of critical services, including technical and financial support, for land reform projects that are currently in distress and this will contribute towards the coordinated and integrated broad-based agrarian transformation strategy of the CRDP.

The RADP focuses on land reform farms acquired since 1994 which have received either limited or no agricultural support since then, but have a potential to be sustainable should investment and necessary support be provided. However, strict conditions which are stipulated in “RADP qualifying criteria” should be considered as a precursor for any

envisaged support required by the projects. These mechanism will amongst others ensure that the programme avoid creating a culture of entitlement by unscrupulous individuals who are not committed to sustainable production.

In order to ensure sustainability of the projects, the RADP has adopted two strategic interventions; namely strategic partnership and mentorship. The RADP requires that land reform farmers should enter into partnership with either a Strategic partner or a Mentor for the purpose of capacity building, market linkages, business plan, which will ensure that farms are operated in a sustainable manner i.e. maintenance of the production discipline and value chain integration.

1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

The implementation evaluation aims to:

Provide strategic information on the implementation of the RADP since its inception in 2010, stakeholders' effectiveness during the implementation of the programme and compile lessons learned and recommendations. The evaluation will provide the Department and the intended beneficiaries of RADP with information and recommendations on how to improve the implementation of this program in line with its targets and objectives.

2. Focus of the evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the implementation process of the Recapitalization and Development Programme.

2.1 Key evaluation questions

The evaluation will respond to the following key questions:

- Are the two interventions (strategic partnership and mentorship) effective in developing the projects?
- Does the programme effectively develop the intended beneficiaries to participate in commercial production?
- Is the programme reaching its targeted beneficiaries?
- Was the RADP designed appropriately for the achievement of its objectives?
- Are the resources used efficiently? Is the value for money being obtained?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the programme in achieving its objectives in relation to the technical competencies of the various stakeholders?

- How can the programme be strengthened?
- Is the RADP project cycle aligned to the farming operations?
- Are the intended objectives of recapitalization and development programme being achieved / are likely to be achieved?

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 stakeholders (Department, Farmers, Strategic Partners and Mentors)	<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 stakeholder? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overcoming bottleneck and improve implementation of programmes.
Development partners and NGOs	<p>As above plus:</p> <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 or community level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What skills and support do we need to ensure we can deliver services appropriately? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate mobilisation and commitment provided. • 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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refocusing resources and services.

User	Key question	How they may use the evaluation results
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What type of support by government is appropriate to promote farm productivity and sustainable livelihoods? 	

2.3 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the implementation of RADP from its inception in 2010 until June 2012. The following themes will be included / excluded in the evaluation:

Table 2: Themes/components of the evaluation

Themes/components covered	Themes/components not covered
1. Criteria for identifying distressed projects (e.g. Commodity Clustering) and beneficiaries.	
2. RADP Interventions used: Strategic partners and Mentorship.	
3. RADP funding released.	
4. Business Plan implementation stage (e.g. infrastructure, production or marketing).	
5. Contractual agreements entered into between partners (SLA, Tripartite and Social contract).	
6. Monitoring and Evaluation.	
7. Production impact.	
8. Sustainability of the project.	
9. Job created per project.	
10. Possible project turn over.	
11. Farm comprehensive business plan approved versus support provided by RADP.	
12. Status of transformation from emerging to Commercial farming.	
13. What commodities and level of their production (commercial or emerging).	
14. Availability of market and integration to the Value chain.	
15. Compliance of the farming operation with environmental legislation e.g. National Environmental Management Act,	

Conservation of Agricultural Resource Act.	
16. Contribution of RADP Different projects to Commercial Agriculture Nationally.	
17. The involvement of beneficiaries in the farm operations.	
18. Skills transfer and capacity building	

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.
6. Some high impact interventions selected for detailed case studies. This should explain and illustrate implementation challenges and proposals to strengthen.
7. Thorough institutional analysis to understand how within and across departmental systems, structures, capacity, organisational culture and leadership is 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 projects to be used for the evaluation study should be selected from the list of projects that will be provided by the Department. The selected projects should be a representative sample in terms various land reform programmes (i.e. SLAG, LRAD, SPLAG, PLAS, Commonage, and restitution).

Projects visited should be inclusive of various farming commodities i.e. livestock, crop, poultry, horticulture, etc.

The following qualitative and quantitative mixed methods should be used:

Data collection and Analysis

- Both observations 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 documents on the implementation of the land reform RADP based on the available programme and project administrative records in the Department. Sources or documents to be provided will include:
 - RADP memorandum
 - Project business plans
 - Contractual agreements
 - RADP Log frame / theory of change
 - RADP Policy
 - RADP Guidelines
 - List of RADP funded projects
 - Project Management Unit (PMU) reports
- The service provider should analyse documents, draw conclusions as well as formulate recommendations taking into consideration the seasonal and type of enterprise involved.

Site visits and interviews

- Collect data at project level (selected projects (which will include restitution projects receiving RADP funding)) 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, strategic partners, beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders.
- Analyse data and the success of the programme, draw conclusions as well as formulate recommendations.

In addition, the service provider should conduct a basic financial analysis of the RADP to assess 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;
- Other technical or process reports, e.g. field work report, reports of engagements with stakeholders involved in implementing RADP;
- Lessons learned concerning best and worst practices in producing outputs and linking them to outcomes.
- **Draft evaluation report** for review, full and in 1/3/25 format, with **findings and recommendations which are specific to themes/ components of the evaluation as stated in Table 1**. 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 design is found to be inadequate then the evaluators 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, reasons underpinning RADP 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 six (6) months. The evaluation will start towards the end of October 2012 and should be completed by the beginning of May 2013.

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 in **Table 3** below. The service provider should produce the project indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **Table 3**.

Table 3: Outline the 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	25th March 2013	

discuss the draft report		
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%

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:

- RADP memorandum
- RADP Log frame / theory of change
- RADP Policy
- RADP Guidelines
- List of RADP funded projects
- Project Management Unit (PMU) reports

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 competences outlined in section 7.5 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, recapitalisation and development and agribusiness development 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"> • Qualitative research; 	3			6

• Quantitative research;	1			2
• Formative & Summative evaluation	1			2
• Policy analysis and policy evaluation.	1			2
• Cultural competence – the ability to deal effectively with the different stakeholders involved in evaluations, including appropriate language skills;	1			2
• Demonstrated experience of building ownership of evaluations and evaluation results, working in ways which build capacity and commitment amongst stakeholders;	1			2
• Ability to write short reports (using a 1/3/25 page rule) and to communicate effectively to different audiences;	1			2
• Strong project management skills, including field coordination and implementation where needed;	2			4
• 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 below, 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 5: 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 Edwin Moshabele Recap & Development, DRDLR	Steering Committee member and programme manager RADP	MEMoshabele@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

The following is a list of generic competencies being used to establish a National Evaluation Panel. Many of these will be relevant but will have to be tailored to specific evaluations:

- Strong understanding of the use of log frames for planning and M&E
- Good knowledge of government systems and practical implementation issues in the three spheres of government (may specify specific areas in relation to the evaluation focus)
- A good knowledge of Land reform programmes
- Good knowledge of Recapitalisation and Development programme
- Experience in agribusiness development
- 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
- Formative and summative evaluation
- Policy analysis and policy evaluation
- Demonstrated experience of building ownership of evaluations and evaluation results, working in ways which build capacity and commitment amongst stakeholders
- Cultural competence-the ability to deal effectively with the 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.

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