



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Tel: +27 (0)12 308 1884

Fax: +27 (0)86 2755 164

Postal address: Private Bag X944, Pretoria, 0001

RFP / Bid number: 12/0468

Title: Formative Evaluation on the Presidential Revitalisation Intervention within the King Sabata Dalindyebo Local Municipality, Eastern Cape Province

Compulsory briefing session

Date: 21 November 2012

Time: 14.30-16.00

Venue: Room 160, East Wing, Union Buildings, Pretoria

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

Bid closing date:

16.00 5 December 2012 with provision of electronic and 6 hard copies

1. Introduction and Background

1.1 Context

King Sabata Dalindyebo Local Municipality (KSDLM) is one of seven municipalities falling within the OR Tambo District Municipality and has Mthatha as its main town. In 2009 the KSDLM had a population of just over 440 000¹ and is the largest municipality in the District in terms of population size.

Poverty in the municipal area is evident with KSDLM having the highest concentration of poor households in the District. It is estimated that 59% of the households live in poverty and as much as 61% earn less than R3500 per month. According to reports in the hands of DPME, 33% of the population is without access to sanitation, 30% without electricity for lighting and 33% are without access to basic water.

Although the KSDLM is the largest contributor to the district economy, unemployment is high and labour force participation is extremely low. Staggeringly, about 55% (or 128 000) of the total labour

¹ Eastern Cape Socio-Economic Consultative Council (ECSEC) 2009

force of about 230 000 is classified as not economically active². Data suggests that the dependency ratio could be as high as 1: 7; that is 1 employed person for every 7 persons.

Prior to the launch of the KD PI, the Municipality had a number of challenges particularly with respect to financial management and human resource capacity. It had a high vacancy rate within the administration, low skills base amongst staff and, accumulated outstanding debts, weak billing systems and expenditure on personnel consumed about 49% of the budget compared to a national average of 30%³.

Maintenance of infrastructure has been weak, infrastructure was in a poor state and inadequate and there was a general state of disorderliness. Consequently the area experienced sewer spills (the 12 out of 19 sewage pump stations were dysfunctional⁴), on-going power failures, water shortages, deteriorating roads, environmental degradation due to pollution of the Mthatha River from sewer run off and solid waste dumping and decline in the general upkeep of the area in terms of clearing of litter, poor refuse collection and disposal and the poor management of public spaces. The area's role as an economic hub was further weakened by the deterioration in infrastructure. To be fair to the KSD municipality, water and sanitation powers reside with the OR Tambo District Municipality with Umgeni Water playing the role of Water Services Provider, and it cannot therefore be directly held accountable for the poor state of this infrastructure and services.

The parlous state of Mthatha, the dilapidated infrastructure and historically poor management and systems and the negative impact this has had on the provision of basic services and the general quality of life of the people prompted President JG Zuma to declare King Sabata Dalindyebo (KSD) Local Municipality a Presidential Priority Programme in August 2009.

1.2 Programme Design and Institutional Arrangements

Prior to the declaration of the KSDL as a Presidential Intervention Node, the municipality had in March 2009 prepared a 20 year Development Master Plan for the revitalisation of the area. This is a well-crafted plan that identifies 280 projects to be implemented over the immediate, medium and long-term. The KSDL however lacked the financial, technical and administrative capabilities to carry through the plan. The implementation of the plan required a 'whole of government' approach with national and provincial sector departments and State Owned Enterprises having a critical role to play in implementing the plan.

To give effect to this approach and drive implementation of the Presidential Programme and ensure overall coordination, the President reconstituted an Inter-Ministerial Committee, chaired by the Minister of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency. A Technical IMC was also established, chaired by the Director-General in the Presidency. The IMC and the Technical IMC have worked with the Office of the Premier that provides oversight and facilitates implementation through the Provincial Cabinet Committee. A Provincial Working Group chaired by the Superintendent General: Local Government and Traditional Affairs, was established to drive implementation.

To increase the pace of delivery the IMC approved the prioritisation of seven work streams that would be critical for the revitalisation of Mthatha.

² KSD IDP 2011/2012 citing 2007 labour force figures.

³ National Treasury

⁴ Department of Water Affairs

A Programme Management Office (PMO) was also established at KSD Municipality, with Secretariat support provided by the provincial Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs. Following an IMC recommendation, national departments deployed technical experts to the PMO.

1.3 Objectives and focus of the KSD Presidential Intervention

The KSD Master Plan was used as the basis for the KSD PI. The KSD Presidential Intervention is essentially a territorial renewal and revitalisation programme with the objective of arresting the decline and improving service delivery through local infrastructure investment and institutional performance improvements via 7 work streams. These are:

- Energy, Waste and Environment Management
- Human Settlements
- Transport and mobility
- Water and Sanitation
- Social Development and Health
- Governance and Communication
- Local Economic Development

Within each of the work streams catalytic projects were identified and funding mobilised.

2. Rationale for and Objectives of the Evaluation

The KSD PI has seen significant resources (human and financial) converging on a single territory and drew on a whole of government approach involving actors from national, provincial, local and SOEs to arrest the decline in institutional performance and service delivery. Evaluation of this high level presidential intervention to address stubborn social issues like poor service delivery, poverty and collapse of municipal systems and performance is of important policy concern not least to inform future initiatives of this nature in bringing value to citizens and improving the quality of life in localities where there is general malaise and a breakdown in service delivery.

- Objectives – The objective of the evaluation is to establish the merits and trade-offs based on worth, replicability and efficient attainment of government development priorities that a presidential intervention brings to bear on a locality facing stubborn social, administrative, institutional and economic problems.
- Users of the evaluation – the President, Cabinet, EC Premier's Office, District and local municipalities and the technical teams and communities

3. Evaluation Design and Methodology

3.1 Client and Study Name

The Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) will be the client for the evaluation. The Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation branch will administer the evaluation and the evaluation will be supervised by Mr Hassen Mohamed; Outcomes Facilitator for Outcome 9: A Responsive, accountable, effective and efficient local government system, assisted by Ms Jacqueline Nel; Outcomes Manager for Outcome 9 and representatives from the DPME Evaluation Unit.

The assignment will be called the **Formative Evaluation on the Presidential revitalisation intervention within the King Sabata Dalindyebo Local Municipality, Eastern Cape Province.**

4. Project Management, Governance and Accountability Arrangements

As indicated above, the DPME project team will be led by Mr Hassen Mohamed supported Ms Nel and by the Evaluation unit in DPME. A Steering Committee convened by DPME and comprising the National and Provincial Departments of Local Government, the Project Management Office and Offices of the Municipal Managers of ORT DM and KSDLM will oversee the implementation of the evaluation and address blockages. The Ministerial IMC Technical Task Team will provide a technical oversight role. The Ministerial IMC will provide political oversight

5. Type of Evaluation

The type of evaluation envisaged for the KSD Presidential Intervention is essentially a formative evaluation designed to assess the worth of a Presidential intervention in areas where there is a serious breakdown in service delivery. As such the focus will be on design and process with a developmental twist. By this it is meant that the evaluation will seek to analyse the value of the intervention in terms of design and process as well as whether the Presidential intervention can be considered innovative in localities experiencing decline and a breakdown of services. In terms of the latter (developmental evaluation) the focus will be on whether the Presidential intervention is an ideal solution in driving change, i.e. what aspects hold promise and what are the unintended consequences.

6. Key Evaluation Question

Is the KSD Presidential Intervention an ideal and innovative solution to tackling stubborn social problems of the kind experienced in localities such the KSDLM? What are the benefits in terms of improvement in government practices, policies, programmes, the dynamics of collaboration and resource flows and what are the pitfalls and trade-offs? What are the lessons for the design and implementation of future Presidential Interventions?

7. Scope of Evaluation

The service provider must undertake all planning, activities and investigations necessary to, *at the minimum provide detailed analysis informing the following specific research questions organised around 3 core evaluation elements, as well as other questions that may be identified through the course of the evaluation:*

7.1 Evaluation Element 1

Assessing the governance, accountability and programme management arrangements (Ministerial IMC, Technical IMC, PWG and PMO) and their effectiveness. Examples of evaluation questions to be considered are:

- What is the intervention logic?
- Is the intervention appropriate for dealing with present challenges?
- Does the intervention address the root cause and not the symptoms?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of the various role players involved in governance and programme management?
- How have these impacted on efficiency of decision-making, quality of planning, improved implementation, tackling blockages, increasing accountability?
- How has this impacted on inter-governmental coordination and the dynamics of collaboration, particularly (but not exclusively) as it relates to planning and budgeting for bulk infrastructure - sequencing, alignment with grant allocation and usage and coordination with regard to project dependencies?
- What have been the pros and cons of the intervention in terms of other planning priorities and budgeting operations of the government entities?

- Did the government entities incur opportunity costs especially in terms of infrastructure investments forgone in other communities in need?
- How do the costs of the governance and programme management and accountability elements measure up against the benefits of the established structures and arrangements?
- Are there any elements that were not included that may have enhanced programme efficiency/ effectiveness /impact and sustainability?
- What was the level of beneficiary engagement and were communities sensitized to their responsibility in sustaining gains made post intervention?
- What were the identified indicators of programme success?
- Any other pertinent governance, accountability and programme management questions

7.2 Evaluation Element 2

Assessing the value add derived through the intervention with respect to **enhancing** institutional capacity and ensuring the sustainability of the investment post-implementation when national and provincial government withdraw from the area. Examples of evaluation questions to be considered are:

- What capacity building activities have been brought about by the implementation of this project
- To what extent has the intervention built capacity in the OR Tambo DM and KSDLM to sustain the investments in terms of technical capacity to plan, operate and maintain infrastructure?
- Is there a demonstration that critical business attributes for operating and maintaining core services (water, sanitation, refuse, municipal roads and electricity) are being developed?
- How is the intervention impacting (positively or negatively) on the broader management and administrative performance (financial, human resource, governance) of the district and local municipality? And what are the reasons thereof?

7.3 Evaluation Element 3

Harvesting learning in respect of lessons that can be learnt from the design and implementation of the intervention that may inform replication of interventions of this nature in other areas, best practice in respect of the governance components driving such interventions, appropriateness of this type of intervention in respect of driving socio-economic development in an area *viz-a-viz* unintended consequences of such an intervention. Examples of evaluation questions to be considered are:

- What are the major lessons to be learnt from the intervention?
- Can the initiative be considered innovative in a context where stubborn social problems exist or are there alternative approaches?
- What precedences have been set and what are the implications?
- Do interventions of this nature go to the heart of the problem or deflects accountability for poor delivery performance?
- Do they encourage greater inclusiveness, foster greater social cohesion and solidarity or do they risk capture by political elites?
- What do interventions of this nature suggest in terms of broader social change and reorganisation at the systems level? That is changes in practice, programming and resource flows as well as changes at systems level such as change in policies (e.g. powers and functions).

8. Scoping of the evaluation

The evaluation should be benchmarked and contextualised within three event points/periods, namely; i) the local government electoral cycle starting in 2007 informing and encompassing the development of the 20 year Development Master Plan; ii) from early 2009, the period covering the identification of KSD as a site for the President to visit, the lead-up to the Presidential visit, the actual visit up to the second Presidential visit that took place in September 2011; and iii) the period post the second Presidential visit to date.

9. Methodology

The evaluation will need to draw on a time series analysis informing the baseline for the evaluation as well as quantitative and qualitative research methods providing validation and rigour through triangulation of findings. Methodologies applied may include primary data collection by means of field investigations, focus group discussion and/or key informant interviews and secondary data collection by means of desk-top studies and document reviews and analysis.

The service provider will also be required to provide a detailed description of tools and methods to be employed for purposes of data gathering and analysis.

10. Project Plan, Phasing and Pay Schedule

The evaluation should be undertaken in a phased manner, structured around clearly defined milestones.

Table 1: Outline of project plan and payment schedule

	Deliverables	Delivery Date?	% payment
1.	Inception Report	1 February	20%
2.	Literature review;	15 February 2013	10%
3.	Final data collection instruments and other tools; Analysis Plan	15 February 2013	10%
5	Field work report	Provide delivery date	
6	Evaluation reports per evaluation element (3 in total)	15 March 2013	30%
7.	Draft consolidated evaluation report for review, full and in 1/3/25 format	15 April 2013	15%
8.	Workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report	Provide delivery date	
9	The final evaluation report (Incorporating comments)	15 May 2013	10%
10.	Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results to the Ministerial IMC Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected.	15 May 2013	5%

These milestones relate, inter alia to the delivery of specified outputs as detailed below.

The work programme should be phased in accordance to critical milestones linked to deliverables as broadly outlined below into the following phases to be completed in line with the proposed timeframes stipulated:

10.1 Inception and planning phase

Inception report should consist of the following:

- background to the study,

- desktop review detailing available information and informing the time series analysis as described above leading into the establishment of a baseline for the evaluation
- gaps identified requiring primary data and information collection
- detailed approach and methodology descriptions including detailed descriptions of data analysis, tools and methods that will be used to carry out the evaluation
- confirmed work programme and timeliness for completion of the evaluation detailing pre-execution planning requirements and activities
- Tabling of the Inception report for approval by the Project Steering Committee constituted as detailed under the section dealing with Project Management, Governance and Accountability arrangements
- Any and all amendments as required by Project Steering Committee necessary to obtain written sign-off on the Inception report to be completed within the set timeframe

10.2 Document Review and Analysis Phase

- Secondary data collection by means of desk-top studies and document reviews and analysis.

10.3 Data gathering and analysis phase

- Final data collection instruments and other tools (these will have to be approved by the DPME);
- Analysis plan
- Data gathering & analysis
- Fieldwork Report

10.4 Report Writing Phase

- Compilation of draft reports per evaluation element (3 reports in total)
- Consultation on draft reports
- Tabling of the **3 draft reports** for approval by the Project Steering Committee
- Any and all amendments as required by Project Steering Committee necessary to obtain written sign-off on the 3 reports to be completed within the set timeframe

10.5 Consolidation Phase

- Finalisation of a draft consolidated report providing a synthesis of all elements of the evaluation
- Tabling of the **draft consolidated report** to the Project Steering Committee
- Incorporating amendments as required by Project Steering Committee

10.6 Formalisation Phase

- This phase will be subject to scheduling of Technical and Ministerial IMC
- Tabling of the **final draft consolidated report** to the Technical IMC
- Any and all amendments as required by Technical IMC necessary to obtain written sign-off on the Consolidated report to be completed within the set timeframe.
- Tabling of the approved consolidated report to the Ministerial IMC

10.7 Close-out Phase

- End of Assignment Quality Assessment Report to be compiled detailing all project related activities inclusive of a detailed expenditure report, lessons learnt and recommendations on process improvement
- Tabling of the End of Assignment Quality Assessment Report to the Project Steering Committee
- Any and all amendments as required by Project Steering Committee necessary to obtain written sign-off on the Consolidated report to be completed within the set timeframe
- Hand-over of all project files in hardcopy and electronic formats; provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews)

11. Deliverables

The broad deliverables expected of service providers are as follows:

- Approved Inception report and work plan (sampling/evaluation tools?) for the evaluation
- Literature review;
- Final data collection instruments and other tools;
- Analysis plan;
- Field work report;
- Approved evaluation report per evaluation element (3 reports)
- Approved final draft consolidated report; full and in 1/3/25 format, with findings and recommendations.
- PowerPoint presentation on final draft consolidated report to Technical IMC
- Approved consolidated report (Technical IMC approval)
- Final report – within 2 weeks of receiving comments on draft
- PowerPoint presentation on approved consolidated report to Ministerial IMC
- Approved Close-out report and hand-over of project files;
- Monthly project progress reports indicating expenditure to date etc.
- Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews)

12. Professional Qualifications and Competency Requirements of Evaluators

It is envisaged that the assignment will require a multi-disciplinary team comprising of experts in regeneration initiatives, economics, local government and municipal governance, monitoring and evaluation methods, engineering services. Required specialists must form part of the service provider's project team. Any further anticipated expertise that may be required during the evaluation must be detailed and budgeted for within the initial proposal, inception report and work programme.

12.1 Evaluation Team

The service provider should specify the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. The team must cover competencies outlined below. The service provider also needs to demonstrate how it will ensure skills transfer of stakeholders and PDI evaluators.

12.2 Competencies and Skills-Set Required:

The following is a list of generic competencies expected for this assignment:

- Strong understanding and knowledge of evaluation practice in South Africa, including a range of different types of evaluation;
- Good knowledge of government policies, systems and practical implementation issues at national and provincial level;
- Strong understanding of the use of logical frameworks, results chains, and theories of change for planning and M&E;
- A good knowledge of evaluation methodologies, and experience in applying them. This would be required in relation to:
 - Qualitative research;
 - Quantitative research;
 - Conducting of research synthesis;
 - Policy analysis and policy evaluation.
- Cultural competence – the ability to deal effectively with the different stakeholders involved in the evaluation, including appropriate language skills;
- Demonstrated experience of building ownership of evaluations and evaluation results, working in ways which build capacity and commitment amongst stakeholders;
- Ability to write short reports (using a 1/3/25 page rule) and to communicate effectively to different audiences;
- Strong project management skills, including field coordination and implementation where needed;

Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice would be an advantage, particularly in middle-income and African countries.

13. The Proposal to be submitted

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

Box 2. Structure of a proposal

The bidder 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 Previous Experience: (should include a list of related projects undertaken of main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, and contact people for references (minimum 3 projects in the past two years and minimum of 3 references)
- 6 Competencies of the Project Team (team members, roles and responsibilities, qualifications and years of experience in related projects.)
- 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)
- 9 How the skills will be transferred during the project

Attachments

Example of related evaluation reports undertaken in the past three years

CVs of key personnel

Completed supply chain forms attached herewith (including updated tax clearance)

14. Information for Service Providers

A bidders briefing will be held on 21 November 2012 at the Presidency. Tenders should be submitted by 16.00 on 5 December 2012 with electronic and 6 hard copies.

The short-listed candidates will be asked to come and present their proposal on 21 November 2012 at DPME as part of the selection process.

14.2 Evaluation criteria for proposals

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. Two main criteria are functionality/capability and price. Functionality/capability factors must cover the competences outlined in 12.2.3 as demonstrated through:

- Quality of proposal;
- Service provider's relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors;
- Qualifications and expertise of the proposed evaluation team members.

14.3 Pricing requirements

All prices must be inclusive of VAT. 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.

15. Evaluation of Proposals

15.1 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

15.2 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 2 below outlines the functional evaluation criteria as applied to the competences outlined above which will be used in assessing the proposals.

Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Minimum
Understanding of the intervention and the TORs	2			4
Approach, design and methodology for the support	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	4			12
Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong understanding and knowledge of evaluation practice in South Africa, including a range of different types of evaluation; 	4			12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good knowledge of government policies, systems and practical implementation issues at national and provincial 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			9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantitative research; 	3			6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy analysis and policy evaluation. 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to write executive summaries 	1			2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong project management skills; 	2			6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries. 	1			2
Capacity development elements (building capacity of DPME)	1			4
Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)	2			4
TOTAL	30	-----		

Minimum requirement: Service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each element as well as the overall minimum score (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.

15.3 Price Evaluation: The PPPFA

Only bids/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 bids from R1 million and the 80/20 method will be used for bids/quotes below 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. **The 80/20 point system will apply for this evaluation.**

15.4 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.

16. Intellectual Property

The DPME will own copyright of the products of this assignment, except prior material brought in to the assignment or that owned by a third party. The service provider will not use the material (whether in part or whole) without the written permission of the DPME.

17. Enquiries

For content enquiries, please contact Mr Hassen Mohamed; Outcomes Facilitator (Deputy Director-General) for Outcome 9, hassen@po.gov.za, Tel: 012 308 1855 / Ms Jacqueline Nel; Outcomes Manager for Outcome 9; JacquelineN@po.gov.za

For evaluation process and commissioning, contact Mr Jabu Mathe, Evaluation and Research Unit, DPME, Tel: 0734763503, e-mail:

jabu@po.gov.za
