DEPARTMENT OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

THE PRESIDENCY

Terms of Reference for Impact/implementation evaluation of Government Coordination Systems

RFP: 12/0536

Compulsory briefing session
Date: 18 January 2013
Time: 13.00-14.30
Venue: Room 282, East Wing, Union Buildings

Closing date for submission of proposals:
12.00 4 February 2013 with provision of an electronic and 6 hard copies.

Presentations of proposals   From 11.00, 12 February 2013
Anticipated start date   25 February 2013

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

1   Background information and rationale

1.1   Background to the intervention

Many areas of government work require coordination, and part of the reason for poor implementation is inadequate coordination. The Cluster System has been operating since 1999 without substantial modification and the introduction of the outcomes approach in 2010 and the requirements for coordination of these raised some challenges for the Cluster system. Nearly three years after introduction of the outcomes approach and where coordination is emerging as a major challenge, it is very important to review the Cluster system, Implementation Forums and other intergovernmental coordination mechanisms to see how they can be strengthened.

Some of the coordination mechanisms being used include:

- •   Within national government, the cluster system which has been operating for over 10 years and has developed some institutional stability;
- •   Across spheres, MinMECs established to deal with concurrent functions;
- •   Implementation Forums established in 2010 to coordinate outcomes (which use the MinMECs or clusters);
- •   Interdepartmental mechanisms such as those for Early Childhood Development;
- •   Structures proposed by the Intergovernmental Relations Act.

Despite these systems, coordination is not as strong as is needed. Weaknesses of the current cluster system were raised as early as 2005, in the Cabinet Discussion Document on the Capacity and Organisation of the State (the Presidency, 2005). This document noted that the clusters "do not seem adequately to address the priorities that government has identified for the Second Decade of Freedom. A number of similar strategic activities are duplicated, while related functions are not adequately co-ordinated….In the majority of instances, the officials' inter-departmental project teams exist only in name, and relate to one another only when updates have to be provided – nor do the agendas of DG cluster meetings provide for continuing

monitoring and evaluation of implementation…[POA projects] are treated by DGs and other SMS members as add-ons to the "normal" work of departments – we have not as yet reached a stage in which each relevant public servant is a project supervisor/manager/member fully cognisant of where as a cog s/he fits in the wheel… The cluster system among Ministers is no more than informal brainstorming add-ons to their formal roles…The same applies to DG/HoD clusters, while the formal line of accountability for each HoD is to the political principal." The Cabinet Discussion Document concluded that there is a need for "greater firmness on the part of the President and Deputy President (correspondingly, Premiers and Mayors) in their supervision of the work of members of Cabinet/Excos."

An evaluation of the cluster system was carried out in 2008 by the Technical Assistance Unit (TAU) of National Treasury. This indicated that:

- There is inconsistency in representation from some departments and participation is not limited to Directors-General and Deputy-Directors-General;
- The average participation rate of Directors-General in the cluster meetings was 32%;
- There has been a decline in participation since 2006, when a study by the Presidency indicated an average participation rate of 40%;
- The majority of respondents to the questionnaire did not think that Directors-General see attending cluster meetings as good use of their time;
- There is poor participation of National Treasury in the G&A Cluster, and to a lesser extent, the Economic Cluster.

There are also many programmatic areas where coordination is critical and failing. Classic examples are around the gap between the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, leading on land reform, and DAFF, leading on agricultural extension and post settlement support. Another is in Early Childhood Development (ECD) where the recently completed Diagnostic Review states that "ECD services require strong and coordinated inter-sectoral vision, commitment and action. The current coordination structures are not working adequately. High-level authorization and legitimacy of a well-resourced central agency or mechanism is needed to drive forward key strategies for ECD."

This evaluation will provide an opportunity for Cabinet to reflect on how these systems could be strengthened which should have a big impact on cross-government programmes and policies.

1.2   Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the performance of coordination systems in government, both technical and ministerial, and to see how to strengthen their effectiveness.

2   The focus of the evaluation

2.1   Evaluation questions

The assignment will assess:

1   To what extent are these systems improving coordination in government in general?
    a.   What is working well and what is not working well, and why?
    b.   How are the cluster system (Ministerial and FOSAD clusters) and MinMECs working in general terms? How do the ministerial and technical structures relate? How do they work in relation to the outcome Implementation Forums? Is there a need for rationalisation in this regard?
    c.   How are these structures working with Parliament? Is there need for any change in this regard?

2   What needs to be done to improve the coordination mechanisms? For example:
    2.1   Are the mandates, roles and responsibilities clear, appropriate and being fulfilled?
        a.   Do they need to be clarified or changed?
        b.   Are they feasible and realistic?

      c.   Does there need to be change in mandates in terms of oversight roles of individual departments versus dealing with cross-government issues?

      d.   Are there any contradictions between existing mandates/roles and responsibilities and any other structures or legislation?

      e.   Are the systems meeting their existing roles/mandates?

2.2   Institutional capacity - do the systems have the institutional capacity to do what is expected of them? If not, what should be done in this regard?

2.3   How could their operation be improved?

      f.   Is the schedule of meetings appropriate?

      g.   What is needed to ensure appropriate representation?

3   Should the regulatory framework be changed, eg to give clusters or MinMECs authority and accountability for overseeing implementation of the outcomes?

2.2 Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation

The key users of this evaluation are:

- Cabinet
- Centre of government departments promoting coordination, notably Presidency, DPME and National Treasury;
- Coordinating ministers and departments for outcomes;
- Ministers and departments involved in MinMECs;
- Departments in cross-government programmes such as ECD, EPWP, who need effective coordination systems;
- All other government departments who in some way or other are asked to coordinate.

2.3 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the following national structures, focusing on the political component (eg Ministerial clusters) as well as the technical component (FOSAD clusters):

- Within national government, the cluster system (both Ministerial clusters and the FOSAD clusters which report to them) which has been operating for over 10 years and has developed some institutional stability;
- Across spheres, MinMECs established to deal with concurrent functions;
- Implementation Forums established in 2010 to coordinate outcomes (which use the MinMECs or clusters);
- Interdepartmental mechanisms such as those for Early Childhood Development.

3 Evaluation design

The evaluation will cover all clusters. It will include some consultation with all MinMECs and Implementation Forums in some form, but undertake detailed interviews with at least 4 MinMECs and 4 Implementation Forums, and 4 cross-departmental structures. These should reflect those working more and less effectively.

The theory of change around coordination will be developed, and the elements of this will be tested in the evaluation.

The design is likely to involve some surveys of members of these structures, plus semi-structured interviews with key members of the forums, and those affected by these forums.

It will be difficult to find a counterfactual to look at impact, and so perceptions of with and without the coordination structure will need to be assessed. Specific incidents of where coordination has resolved issues or not resolved issues should be looked at to understand how the system is working in practice so that the evaluation is based on practical experience and not just perceptions.

4   Evaluation plan

4.1   Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

The deliverables expected include:

1. Inception Report
2. Draft theory of change
3. International literature review on effective government coordination systems
4. Final data collection instruments and other tools
5. Analysis plan
6. Draft evaluation report for review, full and in 1/3/25 format
7. Workshop to discuss the draft report
8. The final evaluation report
9. Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected (see Annex 1)
10. Powerpoint or audiovisual presentation of the results

4.2   Time frame for the project

Table 1 sets out the expected duration and milestones assuming the project is commissioned by 15 November 2012.

Table 1:   **Outline project plan and payment schedule**

Deliverable	Expected milestones	% payment
Briefing meeting and start of assignment	25 February 2013	
Submission of inception Report	1 March 2013	
Meeting to approve inception report and sign SLA	4 March 2013	10%
Submission of international literature review	22 March 2013	20%
Draft theory of change and questions for analysis	22 March 2013	
Final data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools	5 April 2013	10%
Interim report with emerging issues, findings and questions to pursue	31 May 2013	20%
Draft evaluation report for review, full and in 1/3/25 format (see Action Points)	26 July 2013	20%
Possibly a workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report	tbc	
The final evaluation report	23 August 2013	20%
Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected (see Annex 1)	23 August 2013	
Powerpoint or audiovisual presentation of the results	23 August 2013	
Project closure meeting	30 August 2013	

5   Budget and payment schedule

The funding will be provided by DPME who will commission the assignment. The proposed payment schedule is in Table 1.

6   Management Arrangements

6.1   Role of Steering Committee

A Steering Committee will be established to oversee the project. This will include representatives from Presidency, DPME, Treasury and at least 2 outcome coordinating departments, as well as two provincial departments involved in MinMECs, or offices of the Premier.

6.2   Reporting arrangements

The consultants will report to Dr Ian Goldman, Head of Evaluation and Research, Outcomes Monitoring and Evaluation Branch, DPME.

7   Proposal to be submitted

7.1   Structure of proposal

The structure of the proposal required is shown in Box 1.

Box 1: Structure of a proposal

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

1   Understanding of the project and the TORs
2   Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation
3   Activity-based plan (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities)
4   Activity-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT)
5   Competence (include table showing related projects undertaken in last 5 years by main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, and contact people for references)
6   Team (team members, roles and level of effort, and key competences related to this evaluation)
7   Capacity development elements (building capacity of DPME, partner departments and PDI/young evaluators)
8   Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)

Attachments
Examples of reports of at least 3 related assignments undertaken
CVs of key personnel
Completed supply chain forms, tax clearance etc

7.2   Evaluation team

The team must cover the competencies outlined in section 7.3. The service provider also needs to demonstrate how it will ensure skills transfer to DPME, possibly including some DPME staff participating in the assessment.

7.3   Competencies and skills-set required

The competencies for evaluation are summarised from the Draft Evaluation Competencies available on the DPME website:

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
1 Overarching considerations	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Understand relevant sectors and government systems in relation to the 12 priority outcomes and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments
	Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to issues of diversity
1.2 Ethical conduct	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.
1.3 Interpersonal skills	Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders
2 Evaluation leadership	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively
3 Evaluation craft	
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation
3.2 Research practice	Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation's research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods.
	Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps
4 Implementation of evaluation	
4.1 Evaluation planning	
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes with good programme logic and indicators
Design	Design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives.
4.2 Managing evaluation	Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other
Total	

Furthermore, it is important that service providers nominated exhibit the following skills and attributes:

- Are team players and analytical and lateral thinkers;
- Have excellent communication skills with the ability to listen and learn;
- Have good facilitation skills for strategic thinking, problem solving, and stakeholder management in complex situations;
- Have the ability to work under consistent and continuous pressure from varied sources, yet be able to maintain a supportive approach; and
- Have excellent computing skills including detailed knowledge and use of: Word, Excel, Power Point, Microsoft Project or similar compatible software.

8   Information for service providers

A compulsory briefing will be held on 18 January 2013 from 13.00 to 14.30 at DPME, room 282. Proposals should be submitted by 12.00 Monday 4 February 2013 with an electronic version and 6 hard copies.

Selected candidates will be asked to come and present their proposals on 12 February 2013 at DPME as part of the selection process. The successful candidates should be prepared to start work on 25 February, starting with a briefing meeting with DPME.

8.1   Key background documents

Evaluation of the cluster system by the Technical Assistance Unit of National Treasury.

8.2   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 7.3 as demonstrated through:

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

8.3   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.

8.4   Evaluation of proposals

8.4.1   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

8.4.2   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

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 below.

Domain/descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
The quality of the proposal	Understanding of the intervention and the TORs	4			*8*
	Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation	4			*8*
	Quality of activity-based plan (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities)	4			*8*
	Demonstrated high quality experience in at least 5 related projects undertaken in last 5 years by main contractor and subcontractors	4			*8*
	Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries.	2			*4*
	Capacity development elements (building capacity of partners, PDI/young evaluators)	1			*2*
The quality of the team	Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment, with the ability to:				
1 Overarching considerations					
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Understand government systems in relation to the evaluation and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments	4			8
	Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attend appropriately to issues of diversity	2			4
1.2 Ethical conduct	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/ anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.	2			4
2 Evaluation leadership	Lead an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders	5			10
3 Evaluation craft					
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation	3			6
3.2 Research practice	Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps	3			6
4 Implementation of evaluation					

Domain/descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
4.1 Evaluation planning					
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change	2			*4*
4.2 Managing evaluation	Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards	5			*10*
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other	5			*10*
Total		50			

8.4.3   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. 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 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.

9   Intellectual property rights

Evaluation material is highly sensitive. The ownership of the material generated during this evaluation shall remain with DPME and shall not be quoted without permission, except for reports that are within the public domain. Evaluations that are part of the national evaluation plan will be made publically available, unless there are major concerns about making them public.

10   General and special conditions of contract

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

11   Enquiries

For enquiries contact Dr Ian Goldman, Head of Evaluation and Research, DPME, at ian@po.gov.za