



Department of Trade and Industry



The Presidency, Republic of South Africa  
Department of Performance Monitoring  
and Evaluation

## Terms of Reference for the Impact Evaluation of the Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP)

**RFP / Bid number:** Evaluation 13/ 0933

**Compulsory briefing session**

Date: 10 July 2013

Time: 10.00-11.30

Venue: Boardroom 282, East Wing, Union Buildings

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

**Bid closing date:**

**24 July 2013, 12h00.** The service provider must provide an electronic version of proposal and 6 hard copies.

### 1 Background Information and Rationale

The Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme (THRIP) was introduced in 1992 to respond to the challenges of skills development in science, engineering and technology. It is funded by **the dti** and managed by the National Research Foundation (NRF). THRIP strives to improve the competitiveness of South African industry by supporting research and technology development and enhancing the quality and quantity of appropriately skilled people. The planned outputs of the Programme include increasing the number of black female students pursuing careers in science, engineering and technology; promoting technological know-how within the SMME sector; and facilitating and supporting multi-firm projects in which firms (including BEE initiatives) collaborate and share in project outcomes ([www.thrip.co.za](http://www.thrip.co.za)).

THRIP has for a while been producing an Impact Report every two years. The report presents stories of intermediate impacts realised in projects eighteen months after their completion. The last one was published in the 2011/12 financial year. A more comprehensive evaluation is needed to assess the impacts of the Programme as well as how these can be strengthened. This last Impact Report was based on 50 projects that had received a total of R72 million and supported 384 students and 346 researchers, and resulted in 21 patents, 75 various products and 653 publications. In addition, 74% of the projects contributed to job creation.

THRIP is linked to Outcome 4, output 4.2 “More labour absorbing growth” and Outcome 5 Output 5.3 “Increase access to occupationally-directed programmes in needed areas and thereby expand the availability of intermediate level skills”

## 2. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of THRIP in the context of its objectives and priorities over the period to be reviewed, and to determine how the beneficial impacts can be strengthened.

## 3. Key Evaluation Questions

### Impact Questions

- 3.1 What impact does THRIP have on technology development?
- 3.2 Do industry partners realize a significant Return on Investment (ROI) from THRIP? If “yes”, after how long is the ROI realized?
- 3.3 What impact does THRIP have on SMMEs involved in technology development?
- 3.4 What is the impact of THRIP on skills development in Science, Engineering and Technology?
- 3.4. Does South Africa realize a significant return on investment from THRIP against the cost of delivering the programme in terms of:
  - Economic growth and empowerment;
  - Skills development and Job creation (Rate);
  - Taxable revenue;
  - Competitiveness;
- 3.5. What happens to the Intellectual Property from completed THRIP projects?
  - To what extent are they commercialized, if not, why?
  - To what extent are benefits of THRIP realized in South Africa, if not, why?
- 3.6. Is THRIP still relevant when considering other instruments in the innovation landscape?
- 3.7. What factors in the South African context enable or constrain the beneficial impact of THRIP, including the long term sustainability of those impacts?
- 3.8. How can the beneficial impacts of THRIP be strengthened?

### Process question

- 3.9. What effect do institutional mechanisms (structure, management, administration, and processes) have on the efficiency and effectiveness of delivering the programme outcomes?

### Cost Effectiveness

- 3.10. Is the current model of delivering THRIP cost effective in comparison to alternative models?

### Benchmarking

- 3.11. How does THRIP performance compare to similar programmes nationally and internationally?

## 4. Intended Users and Stakeholders of the Evaluation

The main user of the evaluation results will be **the dti**. There are also other government departments which will have an interest in the evaluation results, including cabinet, the Presidency, the National Treasury, other departments in the economic cluster, agencies, and the private sector.

## 5. Scope of the Evaluation

- The period under review is 2000/01 – 2012/13 (thirteen years).
- The prospective service provider should provide an understanding of how programme impacts are differentiated across all the sectors in which the programme is active.
- The prospective service provider should also provide an understanding of how programme impacts are differentiated.
- Geographical coverage: It is anticipated that primary data generation will require travel to 4 provinces where there is a highest concentration of THRIP projects.

## 6. Products/Deliverables

The service provider is expected to deliver the following products:

- **Inception Report** 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** (including an International Comparative review between South Africa and 2 other countries )
- **Final data collection instruments** and other tools;
- **Analysis plan**;
- **Field work report**;
- **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 DPME.
- **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 service provider will need to review the theory of change.
  - The service provider will need to suggest what revisions to the logic model (outcomes and outputs) are needed, and a rating of progress towards outputs, bottlenecks that hinder the achievement of outputs, reasons underpinning THRIP 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.**

## 7. Methodology/evaluation approach

Service providers are expected to recommend appropriate methodology that will respond to the evaluation questions as indicated in section 3. This may include:

### 7.1 Impact methodology

The prospective service provider should propose the most effective methodology for evaluating the impact of THRIP, and providing credible evidence in response to the evaluation questions. No methodologies have been ruled out, however it is anticipated that a mixed methods approach would be adopted. In addition, it is critical that the evaluation offers a convincing case for distinguishing the contribution of THRIP to the beneficial impacts identified, from the contribution made by other sources.

## 7.2 Process evaluation methodology

The process evaluation methodology should provide clear evidence of the link between programme results and the model of programme delivery. The evidence should be reliable enough to lead to confident recommendations on programme design to improve effectiveness, incorporating evidence from the benchmarking and cost effectiveness analyses.

## 7.3 Benchmarking

The benchmarking exercise should allow for a like against like comparison of alternative models of incentivising innovation through similar national and international programmes. It is anticipated that the benchmarking exercise will be based on a review of secondary data and systematic analysis of literature sources.

## 7.4 Cost effectiveness

The prospective service provider should propose the most appropriate cost effectiveness analysis methodology for responding to the relevant evaluation questions. The methodology needs to compare cost effectiveness of the current THRIP implementation model against existing or proposed alternatives. The cost effectiveness analyses will be expected to provide quantitative findings rather than qualitative assessments.

## 7.5 Design of the programme

- Review the theory of change and intervention logic of the THRIP,
- If there is a need for design, recommend how the programme could be redesigned.

## 7.6 Portfolio review (review monitoring data)

Review monitoring data for the period under review (2000/01 – 2012/13)

# 8. Milestones

The duration of the evaluation will be 8 months. The evaluation will start on **21 August 2013** and should be completed by **12 February 2014**. The service provider should produce the project plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 2** below.

**Table 2: Outline project plan and payment schedule**

Deliverable	Delivery Date	% payment
Approved Inception Report	20/08/2013	10%
Service Provider contract signed	21/08/2013	
Literature review including comparative reviews (International)	4/09/2013	20%
Final data collection instruments and other tools	11/09/2013	10%
Analysis plan	11/09/2013	
Field work report	18/10/2013	
Draft Evaluation Report for review.	15/11/2013	20%
A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report	3/12/2013	
Submission of the Final Draft Report full and in 1/3/25 format	3/02/2014	
Approved final evaluation report (approved by Steering Committee)	12/02/2014	30%

<b>Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation</b> (including interview transcripts).	27/02/2014	10%
--	------------	-----

## 9. Competencies and Skills-set

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

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
<b>1 Overarching considerations</b>	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	<p>Have knowledge of relevant sectors and government systems in relation to outcome 4 “decent employment through inclusive economic growth”, especially the manufacturing sector.</p> <p>Ought have knowledge and understanding of research, development, technology and innovation environment (domestic and relevant international markets).</p> <p>Appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments.</p> <p>Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to issues of diversity</p>
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
<b>2 Evaluation leadership</b>	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively
<b>3 Evaluation craft</b>	
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	<p>Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation’s research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods.</p> <p>Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps.</p>
<b>4 Implementation of evaluation</b>	
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

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
	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

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

- 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.

## 10. 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. Some staff from **the dti** & DPME will participate in the evaluation process.

The team must include **experts with proven experience and expertise** in the sector. The team must possess relevant qualification(s), including at least a Master's Degree.

## 11. Management Arrangements

### 11.1 Role of steering committee

A Steering Committee has been established comprising DTI, DPME and other key stakeholders, which will be responsible for overseeing the whole evaluation including approving the inception report and other main deliverables.

### 11.2 Peer Reviewers

Peer reviewers will be contracted to support the assignment.

### 11.3 Reporting Arrangements

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report on evaluation process and commissioning, is Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME, but in terms of content issues the contact person will be Mr Ephraim Baloyi, Director, THRIP, **the dti**.

## 12. Structure and Contents of Proposal to be submitted

### 12.1 Structure and contents of proposal

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

**Box 2. Structure of a 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 (eg 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 related evaluation report undertaken

CVs of key personnel

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

**13. Information for service providers**

The service provider should provide a proposal following the structure above. In addition short-listed candidates will be asked to come and present their proposals as part of the selection process. Tenders should be submitted by 12h00 on 19 July 2013 with electronic and 6 hard copies.

**13.1 Key background documents**

A list of key documents will be provided at the bidders briefing meeting.

**13.2 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 **section 9** 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.

**13.3 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.

## 13.4 Evaluation of proposals

### 13.4.1 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

### 13.4.2 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

**Table 3** below outlines the functional evaluation criteria as applied to the competences outlined in section 9 which will be used in assessing the proposals.

**Table 3: Functional evaluation criteria**

Domain Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Minimum
<b>Quality of the Proposal</b>	Understanding of the Working of Government in general and the Outcomes Approach in particular.	4			8
	Approach, design and methodology for 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 and exposure to International good practise, particularly in middle-income and African Countries.	1			2
	Capacity development element (building capacity of partners, especially young evaluators and PDIs)	1			2
	<b>Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment:</b>				
<b>1. Overarching Considerations</b>					
1.1. Contextual Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand the relevant sector and government systems in relation to the evaluation and</li> </ul>	3			6



	can appropriately relate the evaluation to the current political, policy and governance environments.				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge of research, development and innovation environment.</li> </ul>	8			16
1.2 Ethical Conduct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand ethical issues relating evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.</li> </ul>	2			4
<b>2. Evaluation Leadership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lead an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation to promote commitment and ownership of evaluation.</li> </ul>	2			4
<b>3. Evaluation Craft</b>					
3.1 Evaluative discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use knowledge base of evaluations of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools) critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation.</li> </ul>	3			6
3.2 Research Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps.</li> </ul>	3			6
<b>4. Implementation of Evaluation</b>					
4.1 Evaluation Planning Theory of Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes with good programme logic and indicators</li> </ul>	3			6
4.2 Managing Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards</li> </ul>	2			4
4.3 Report writing and communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable and address the key evaluation questions</li> </ul>	5			10
<b>Total</b>		50			100

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.

#### **13.4.3 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 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.

**In this bid, the 90/10 preference point system will apply.**

## **14. 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.

## **15. Intellectual property**

DPME & **the dti** 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 dti** & DPME.

## **16. Enquiries**

Regarding the evaluation process and commissioning, please contact Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME: Tel. 012 308 1466 / Cell: 073 476 3503, E-mail: [jabu@po-dpme.gov.za](mailto:jabu@po-dpme.gov.za) , however, with regard to content issues, please contact Mr Ephraim Baloyi, Director: THRIP, **the dti** at [EBaloyi@thedti.gov.za](mailto:EBaloyi@thedti.gov.za): 0725012793; (012) 394 1281.