



agriculture,
forestry & fisheries

Department:
Agriculture, forestry & fisheries
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



The Presidency
Republic of South Africa
Department of Performance Monitoring
And Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN IMPACT EVALUATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT PROGRAMME (CASP)

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <u>RFP / Bid number:</u> | Compulsory briefing session |
| Date: 29 July 2013 | |
| Time: 11:30 to 13:30 | |
| Venue: DPME, East wing, Room 282 | |
| Please note that security procedures at the Union Buildings can take up to 30 minutes. | |
| Bid closing date: 19 August 2013 | |
| With provision of an electronic copy and 6 hard copies | |

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 1. | Background information and Rationale | 3 |
| 1.2 | Purpose of the Evaluation..... | 6 |
| 2. | Focus of the Evaluation | 6 |
| 2.1 | Key evaluation questions..... | 6 |
| 2.2 | Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation | 7 |
| 2.3 | Scope of the evaluation | 7 |
| 3. | Evaluation Design | 8 |
| 3.1 | Sampling | 9 |
| 3.2 | Data collection and Analysis | 9 |
| 3.3 | Systematic Review of Programme and Project Administrative Records..... | 10 |
| 3.4 | Site visits and Interviews | 10 |
| 3.5 | Financial analysis..... | 10 |
| 4. | Evaluation Plan | 11 |
| 4.1 | Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation..... | 11 |
| 4.2 | Activities | 12 |
| 4.3 | Time frame for the project..... | 12 |
| 5. | Budget and payment schedule | 13 |
| 6. | Management arrangements..... | 13 |
| 7. | The proposal to be submitted..... | 14 |
| 7.1 | Structure of the proposal | 14 |
| 7.2 | Information for service providers | 15 |
| 7.2.1 | Pricing requirements | 15 |
| 7.3 | Evaluation of proposals | 15 |
| 7.3.1 | Administrative compliance..... | 15 |
| 7.3.2 | Functional Evaluation | 16 |
| 7.3.3 | Price evaluation: The PPPFA | 18 |
| 7.3.4 | General and special conditions of contract..... | 18 |
| 7.4 | Evaluation Team | 19 |
| 7.5 | Competencies and skills-set required of the service provider | 19 |
| 8. | Intellectual Property | 20 |
| 9. | Enquiries..... | 20 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Users and their use of the evaluation results | 7 |
| Table 2: Themes / components of the evaluation | 8 |
| Table 3: Outline project plan and payment schedule | 12 |
| Table 4: Functional evaluation criteria | 16 |

1. Background information and Rationale

The mandate of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) is to lead and support sustainable agriculture (*including forestry and fisheries*) and food security for all South Africans. This is driven through ensuring rural economic development, job creation and the sustainable use of natural resources. The Comprehensive Agriculture Support Programme (CASP) is one of the key programmes DAFF has established to achieve this mandate and to close the gap that was created when the Agriculture Credit Board (ACB) was closed, which led to smallholder producers struggling to access finance and support from the commercial banks. CASP was established in 2004 to provide post-settlement support to targeted beneficiaries of land redistribution and reform and other previously disadvantaged producers who have acquired land through private means and are for example, engaged in value adding enterprises domestically, or engaged in export. CASP has since its inception in 2004 supported close to 387 000 beneficiaries with a total budget spend of R5.8 billion.

It is important for the Department to assess the performance of CASP to establish whether the programme is achieving its objectives and outcomes, and to inform how best it can be strengthened. To establish this, the department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) in collaboration with the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) within the Presidency is commissioning a study on the impact of CASP. The study is expected to determine the impact on food production, livelihoods of rural communities and inform how the programme can be strengthened. Information gathered through the study will guide policy and other decisions that may be required to improve access to post-settlement support to targeted beneficiaries of land redistribution and reform and other producers who have acquired land through private means in South Africa.

1.1 Background to the intervention being evaluated

In 2003 the then Department of Agriculture and nine Provincial Departments of Agriculture supported by the National Treasury and Provincial Treasuries conducted a fiscal review of the agricultural sector. The purpose of the review was to identify the cost drivers and the spending pressures within the agricultural sector. Through this Intergovernmental Fiscal Review Process and assessment of the agricultural budget,

key deliverables as well as some of the constraints to service delivery were identified. In addressing these constraints, CASP was prioritised by the joint committee for implementation during 2004.

CASP is a schedule 4 conditional grant implemented under the Division of Revenue Act (DORA) (Act no 5 of 2012) (*this Act is amended and enacted annually*). The CASP grant can be distributed either as a once-off project lump sum or as a multi-year project finance grant, with no time limit on the finance grant period. CASP seeks to enhance the provision of support services that can promote and facilitate agricultural development with the emphasis on women, youth and the people with disabilities. CASP is also looking at targeting and improving the productivity and livelihoods of individuals in the following groups:

- The hungry and the vulnerable.
- Household food security and subsistence.
- Farm and business level activity.

The programme is supported by six pillars, which aim at delivering comprehensive services to subsistence, smallholder and previously disadvantaged commercial farmers. The six pillars supported are:

- Information and knowledge management;
- Technical and advisory assistance, and regulatory services;
- Marketing and business development;
- Training and capacity building;
- On/off farm infrastructure and production inputs; and
- Financial support (*branded MAFISA*).

CASP also contributes to the achievement of the government's Outcome 7, namely: *Vibrant, equitable and sustainable rural communities and food security*", Outcome 4, namely: *"Decent employment through economic growth"* and Outcome 10: *Sustainable natural resources management*.

The following are the planned outputs to achieve the outcomes of CASP:

- Subsistence, smallholder and previously disadvantaged commercial farmers supported through CASP;
- Youth and women farmers supported through CASP;
- On-and-off farm infrastructure projects completed; and their contribution to production;
- Beneficiaries of CASP trained on farming methods etc;
- Beneficiaries of CASP with markets identified;
- Jobs created;
- Extension personnel recruited and maintained in the system;
- Extension officers upgrading qualifications at various institutions; and
- Successful partnerships created to support farmers.

As a schedule 4 conditional grants, the funds for CASP are raised nationally by DAFF and as required by the Division of Revenue Act, these funds are administered by provincial departments of agriculture. Each province receives an allocation as determined by a weighted average of the following variables: Competitive CASP performance; provincial land area (ha); restituted land delivered; redistributed land delivered and current benchmarks on production and national policy imperatives.

The established local committees evaluate applications for funding and make recommendations to district committees, which later make recommendations to the provincial committee and a final provincial business plan is compiled for submission to DAFF. There is a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) in place which guides how the programme should be implemented and provides criteria for the funding of projects. All provinces implement the commodity approach, looking at products that have a high competitive advantage in the area as well as driving provincial and national priorities. However, provinces have varying approaches to the commodity approach, influenced by their unique circumstances. It will be of great value to determine the key ingredient/s for success and value for money from the findings of the evaluation, which will be used to improve and strengthen the CASP programme.

1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether CASP is achieving policy goals or not. The assessment will further establish the effects of CASP on the beneficiaries. The evaluation should determine the impact of CASP on food production, livelihoods of rural communities and inform how the programme can be strengthened.

2. Focus of the Evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the impact of the programme on its targeted beneficiaries. This will be to determine the effects of the programme on production efficiency, marketing development, farmer development and livelihoods of the farmers and their households. To the extent possible, efforts must be made to pick out CASP specific impacts as there are other programmes that may have contributed to the changes in beneficiaries' livelihoods. The impact evaluation will look at the impact of policy goals of CASP.

2.1 Key evaluation questions

This impact evaluation will respond to the following questions:

- To what extent were the objectives of CASP achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- To what extent did the program reach its appropriate target population?
- What impact has CASP had on livelihoods of the farmers and their households (food security, nutrition, income, skills, poverty)
- What impacts has CASP had on agricultural production, on production efficiency, and on access to markets by smallholder farmers?
- What impacts has CASP had on farmer development? How many farmers graduated (in increments) from subsistence to commercial?
- To what extent do beneficiaries receive an appropriate package of CASP and other agricultural services?
- To what extent do CASP services develop farmers' sense of self-reliance (not dependent on government grants) and capacity for on-going management and resilience?
- How can the results inform how the programme can be strengthened?

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 |
|---|--|--|
| Cabinet, portfolio committee, parliament and MinMec | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Is CASP having an impact? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Reprioritize resources and strengthen intergovernmental collaboration. |
| Provincial Departments of Agriculture and DAFF | <ul style="list-style-type: none">What is the implication of the results of the impact evaluation for service delivery? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">To have a better understanding of the provision of services to beneficiaries of CASP |
| Academic institutions, researchers, strategic partners farmers, agricultural producer organisations | <ul style="list-style-type: none">As a result of this impact evaluation how can we improve government support programmes towards sustainable agriculture and rural development as well as evaluation studies of this nature? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Continuing research, develop and design effective methods for impact evaluations, to engage in strengthening government programmes, promote activities within the community of scholarship, and learn from each others' evaluations. |

2.3 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover the period from inception of the programme in 2004 to end of the financial year 2012/13. The evaluation will be limited to impact on beneficiaries within the agriculture sector (*excluding forestry and fisheries; the grant only support agriculture and a few recent aquaculture projects*). Geographically, the evaluation study should cover all nine provinces of South Africa. The Service Provider is required in consultation with the department to develop the Theory of Change for the CASP programme. Based on the results of the evaluation, the service provider will then revise the Theory of change appropriately.

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

Table 2: Themes / components of the evaluation

| Themes/components covered | Themes/ components not covered |
|--|---|
| Jobs created per project | Creation of access to credit facilities- ease of access |
| Institutional arrangements (successful partnerships created to support farmers) | |
| Production impact (efficiency, etc) | |
| Entrepreneurial development | |
| Graduation of farmers from subsistence to small holder to commercial | |
| On-and-off farm infrastructure projects completed; and their contribution to production | |
| Skills transfer to beneficiaries | |
| Availability of markets identified for CASP beneficiaries | |
| Support to farmers, facilitate a link to mentoring and access to services. Extension officers recruited, maintained and upgrading qualifications | |
| Youth and women farmers supported through CASP | |
| Subsistence, smallholder and previously disadvantaged commercial farmers supported through CASP | |
| Sustainability of CASP funded projects | |
| Development of farmer's/beneficiaries sense of agency (not dependency) | |
| Level of appropriate CASP packages received by beneficiaries | |
| Livelihoods of the farmers and their households (food security, nutrition, income, skills, poverty) | |

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 4 middle-income countries, especially where data is limited. The countries should be suggested in the inception report.
4. Make use of quantitative and qualitative methodologies – see sampling below.

3.1 Sampling

The CASP funded projects/farmers to be used for the evaluation study should be selected from the list of CASP projects/farmers that will be provided by the Department. The selected projects/farmers should be a representative sample in terms of the various support/intervention packages offered by CASP (i.e. information and technology management, technical and advisory assistance, training and capacity building, marketing and business development, on/off farm infrastructure, production inputs and financial support).

All nine provinces to be selected for detailed case studies (maximum variance sample) to explain what is the impact and why (including projects with comprehensive support on all 6 pillars and different beneficiary types (individual/or group). These should cover 3 rural communities per province, covering a relatively well performing district and a poorly performing district. Twenty seven case-studies will be evaluated. A list of all CASP funded projects per province will be provided.

The service provider must analyse the CASP database in terms of specific criteria to be determined by the project management.

Case studies should look at 'special case' scenarios (geographically spread, worst case, best case, some average etc. – systematically selected from the quantitative analysis).

A multi-method approach will be used in order to evaluate. This will include the following methods:

3.2 Data collection and Analysis

- Both interviews and focus groups should be used collaboratively to collect data. Interviews and focus groups sessions will be conducted with beneficiaries,

extension officers and relevant stakeholders using a well-structured questionnaire and guideline.

- [Comparison of provinces](#) should also be considered.
- Data triangulation (making use of both quantitative and qualitative research methods) will be considered to provide a comprehensive analysis and subsequent recommendations.

3.3 Systematic Review of Programme and Project Administrative Records

Collect data on the implementation of CASP based on the available programme/project administrative records in the Department. Sources or documents to be provided will also include:

- Quarterly performance reports
- Project monitoring reports
- Document reviews
- Case studies and profiling data

The service provider should analyse documents on the programme, draw conclusions as well as formulate recommendations where appropriate.

3.4 Site visits and Interviews

- Collect data at project level (selected projects). This should include site visits to projects/farmers and interviews with the projects/farmers/beneficiaries programme coordinators, project managers, extension officers and other relevant departments / stakeholders (Council of stakeholders, technical committee; etc.)
- Analyse data on the success of the programme, draw conclusions and formulate recommendations where appropriate.

3.5 Financial analysis

The service provider should conduct a basic financial analysis of the CASP to assess the viability of the programme and whether value for money has been obtained from the delivery of the programme

4. Evaluation Plan

4.1 Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

The evaluation must produce a report with findings and recommendations. The report must contain detailed information on key variables used as the core of the study. The deliverables include among others the following core products:

- 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;
- Theory of change workshop
- Literature review;
- Final data collection instruments and other tools;
- Analysis plan;
- Field work report;
- Other technical or process reports, e.g. field work report and reports of engagements with stakeholders involved in implementing CASP;
- **Draft evaluation report** for review, full and in 1/3/25 format, with findings, recommendations and Theory of change. The report should be submitted to the contact person of both the Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries and the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.
- A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report;
- **First draft final** evaluation 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 report will also be posted onto the website.

- If the CASP programme is found to have limited impact, the service provider will need to highlight key changes (outcomes and outputs), the theory of change, a rating of progress towards outputs, reasons underpinning CASP 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 institutions 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 7 months. The evaluation will start in September 2013 and should be completed by March 2014. The service provider should produce the project indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 3** below.

Table 3: Outline project plan and payment schedule

| Deliverable | Expected milestones | % payment |
|--|---------------------|-----------|
| Inception report submitted | 16 September 2013 | |
| Review of the inception report by the Peer Reviewer and the Steering Committee | 18 September 2013 | |
| Incorporation of comments from Peer Reviewer and steering committee and Final Inception report Submitted | 20 September 2013 | |
| Final Inception report approved and SLA signed | 25 September 2013 | 10% |
| Theory of change workshop | To be confirmed | |
| Literature review submitted | | |

| | | |
|---|---------------|-----|
| Literature review approved by Steering committee | | 10% |
| Final data collection instruments and other tools | | |
| Analysis plan submitted | | |
| Analysis plan approved | | 40% |
| Other technical/ process reports e.g. field work report of engagements with stakeholders involved in implementation of CASP | | |
| Draft evaluation report submitted for review, full and in 1/3/25 format | | 10% |
| A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report | | |
| Draft final evaluation report submitted- version1 | | 10% |
| Comments to service provider from Steering Committee and Peer Reviewers on Final Report | | |
| Final evaluation report submitted- version 2 | 15 March 2013 | 10% |
| Proposed changes to the intervention design if need- this may be part of the final report | 15 March 2013 | |
| Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) | 15 March 2013 | |
| Power point or audio-visual presentation of the results. | 15 March 2013 | 10% |

5. Budget and payment schedule

Funding for this evaluation will be provided by DAFF and DPME and payments will be effected by the Department of Performance Monitoring & Evaluation. The payment schedule is illustrated on Table 3 above.

6. Management arrangements

6.1 Role of steering committee

A steering committee comprising DPME, DAFF, and other relevant stakeholders will be responsible for the appointment of the service provider; approval of the 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 Elder Mtshiza at DAFF and Ms Zama Sibiya 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 programmes which have direct influence on CASP (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 timeframe 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 **29 July 2013** from 11:30 to 13:30 at the Presidency. Tenders should be submitted by 12.00 on **19 August 2013** with 1 electronic copy 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 **03 September 2013** 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:

- Quarterly/Annual performance reports
- Project Monitoring reports
- Document reviews
- Case studies and profiling data
- CASP Policy – Its implementation

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 4 below outlines the functional evaluation criteria as applied to the competencies outlined in section 7.5 which will be used in assessing the proposals.

Table 4: Functional evaluation criteria

| 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 | Understand government systems in relation to the evaluation and can | 4 | | | 8 |

| Domain/descriptor | Functional Evaluation Criteria | Weight (out of 4) | Score | Weight x score | Minimum |
|--|--|-------------------|-------|----------------|---------|
| and understanding | appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments | | | | |
| | Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attend appropriately to issues of diversity. Specifically 1/3 of the team must be PDI | 3 | | | 6 |
| 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 | 4 | | | 8 |
| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 |

| Domain/descriptor | Functional Evaluation Criteria | Weight (out of 4) | Score | Weight x score | Minimum |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------|----------------|---------|
| Total | | 50 | | | 100 |

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

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

7.3.3 Price evaluation: The PPPFA

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

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

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

7.3.4. General and special conditions of contract

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

7.4. Evaluation Team

The team must cover the competencies outlined in section 7.5, and consist of 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 (both National and Provincial) and Provincial CASP coordinators will participate in the evaluation process.

Table 4: Key contacts in related departments

| Name | Role | E-mail address |
|---|---|--|
| Ms Elder Mtshiza Chief Director CASP DAFF | Steering Committee member and project manager | ElderM@daff.gov.za |
| Mr Garfield Whitebooi M&E Specialist DAFF | Steering Committee member | GarfieldW@daff.gov.za |
| Ms Zama Sibiya Evaluation & Research DPME | Secretary of the Steering Committee & project manager | Zama.Sibiya@po-dpme.gov.za |

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

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

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

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

8. Intellectual Property

In addition to all learning material, DAFF 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 DAFF and DPME.

9. Enquiries

For content enquiries, please contact:

Ms Elder Mtshiza

DAFF

E-mail: ElderM@daff.gov.za

For commissioning or evaluation process enquiries, please contact:

Ms Zama Sibiya

DPME

E-mail: Zama.sibiya@po-dpme.gov.za

