



**agriculture,
forestry & fisheries**

Department:
Agriculture, forestry & fisheries
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



**rural development
& land reform**

Department:
Rural Development and Land Reform
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

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

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR A DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION OF THE GOVERNMENT SUPPORTED SMALL HOLDER FARMER SECTOR

Request for proposal /Bid number: RFP – 14/686 **Evaluation number:** 2014/12

Date: 20 March 2015

Compulsory briefing session

Date: 30 March 2015 Time: 8:30-10h00 Venue: DPME, Union Buildings, Pretoria
Please note that security procedures at the Union Buildings can take up to 30 minutes.

Deadline for submission of proposal: 10 April 2015

Time: **12h00 midday** (central African Time) on day, date, with provision of one electronic and six hard copies

Presentation by shortlisted candidates

Date: 20 April 2015 Time: 09h00-16h00 – 1 hour slots will be allocated to candidates
Venue: DPME, Union Buildings, Pretoria

Please note that positive proof identity (RSA identity document) is required for entrance to the union buildings. Arrival 30 minutes before presentation appointments advised due to security procedures.

Bid Award Notification Deadline

Date: 12 June 2015

Version: 6 (2015.03.09)

CONTENTS

1	Background information and rationale	4
1.1	Background to the programmes being evaluated.....	4
1.2	Purpose of the evaluation	4
2	Focus of the Evaluation	4
2.1	Evaluation Questions	4
2.2	Intended users and stakeholders and the scope of the evaluation.....	5
2.3	Scope of the evaluation.....	6
2.3.1	Themes covered/ not covered	6
3	Evaluation Design.....	6
3.1	Overview.....	6
4	Evaluation plan	7
4.1	Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation.....	7
4.2	Activities	7
4.3	Time-frame for the evaluation	7
5	Budget and payment schedule.....	8
6	Management arrangements	8
6.1	Role of Steering Committee	8
6.2	Reporting arrangements	9
6.3	Peer review.....	9
6.4	Quality assessment	9
7	The proposal to be submitted.....	9
7.1	Structure of the proposal.....	9
7.2	The evaluation team.....	10
7.3	Competencies and skills-set required.....	10
8	Information to the service provider	12
8.1	Key background documents.....	12
8.2	Evaluation criteria for proposals (DPME).....	12
8.3	Pricing requirements	12
8.4	Evaluation of proposals	13
8.4.1	Evaluation of proposals: Administrative compliance	13
8.4.2	Evaluation proposal: Functional evaluation.....	13
8.4.3	Price evaluation: The PPPFA	19
9	Intellectual property rights	19
10	General and special conditions of contract	19
11	Enquiries	19
12	Annex 1: Requirements for metadata.....	20

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: intended user of the evaluation results	6
Table 2: Themes covered	7
Table 3: Outline project plan and payment schedule	8
Table 4: Functional evaluation criteria	12

1 Background information and rationale

1.1 Background to the programmes being evaluated

Since its inception in 2011, the National Evaluation Plan has included numerous evaluations targeting programmes that support smallholder farmers. Since 2012/13 the following evaluations have been undertaken: Land Recapitalisation and Development Programme, Comprehensive Rural Development Programme, Land Restitution Programme, Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP), and MAFISA. In 2014/15 the following evaluations are to be undertaken: a quantitative impact evaluation of the Land Restitution Programme; an Implementation evaluation of Ilima Letsema and the plan is to do a cost-effectiveness evaluation of the Irrigation Schemes. In addition National Treasury with DPME has undertaken expenditure reviews of both MAFISA and the Land Restitution Programme.

Many of the evaluations are pointing to significant weaknesses in these programmes, and how to strengthen them. The RECAP evaluation specifically indicated that programmes supporting smallholders needed to be rethought in an integrated way. This diagnostic evaluation of the government supported smallholder farmer sector programmes will draw from these detailed evaluations and expenditure reviews to develop an evidence base on which to consider a future smallholder farmer policy, the key programmes needed, and how these should integrate effectively.

1.2 Purpose of the evaluation

This evaluation will synthesis the lessons from relevant existing evaluations to develop the basis (diagnostic) for a coherent overall policy framework to support smallholder farmers (see DPME Guideline 2.2.10 Diagnostic Evaluation).

2 Focus of the Evaluation

2.1 Evaluation Questions

- 2.1.1 **Focus** - How are smallholder farmers defined within these programmes? How has this affected the design, development, implementation, and coordination of these programmes (positively or negatively)? What definitions of smallholder farmers should we use going forward (ranging from household gardening to small-scale commercial)?
- 2.1.2 **Objectives and measures of effectiveness and sustainability** - What are the objectives of the different programmes. How should we view success/impact – sustainable farmers, income, food security, environmental issues? Which smallholder farmers have been addressed, which have been successful, which not and why? What evidence is there of impact on these target groups? How much did this cost per success unit?
- 2.1.3 **What evidence was used** - To what extent and in what manner has research and development informed the development of these programmes or what alternative approaches is current research suggesting? (Including looking at studies in other African and other middle-income countries with which RSA can compare).
- 2.1.4 **Services** - What services/interventions are provided and to whom and what is the underlying theory of change? What processes do smallholder farmers follow to access programmes (between and within the departments)? How are services for different commodities addressed (cash crop; livestock, horticulture, forestry & fisheries) by smallholder farmers? What are the lessons learnt? Should support programmes be customised according to commodities?
- 2.1.5 **Success factors** - What are the key success factors and shortcomings of current programmes e.g. market access, insurance. How far did they manage for risks such as foot and mouth, climate change etc.?

- 2.1.6 What support is needed for different target groups?** To what extent does everyone who accesses land want/know how to farm? What change is needed in target groups, selection criteria, and services for these target groups? Are different theories of change needed for different groups and what should they be so as to ensure the likelihood of sustained and cost-effective improvements in productivity, income, environmental sustainability and cost-effectiveness of support programmes (consider the different settlement programmes – progression from small holder to commercial)?
- 2.1.7 Institutional arrangements** - What coordination structures exist to ensure integrated support across departments and stakeholders including the private sector? What lessons emerge around the strengths and weaknesses of the institutional arrangements, administrative processes and procedures?
- 2.1.8 Efficiency** - What lessons emerge around the effectiveness and efficiency of resources used by these programmes, including the skills of staff and infrastructure, and how this should be revised going forward?
- 2.1.9 Managing risks** - What do we need to do to address risks and improve the resilience of smallholder farmers?
- 2.1.10 Proposed approach going forward** - Based on the above what should be the key target groups going forward, and the approach and types of services provided for each? Who should provide these services? What institutional mechanisms will be needed and what resourcing? How should the current suite of interventions be changed to address these? What does this imply for the roles to be played by key actors including DAFF, DRDLR, provincial departments of agriculture, private sector, NGOs?

2.2 Intended users and stakeholders and the scope of the evaluation

Table 1 depicts potential users of the evaluation results and how they may use them:

Table 1: Users of evaluation results

Stakeholders	Likely use of the result of the evaluation
Ministers from <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAFF • DRDLR • DWA (Water users association) • dti (Agro processing division) • DCOG (Local Economic development) • Ministers in provinces • DPME Portfolio committee Mayors and councillors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine likely approach to have significant and sustained impacts • Determine policy gaps in farmers support interventions • Reprioritise resources • Integrate and institutionalise farmer support in the country • Manage policy conflicts
Administrators/policy makers Director Generals from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAFF • DRDLR • National Treasury • Provincial Head of Departments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As above • Reorganise institutional arrangements for smallholders support
Implementers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWA • DAFF • PDAs • DRDLR • HODs • SOEs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement farmers support in a cost – effective way • Improve service delivery

Stakeholders	Likely use of the result of the evaluation
Organised agriculture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agricultural Unions Commodity associations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information sharing Inputs for policy advocacy Define possible roles in provision of services

2.3 Scope of the evaluation

2.3.1 Themes covered/ not covered

Table 2: Themes covered

Themes/components covered	Themes/ components not covered
• BATAT(before CASP)	
• Deregulation of agricultural markets	
• CASP (inception 2003/04)	
• Land Reform programme, Restitution, SLAG, LRAD, PLAS, ESTA, state land	
• Ilima Letsema (Inception 2008/9)	
• ACB (before MAFISA) MAFISA (since inception)	
• CRDP	
• RADP	
• Use of monitoring data on programmes that have been implemented but not yet evaluated (i.e. Land Care, Revitalisation of irrigation schemes, Extension Recovery programmes (ERP), AgriBEE, Land Care, Fetsa Tlala. Master Mentorship Programme, Animal & Veld Management Programme (AVMP), Programme of strategic land acquisition	
• Relevant DWAF programmes	

3 Evaluation Design

3.1 Overview

The evaluation design details the service provider's systematic plan including an analytical framework, to undertake the evaluation, the type of evaluation (in this case diagnostic), the methodological approach and specific methodology to be employed, data collection methods (synthesis of existing research) and a data analysis plan.

The literature review should include evidence from current research and what it is implying around appropriate approaches for supporting small holder farmers (contributes to analytical framework).

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 a core of the study. The deliverables include, among others, the following core products:

- A comprehensive Inception Report and revised proposal based on an inception meeting
- Literature review including evidence from current research and what it is implying around appropriate approaches for supporting smallholder farmers (contributes to analytical framework);
- Report structure, analytical framework/analysis plan, instruments;
- Current Theories of Change for Smallholder Farmer Support programmes based on stakeholder consultation (these may be grouped), drawing from those in some existing evaluations.
- Proposed Theories of Change for Smallholder Farmer Support for different target groups.
- Workshop with stakeholders to validate emerging lessons and proposed approaches
- Draft Evaluation report for review: Full (in Word format) with findings, recommendations and proposed revised theory of change. The report should be submitted to Ms Priscilla (Mutondi) Rambau – Priscilla@presidency-dpme.gov.za.
- 1st draft final evaluation report for review: Full and 1/5/25 format (in Word format)
- Presentations to DRDLR & DAFF senior management (EXCO) and the evaluation steering committee
- A Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the diagnostic evaluation.
- The final Evaluation report, Full and in 1/5/25 format, (in Word and PDF format) in hard copy and electronic formats;

The full report may be 100 pages or more. The 1/5/25 report includes a one page policy summary of implications for policy, a five page executive summary of the whole report and a 25-page main report (Arial 11 point, single space, exclusive of appendices). The 1/5/25 is what will be distributed widely, but both reports will also be posted on the website. There is a standard template which should be used for the reports. All deliverables will be subject to peer review and a post evaluation quality assessment process.

4.2 Activities

The evaluation approach (diagnostic) suggests the type of activities required. In addition to this it is expected that:

- There will be inception meetings and then regular meetings with the Steering Committee
- The service provider is expected to provide (capacity development) 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 evaluation

The duration of the evaluation will be **6 months**. The evaluation will start in **beginning July 2015** and should be completed by **December 2015**. The service provider should produce the implementation plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 3** below.

Table 3: Outline implementation plan and payment schedule

Deliverable	Indicative milestones	Payment (% of overall budget)
1. Inception meeting with the selected service provider	Week of the 2 nd of July 2015	
2. Inception report submitted (including capacity development plan)	Week of the 3 rd of July 2015	
3. Approval of inception report and service provider contact signed	Week of the 3 rd of July 2015	10%
4. Theory of Change workshop/ stakeholder engagement		
5. Submission of Literature review	5 day turnaround	
6. Approved Literature review		10%
7. Submission of report structure, analytical framework/analysis plan, and instruments	5 day turnaround	
8. Approved report structure, analytical framework/analysis plan, and instruments		20%
9. Draft theory of change submitted for the Programme as currently operating	5 day turnaround	
10. Draft theory of change approved for the Programme as currently operating		10%
11. Submission of the first draft full report	10 day turnaround	10%
12. Service provider presentation and stakeholder workshop to discuss 1 st draft report		
13. Service provider presentation to DAFF & DRDLR senior management (EXCO)		
14. Submission of the 1 st draft final full and 1/5/25 reports including proposed revise theory of change	10 day turnaround	10%
15. Submission of the final full and 1/5/25 reports	5 day turnaround	10%
16. Approval of the final full and 1/5/25 reports		10%
17. Service provider presentation to DAFF & DRDLR senior management (EXCO)		
18. Project close out meeting and handover of all metadata, PowerPoint presentation to the steering committee		10%

5 Budget and payment schedule

Funding for this evaluation will be provided by DPME and payments will be effected by DPME. The payment schedule is illustrated in Table 3 above.

6 Management arrangements

6.1 Role of Steering Committee

Evaluations will have a steering committee comprising the main departments and agencies involved in the intervention in question, and the evaluation custodian. The steering committee will approve the inception report and other main deliverables, prior to payments. The Outcomes Facilitator for Outcome 7, DPME, will chair the steering committee with ERU, DPME providing the secretariat. Comments by the steering committee on deliverables will be consolidated and synthesized by the secretariat (DPME) and forwarded to the service provider.

A Technical Working Group may be needed where there is a lot of technical complexity, or to deal with practical issues quickly such as instruments, to avoid overburdening the steering committee.

6.2 Reporting arrangements

The commissioning department is DPME and the evaluation managers to whom the service provider will report are Dr Tsakani Ngomane and Ms Christel Jacob at DPME. All correspondence should be sent to Ms Priscilla (Mutondi) Rambau – Priscilla@presidency-dpme.gov.za.

6.3 Peer review

Two peer reviewers will be appointed by the DPME, one on content issue, and another on methodology.

6.4 Quality assessment

Once the final evaluation report has been approved, the evaluation will be quality assessed by independent assessors, using a methodology based on the national evaluation standards. These standards and an example of the quality assessment can be found on the DPME website.

7 The proposal to be submitted

7.1 Structure of the proposal

A potential structure of a good proposal is shown in Box 4.

Box 4: Potential structure of a proposal

The tenderer must provide the following. 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, analytical framework, data collection tools, 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) also indicating clearly who PDI evaluators are
- 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). This must make clear who is playing the role of project manager, evaluation specialist and sector specialist. These will each be considered in their own right although roles may be combined)
- 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.

Letter from departments with a reference for work undertaken indicating the work carried out, date, value and whether the work was satisfactory. This should include contact details for follow up.

CVs of key personnel

Completed supply chain forms, tax clearance etc.

7.2 The evaluation team

The evaluation team must meet the requirements as indicated in Table 4: Functional evaluation criteria. There must be sufficient capacity in the consultation team to undertake the work in the specified period. Service providers are required to sub contract in specialized skills where these are specified for execution of the evaluation. The service provider will also need to specify how it will ensure skill transfer where specified, and the PDI component in its team. The service provider will specify the number of team members, their identities, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities and billable time allocations within the team project plan.

7.3 Competencies and skills-set required

The competencies for evaluation are summarised from the Evaluation Competencies available on the DPME website. The service provider will be assessed against some of these competencies (see 8.4.2):

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
1 Overarching considerations	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Have knowledge of relevant sectors and government systems in relation to the 14 priority outcomes and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments
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	
2.1 Project management	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively and efficiently, and manage the project effectively to completion in a way which delivers high quality evaluations and builds trust of stakeholders.
2.2 Composition of the team	Strong project manager, evaluation specialist, and sector specialist (not necessarily three people) as well as other relevant team members for the specific assignment

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
2.3 Involvement of PDIs	At least 30% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs) ¹ and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation (shown in the activity table)
2.4 Capacity development	Meaningful capacity development to departmental staff as agreed with the relevant departments
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, and use evidence appropriately to inform findings and recommendations.
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, and drawing appropriate findings and recommendations.
4 Implementation of evaluation	
4.1 Evaluation planning	
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change with quality programme log frames 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

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

- Are team players and analytical and lateral thinkers;

¹ By PDIs we mean people of Black, Indian, and Coloured ethnicity. For example if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.

- 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 to the service provider

The service providers should provide a proposal following the structure above. In addition they should be given opportunities for clarification (e.g. a compulsory bidders briefing); any format requirements and length; mode of transmission of proposals; number of copies expected (if hard copy).

8.1 Key background documents

The following documents and/or sources of information will be beneficial for the service provider:

- Relevant NEP evaluation reports
- Quarterly performance reports
- Annual performance reports
- Research conducted by DAFF & DRDLR
- Project Monitoring reports
- Grant Frameworks as provided by National Treasury

8.2 Evaluation criteria for proposals (DPME)

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. There are two main criteria for evaluating proposals: Functionality/ capability and price. Functionality/ capability factors must cover the competencies and skill set outlined in table 4 below as demonstrated through:

- Quality of the proposal;
- Service provider's relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors
- Team leader's levels of knowledge and expertise
- Qualification and expertise of the evaluation team
- Inclusion of PDI members in the evaluation team who will gain experience

8.3 Pricing requirements

Only bids/quotes that meet the minimum score required indicated under the functional evaluation above can be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. The 90/10 evaluation method must be used for bids from R1 million and above and the 80/20 method for bids/quotes below R1 million. A decision has to be taken as to whether the evaluation will be above or below R1 million, and so whether an 80/20 or 90/10 should be applied. 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.

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

8.4 Evaluation of proposals

There are three stages in selection - ensuring bids comply with administrative requirements, checking that functionally the proposal is adequate to do the job, and lastly the price is acceptable.

8.4.1 Evaluation of proposals: Administrative compliance

Only proposals that comply with all the administrative requirements will be considered acceptable for further evaluation in the subsequent functional evaluation phase. Incomplete and late proposals will not be considered.

The following documentation must be submitted in support of each proposal:

- Documents specified in the request for proposal documents (distributed separately from this TORs); and
- Any other requirement specified in the TOR.

8.4.2 Evaluation proposal: Functional evaluation

Only proposals 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 functional 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: Functional evaluation criteria

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
The quality of the proposal	Addressing the TORs 1= The requirements of the evaluation not addressed at all. 2= Requirements of the evaluation partially addressed but not convincing. 3= Requirements of the evaluation addressed well and convincingly. 4= Requirements of the evaluation addressed well and additional value added	4			8
The quality of the team	Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment, with the ability to:				

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
1 Overarching considerations					
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	<p>Understand the relevant sector/intervention and government systems in relation to the evaluation and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments</p> <p>1= Unconvincing that understand the sector/intervention</p> <p>2= Some understanding of the sector but not deep</p> <p>3= Good understanding of the sector and how implementation happens</p> <p>4= Good understanding of the sector nationally and internationally, and can bring international insight</p>	3			6
2 Evaluation leadership	Lead an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders in relation to the following three key role players				
Composition of team	<p>Project manager has experience of managing successfully projects of this size previously</p> <p>(examples and references to be provided)</p> <p>1= Managed successfully <3 projects or of less than R1m</p> <p>2= Managed successfully 1-2 projects of R1m and above</p> <p>3= Managed successfully 3 projects of R1m and above</p> <p>4= Managed successfully 3 evaluation or research projects of R1m and above</p>	3			6
	<p>Evaluation specialist has experience of undertaking successfully evaluations of this size and nature previously (examples and references to be provided)</p> <p>1= Undertaken successfully <3 evaluations of</p>	4			8

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
	<p>a similar nature and over R500 000</p> <p>2= Undertaken successfully 3-5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000</p> <p>3= Undertaken successfully >5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work)</p> <p>4= Undertaken successfully >5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R1 000 000 and with knowledge of international best practice (convincing internationally as an evaluator in this type of work)</p>				
	<p>Sector specialist has deep knowledge of the sector</p> <p>1= Worked in the sector for less than 3 years</p> <p>For all others a minimum of a master's degree plus:</p> <p>2= Worked in the sector for 3-5 years and a reasonable understanding</p> <p>3= Worked in the sector for 5-10 years and a strong understanding of the sector and the intervention concerned</p> <p>4= Worked in the sector for 10+ years and a strong understanding of the sector and the intervention concerned as well as international good practice</p>	4			8
PDI role in team	<p>At least 30% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs)² and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation</p> <p>1= Team consists of less than 30% PDIs and less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs</p> <p>2= Team consists of 30% PDIs but less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs</p> <p>3= Team consists of at least 30% PDIs, at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company)</p>	3			9

² By PDIs we mean Blacks, Indians, and Coloureds. For example if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
	4= Team consists of at least 30% PDIs, at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs, and one of the specialists above is PDI (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company)				
Capacity development	Capacity development elements and building capacity of government partners, namely: 1= No indication of capacity development 2= Some capacity development included in proposal but not well thought through 3= Well thought through strategy of how they would use junior government staff on the evaluation 4= Interesting/innovative model for building capacity in evaluation of junior and potentially other government staff	3			6
3 Evaluation craft					
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	Demonstrated experience of undertaking quality evaluations (so using evaluation knowledge) relevant to the evaluation. 1= Organisation has undertaken successfully <2 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work) 4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R1 000 000 (convincing as an evaluation organisation in this type of work)	4			8
	Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries. 1= No international experience available	1			2

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
	<p>2= Proposal makes mention of international experience but not convincing in how this will benefit the project</p> <p>3= Organisation has undertaken international work and shows in the proposal how it will draw in international experience and insight</p> <p>4= Recognised international expertise included in the team (either sector or evaluation)</p>				
3.2 Research practice	<p>Demonstrated experience of systematically gathering, analysing, and synthesising relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and writing effective research reports.</p> <p>1= Organisation has undertaken successfully <2 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate knowledge of (qualitative or quantitative research)*³ and are over R500 000</p> <p>2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R500 000</p> <p>3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R500 000</p> <p>4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R1 000 000 (convincing as an organisation undertaking this type of research)</p>	3			6
4 Implementation of evaluation					
4.1 Evaluation	Approach, design, methodology for the evaluation	4			12

³ Define the nature of research expertise needed depending on the type of evaluation

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
planning	<p>1= Not likely to address the needs of the evaluation</p> <p>2= Some parts of the evaluation addressed satisfactorily but overall not convincing</p> <p>3= Addresses these satisfactorily. Confident the evaluation can be implemented.</p> <p>4= Addresses these satisfactorily. In addition some very interesting approaches suggested for undertaking the evaluation which are likely to increase the use</p>				
	<p>Quality of activity-based plan (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities)</p> <p>1= No plan</p> <p>2= Activity-based plan produced but not convincing that the methodology can be delivered using resources proposed</p> <p>3= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology</p> <p>4= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology, and innovative so that more can be delivered</p>	3			9
4.3 Report writing and communication	<p>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</p> <p>1= No examples of writing provided or examples show poor writing skills</p> <p>2= Examples provided show adequate but not good writing skills, but use of evidence is not good</p> <p>3= Examples provided show good reports which demonstrate use of evidence, good logic, and are well-written</p> <p>4= Well-written and punchy reports with good use of infographics, good summaries, good use of evidence</p>	3			6

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
Total		43			

Minimum requirement: Service providers should be required to meet the minimum scores 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.

8.4.3 Price evaluation: The PPPFA

Only proposals/quotes that meet the minimum requirements 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.

9 Intellectual property rights

Evaluation material is highly sensitive. The ownership of the material generated during the evaluation shall remain with the commissioning department. However evaluations that are part of the national evaluation plan will be made publically available, unless there are major concerns about making them public. In general publication of results in journals is to be welcomed, but only after the reports have been to Cabinet/Provincial EXCO, and subject to permission by the commissioning department to ensure that confidential information is not used.

10 General and special conditions of contract

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of a Service Level Agreement between the DPME and the successful service provider.

11 Enquiries

For enquiries, please contact: Ms Priscilla (Mutondi) Rambau, DPME, email: priscilla@po-dpme.gov.za

12 Annex 1: Requirements for metadata

A metadata should accompany any datasets produced. It should include, amongst other issues, the following:

1. Explanation of what format the data is in and how one might convert the data into another format if needed (e.g. from Excel to Stata).
2. Description of the data: What the units of analysis are, how many variables (columns) there are, etc?
3. Data structure: Description of whether the data is contained in a single data file or in several data files. If there are separate data files there should be an explanation of how to merge the various data files (e.g. what unique identifiers should be used to merge the data files).
4. Explanation of variable labelling and how the variable names correspond to the questionnaires.
5. A discussion about the weights. Which weights should be used when doing various types of analysis?
6. Data quality issues. Are there any variables that should be treated with caution due to reliability issues?
7. A discussion of non-response and what procedures were followed to deal with it, if any (e.g. imputation).
8. A discussion of coding: What coding was used to identify “unspecified”, “don’t know”, “Not Applicable, etc.

Derived variables: Are there any derived variables (e.g. minimum infrastructure standards combining water, electricity, toilets, etc.)? How were these calculated?