



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



South African Police Service

## Terms of Reference for the Economic Evaluation of the Incremental Investment into the SAPS Forensic Services

**RFP / Bid number:** 13/1389

**Compulsory briefing session**

Date: 25 March 2014

Time: 11.00-12.00

Venue: **to be confirmed**, East Wing, Union Buildings, Pretoria

Please note that security procedures at the Union Building can take up to 30 minutes and that positive proof of identity (RSA identity document) is required for entrance to be granted

**Bid closing date:**

11 April 2014 with provision of one electronic and 6 (six) hard copies.

**Date for presentation by shortlisted candidates:** 16 April 2014 **to be confirmed**

**Venue:** **to be confirmed** East Wing, Union Buildings, Pretoria

Please note that security procedures at the Union Building can take up to 30 minutes and that positive proof of identity (RSA identity document) is required for entrance to be granted

### 1. Background information and Rationale

Cabinet approved seven fundamental and far-reaching transformative changes (the CJS Seven-Point-Plan) on 7 November 2007 that are required to establish a new, modernized, efficient and transformed criminal justice system (CJS). By approving the Seven-Point-Plan Cabinet set in motion a fundamental and radical journey from what is best described as a fragmented, unfocused and dysfunctional CJS to a CJS that is focused, co-ordinated and well managed at every level.

The government embarked on two processes in respect of the Review of the Criminal Justice System (RCJS). The first focuses on RCJS research initiatives, and the second on short, medium and long term initiatives mainly of a structural or practical nature, such as identifying the necessary capacity required to help government fight crime and removing blockages in the investigation and court processes.

As part of the second initiative, SAPS initiated a project to improve the impact of forensic services in

the investigation of crime and prosecutions. Government subsequently committed a substantial annual incremental investment into this Forensic Services CJS project seeking the desired benefits in respect of creating a new, modernized, efficient and transformed Forensic Services. This incremental investment was provided by the Treasury in addition to the normal operational budget appropriated to Forensic Services from the SAPS budget. This is relevant to the evaluation of the incremental investment into the SAPS Forensic Services.

The evaluation is linked to Outcome 3 of the Governments Programme of Action, which states that “All people in South Africa are and feel safe” and the country’s vision contained in the National Development Plan, i.e. “In 2030, people living in South Africa feel safe and have no fear of crime”. In setting forth how to achieve this vision, the National Development Plan states that this “requires a well-functioning criminal justice system, in which the police, the judiciary and correctional services work together to ensure that suspects are caught, prosecuted, convicted if guilty, and securely incarcerated.”

It is envisaged that the only way to restore a victim of crime’s faith and trust in the criminal justice system is to deliver swift and effective justice. At the operational level, this requires increased detection and conviction rates, as well as quicker throughput of criminal cases from the point where a crime is reported to the police until successful convictions in court.

Impartial data provided by crime scene and forensic experts is required to ensure that cases are based on physical evidence where available, rather than on confession and testimony. To this end, Forensic Services form an integral part of criminal investigations from the crime scene to the courtroom.

It is for this reason that a substantial annual incremental investment was made into improving the effectiveness, capacity, core competencies and capabilities of SAPS Forensic Services. It is of great importance and national interest that the incremental investment into SAPS Forensic Services delivers the intended strategic value and benefits. Amongst others, it is hoped that this evaluation will provide recommendations for improved resource optimization and benefits realization.

## **2. Purpose of the evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine whether the benefits (outcomes) of the annual incremental investment into the SAPS Forensic Services outweigh the costs (inputs), or not. The evaluation will provide useful evidence on the implementation of the incremental investment into SAPS Forensic Services and how its effectiveness can be optimized.

## **3. Focus of the Evaluation**

### **3.1 Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation will respond to the following questions:

- a) To what extent are the intended benefits of the annual incremental investment into the SAPS Forensic Services achieved?
- b) Overall how cost-effective is the annual incremental investment into the SAPS Forensic Services?
- c) What is working, and what is not working in terms of the incremental investment into the SAPS Forensic Services?
  - What are the operational constraints and challenges during implementation of the

- intervention (such as IT, HR, procurement etc).
- What are the implications of the institutional arrangements on the performance of the incremental investment into the SAPS Forensic Services, e.g. Technology Management Services; Supply Chain Management and the Department of Public Works?
- d) How can the effectiveness of the incremental investment into SAPS Forensic Services be improved and what are the implications for the design of the intervention?

### 3.2 Potential Users of the Evaluation

The following diagram depicts potential users of the evaluation results and how they may use them:

Potential Users of the Evaluation	How they will use it?
Cabinet	Take necessary decisions on policy and legislative changes needed to improve service delivery
Parliament [Portfolio Committee on Police]	Improve oversight
Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	Facilitate and advise on improvements
SAPS Departments (National & Provincial)	Take necessary decisions to improve the design, economic value and implementation of the intervention
IJS Board	Take necessary decisions to improve the design, economic value and implementation of the intervention in respect of information, communication and related technologies
Department of Public Works	Collaborate and participate in the Improvement Plan, including the improvement of the relevant institutional arrangements
Department of Justice	Collaborate and participate in the Improvement Plan
Department of Correctional Services	Collaborate and participate in the Improvement Plan
National Planning Commission	Collaborate and participate in the Improvement Plan
Department of Home Affairs	Collaborate and participate in the Improvement Plan

### 3.3 Scope of the evaluation

#### 3.3.1 Time period under review

The evaluation will cover the time period from the inception of the Incremental Investment in the 2008/09 financial year into SAPS Forensic Services until the end of the 2013/14 financial year.

#### 3.3.2 Themes covered/ not covered

The table below depicts the main themes covered in order to assess the scope of the evaluation. The evaluation is not limited to these themes. The themes may be expanded in order to comprehensively and effectively answer the evaluation questions.

Themes/components covered	Themes/ components not covered
Forensic Services – issues covered by the incremental investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aspects outside the scope of the Forensic Services CJS project</li> </ul>
Dependency on Technology Management Services for IT solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TMS services to other SAPS Divisions and clients</li> <li>TMS funding which falls outside the CJS Review budget allocation</li> </ul>
Dependency on SITA for IT solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SITA services/projects which are not funded by the CJS Review budget allocation</li> </ul>
Provisioning of timely contracts, tenders and procurements (Supply Chain Management)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matters which fall outside the scope of the Forensic Services CJS project</li> </ul>
Provisioning of timely and skilled human resources by HR Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HR matters which fall outside the scope of the Forensic Services CJS project</li> </ul>
Provisioning of timely infrastructure and facilities in accordance to needs, requirements and accreditation standards by the Department of Public Works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matters which fall outside the scope of the Forensic Services CJS project</li> </ul>
Department of Home Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matters which fall outside the scope of the Forensic Services CJS project</li> </ul>
Quality and value added by training interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training interventions which fall outside the scope of the Forensic Services CJS project</li> </ul>
Crime scene attendance, evidence collection and management by first responders, investigating officers and crime scene examiners	_____
Handling and management of exhibits from crime scenes until submission to the laboratories	_____
Impact of the future demand for Forensic Services on the need for capacity, infrastructure and resources	_____
The effectiveness and utilization of forensic equipment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forensic equipment procured with non- CJS funds</li> </ul>

### 3.1.3 Geographic coverage

Four provinces have been selected to evaluate the implementation of the Incremental investment at the provincial level. Two of these provinces are predominantly rural, namely: Limpopo and Eastern Cape and two are urban, namely Gauteng and Western Cape.

## 4 Evaluation plan

### 4.1 Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

The core products expected from the evaluation are the following:

- 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.

- Development of draft theory of change and logical framework for the intervention if this does not already exist (using the DPME Guideline on Planning of New Implementation Programmes). The evaluation should test this theory of change.
- Literature review.
- Final data collection instruments and other tools.
- Analysis plan.
- Other technical or process reports, eg field work report.
- **Draft evaluation report** for review, full and in 1/3/25 format (see Action Points).
- Possibly 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.
- Proposed changes to the intervention design if needed - if the design is found to be inadequate then the evaluators will need to suggest what revisions to the logic model are needed, and the theory of change. The department may then need to redesign the intervention. This may be part of the final report.
- **Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation** (including interviews) when data is collected.
- **A Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results.**

## 5. Methodology / Evaluation Approach

The prospective service provider should propose an appropriate Economic Evaluation methodology such as Cost-benefit analysis (CBA), Cost-effectiveness analysis, (CEA), Cost-utility analysis, or expenditure tracking to respond to evaluation questions in section 3 above. The evaluator is expected to use both qualitative and quantitative methods to respond to the evaluation questions. Amongst others, the approach should include the following:

### 5.1 Document Review

Collect data based on monitoring and evaluation reports of the programme. Sources will also include quarterly monitoring reports, document reviews, case studies and profiling data at national level and in the 4 selected provinces. The team should include a person with a high level security clearance so they can use this data.

### 5.2 Literature review/benchmarking

Do a comparative literature review of the implementation of the SAPS Forensic Services programme between South Africa and two other countries implementing a similar programme and analyse evidence from the literature reviews. This should result in a suggested analytical framework to be used in the evaluation, guiding the report outline, and development of research instruments.

### 5.3 Interviews

- 5.3.1 All selected Institutions at National sphere (eg SAPS, Civilian Secretariat and National Prosecuting Authority, Public Works, SITA, Justice, IJS Board). This will include interviews with the following stakeholders:
- (1) Relevant Deputy National Commissioners, Divisional Commissioners and Senior managers responsible for the programme and relevant senior managers from the selected institutions.
  - (2) SAPS National Strategic Management
  - (3) Division Forensic Services Project Management and Strategic Planning

- 5.3.2 Interviews with the following stakeholders **in the 4 selected provinces**. This will include:
- (1) Provincial Commissioners
  - (2) Selected senior managers responsible for the programme.
  - (3) Selected operational personnel as beneficiaries of the programme

#### 5.4 Quantitative analysis

- 5.4.1 Use quantitative analysis on the extent to which key systems are being implemented across the SAPS, including in provinces or changes have happened, e.g. on the degree of attainment of targets.
- 5.4.2 Use quantitative analysis to discover facts, inform decision-making and determine the benefits leveraged by the programme.
- 5.4.3 A comprehensive quantitative analysis is expected in terms of the variables that depict inputs, outputs and benefit related to the incremental investment into SAPS Forensic Services, including the inputs, outputs and benefits of the core processes.

#### 5.5 Learning processes

- 5.5.1 Reflective processes with SAPS officials and a stakeholder workshop to reflect on the lessons, emerging findings and how the system can be strengthened.

#### 5.6 Review the design of the Forensic Services

- 5.6.1 Review the initial theory of change and logical framework of the programme and propose changes.
- 5.6.2 Recommend how the system should be revised /strengthened. Recommendations should be specific and practical, remembering that an improvement plan will be developed following the evaluation.

## 6. Milestones

The duration of the evaluation will be 9 months. The evaluation will start in April 2014 and should be completed by December 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
<b>Approved Inception Report</b>	April 2014	10%
<b>Service Provider contract signed</b>		
<b>Literature review</b> including International Comparative Study		
Approved final data collection instruments, analysis plan and other tools		10%
Submission of field work report		
<b>Five Working Papers (for review)</b> on the status of implementation of the Forensic Services in 4 provinces and at the national sphere of government		30%
<b>Draft Consolidated Evaluation Report</b> for review.		20%
A <b>workshop</b> with stakeholders to discuss the draft report		
Submission of the <b>Final Draft Report full and in 1/3/25 format</b>		20%

<b>Approved final evaluation report</b> (approval by Steering Committee)	December 2014	10%
<b>Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation</b> (including interview transcripts).	December 2014	10%

## 7. Competencies and Skills-set

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

<b>Domain/descriptor</b>	<b>Demonstrated ability to</b>
<b>1 Overarching considerations</b>	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Have intimate and high level knowledge of the Criminal Justice Sector and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to issues of diversity
1.2 Ethical conduct	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.
1.3 Interpersonal skills	Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders
<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 and apply this in high-level, complex and politically sensitive evaluations, in quality, time and budget
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.
<b>4 Implementation of evaluation</b>	
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 in politically sensitive areas on time and to appropriate standards
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, constructive, useful and actionable, address the key

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
	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.

## 8. 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. **Inclusion of international expert in the Criminal Justice Sector with proven experience would be an advantage** in this evaluation, for example, an expert from the LGC Forensics in the UK who provides services to the Criminal Justice System.

The team must possess relevant qualification(s), including at least a Postgraduate Degree. The team leader must have at least 15 years' experience including working with government at a high level, and of leading politically sensitive and complex evaluations. He/she may well be an expert in public sector reform, planning or M&E.

## 9. Management Arrangements

### 9.1 Role of Steering Committee

A Steering Committee has been established comprising SAPS , DPME and other key stakeholders, which will be responsible for overseeing the whole evaluation including approving the inception report and other main deliverables. Refer to the DPME Guideline on TORs for Steering Committees on the DPME website for more detail.

### 9.2 Peer Reviewers

National and international peer reviewers will be contracted to support the assignment. Refer to the DPME Guideline on Peer Reviewers on DPME website for more detail.

### 9.3 Reporting Arrangements

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report is Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME.

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

### 10.1 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 outcomes system and its working in practice 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 – it is particularly important that effort levels for key national and international resources are clear)
- 4 Detailed 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 for each member of the team)
- 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

Examples of reports of 2 politically sensitive and complex evaluations undertaken  
 CVs of key personnel  
 Completed supply chain forms attached herewith (including updated tax clearance)

## 11. 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 12.00 ..... on with electronic and 6 hard copies.

### 11.1 Key background documents

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

### 11.2 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 8** 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.

### 11.3 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

### 11.4 Evaluation of proposals

#### 11.4.1 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

#### 11.4.2 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 8 which will be used in assessing the proposals.

**Table 3: Functional evaluation criteria**

Domain Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Minimum
Quality of the Proposal	Thorough understanding of the working of government, the Outcomes System, and the Criminal Justice System in particular.	5			10
	Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation, reflecting its complex and political nature	5			10
	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, including at least 2 projects that are complex and politically challenging.	4			8
	Knowledge and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries.	1			2
	Capacity development element	1			2

	(building capacity in the evaluation team and of partners, especially young evaluators and PDIs)				
	<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 can appropriately relate the evaluation to the current political, policy and governance environments.</li> </ul>	4			8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to diversity issues – at least 30% of team are PDI</li> </ul>	2			4
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>	4			8
<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, applying this in complex and political sensitive interventions.</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>	4			8
<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</li> </ul>	4			8

	resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards				
4.3 Report writing and communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ability to write constructive, clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable and address the key evaluation questions</li> </ul>	4			8
<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.

#### 11.4.3 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 this bid, the 90/10 preference point system will apply.

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.

## 12. 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.

## 13. Intellectual property

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

## 14. Enquiries

Regarding the evaluation process and commissioning, please contact Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME: Tel. 012 3120158 / Cell: 073 476 3503, E-mail: [jabu@po-dpme.gov.za](mailto:jabu@po-dpme.gov.za) but in terms of content issues, please contact SAPS Programme Manager, Brigadier Lindie de Wit Tel: 012 421 0415, email: [dewitl@saps.gov.za](mailto:dewitl@saps.gov.za)