TERMS OF REFERENCE: ANNEXURE A

SCM /Tender Ref #:	6730/ DPME 03/20-21

Request for proposals for:	Implementation evaluation of the Operation Phakisa

1. BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

Operation Phakisa is a South African government's planning and implementation methodology whose key feature includes acceleration of service delivery by bringing key stakeholders together for intensive and detailed practical planning and solution finding and is aimed at fast tracking delivery of collaborative projects. While modelled around Malaysia's "Big Fast Results", this delivery mechanism is the South African government's commitment to deliver priorities in the National Development Plan of 2030 (NDP) faster, better and effectively. This result-oriented mechanism seeks to elevate planning to result in implementation plans based on agreed solutions that have clear timelines and targets. The model can be summarised into the following key principles:

a. The Operation Phakisa methodology is a delivery transmission mechanism that is aimed at accelerating the delivery of key priorities as contained in the National Development Plan (NDP) 2030, the country's socio-economic development blueprint.
b. The South African government chose this mechanism based on its potential ability to accelerate the resolution of the national question of the 21st century, which talks to how best to accelerate a significant reduction of unemployment, poverty and inequality.
c. This methodology is not an event, rather, a continuous and deliberate government attempt at changing the delivery attitudes of civil servants to that of a nation in emergency, whose relevance should never cease till every South African has been liberated from the triple challenges of poverty, unemployment and inequality.
d. The aim is a complete paradigm shift from business as usual to business unusual, until accelerated delivery is well-entrenched in the public service that it becomes the new normal.

With the convening of the first Operation Phakisa delivery Lab in July 2014, the Oceans Economy; six more Labs were convened in rapid succession. While the Oceans Economy is starting to show some positive results, it is not known if the subsequent six have the potential to replicate the results achieved during the first Operation Phakisa. It is therefore important to evaluate the extent to which the Operation Phakisa Labs were appropriately designed for the achievement of their respective objectives. Responses to this question will assist the DPME in improving the design in future. The core of this question lies in the evaluation of the extent to which these Labs were aligned to the national outcomes as contained in the National Development Plan (NDP) 2030.

The seven (7) Operation Phakisa Labs were undertaken with one overarching objective of assisting the country address the triple challenge of poverty, unemployment and inequality. All the Labs have individual respective Lab aspirations, which are collectively aimed at contributing to the targets set in the NDP, in terms of contribution to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), job creation and transformation (inequality). The seven Labs are at different stages of implementation. Nonetheless, all of them were convened under severe economic conditions, with some already showing the effects of the depressed global and local economic conditions. Below is an outline of all the seven (7) Operations Phakisa Labs convened by government to date:

1.1. Operation Phakisa: Oceans Economy
The delivery laboratory (Lab) focusing on the Oceans Economy was convened from 06 July to 14 August 2014, led by the Departments of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries; Transport, Mineral Resources and Energy; Public Works and Infrastructure; Tourism; Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development and supported by the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME). The Objective of the Oceans Economy Lab was to examine and assess the economic opportunities of the oceans for South Africa as well as contribute up to R177 billion to the Gross Domestic Product and create more than one million jobs by 2033.

1.2. Scaling up the Ideal Clinic Realisation and Maintenance Programme
The Lab on Ideal Clinic Realisation and Maintenance Programme was convened from 12 October to 21 November 2014, led by the National Department of Health and supported by the DPME. The main objective of the lab was to find solutions that will address the following challenges in clinics:
- Service Delivery

TERMS OF REFERENCE: ANNEXURE A

- Waiting Times
- Infrastructure
- Human Resources for Health
- Financial Management
- Supply Chain Management
- Institutional Arrangements
- Scale-up and Sustainability

1.3. Leveraging on ICT in Basic Education

This delivery Lab was convened from 22 August to 02 October 2015, led by the Department of Basic Education (DBE) and supported by the DPME. The Objective of the Lab was to provide solutions on how Information Communication Technology (ICT) can be integrated into all public schools to enhance teaching and learning.

1.4. Galvanising Growth, Investment and Employment Creation along the Mining Value Chain and Mining Related Communities

The Mining Lab was convened from 25 October to 27 November 2015, led by the DPME supported by the Department of Trade, Industry and Competition (the dtic) and the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE), with a broad objective of galvanising growth, transformation, investment and employment creation along the entire mining value chain, in relevant input sectors and in mining related communities. Its specific objectives are the following:

- Revitalise investment along the mining sector value chain (from exploration to processing) and, in doing so, stem the closure of mines and the loss of jobs.
- Position South Africa's mining industry to exploit resources that are presently not mineable and in doing so, galvanise the development of a world leading mining technology design and manufacturing cluster.
- Drive the development of technologies and manufacturing industries that would beneficiate and create additional demand for South Africa's resource wealth.
- Significantly impact on enhancing the living conditions and economic prospects of mining related communities (including labour sending areas).
- Enhance the industry's sustainable utilisation of infrastructure resources.
- Improve the industry's environmental impact, particularly in relation to acid mine drainage, and post closure management.
- Improve mineral resources efficiencies.
- Redefine the transformation trajectory of the "mine of the future", including the role of junior miners.

1.5. Agriculture, Land Reform, and Rural Development

This Lab was convened from 25 September to 28 October 2016 led by the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD) and supported by the DPME. The objectives of the Lab were to:

- Ensure equitable access to land for economic development and agrarian transformation;
- Devise economic growth interventions for priority industries and commodities;
- Identify profitable markets and improve market access for commercial and small scale producers;
- Address fragmented and low-impact support for producers;
- Improve sustainable productivity by balancing mechanization and job creation; and
- Reduce negative environmental impact of agricultural production through interventions to improve soil fertility, water management and pest control.

1.6. Biodiversity Economy

The delivery Lab on Biodiversity Economy was convened together with the Mini-Lab on Coastal and Marine Tourism from 10 April to 13 May 2016, led by the DEFF and the National Department of Tourism and supported by the DPME. The Biodiversity Economy Lab was convened under two main objectives in Bioprospecting and Wildlife, namely;

- To develop and improve the bioprospecting industry to create a sustainable, inclusive and commercially viable sector adding new jobs and contributing to GDP and;
- To have an inclusive, sustainable and responsive wildlife economy that is growing, while providing a foundation for social well-being and maintaining the ecological resource base.

1.7. Chemicals and Waste Economy

The delivery Lab on Chemicals and Waste Economy was convened from 23 July to 25 August 2017, led by the DEFF and supported by the DPME. The Lab was convened with the following objectives:

- Grow the secondary resources economy by increasing local utilisation and beneficiation of waste resources by 50%-75% through creation of an enabling regulatory environment;
- Generation of opportunities from chemical and waste resources for the creation of jobs/ opportunities in new / existing markets specifically through enabling Small, Medium and Micro- Enterprises (SMMEs);
- Invest in R&D innovation (including Intellectual Property (IP)) and infrastructure to enhance the utilisation of local waste resources for new products, substances and services that will create jobs, and enhance the production of environmentally friendly chemicals; and
- Reduce waste to landfill by 75% of industrial waste and 50% of municipal waste through education and awareness, compliant society, application of cleaner production.

While it may not be an opportune time to make a determination if the delivery transmission mechanism is making the intended impact, government aims to convene more delivery Labs using this methodology. In order for government to make an informed decision about this intended roll out, it is important to assess the efficacy of this methodology.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT / PURPOSE

According to South Africa's National Evaluation Policy Framework, implementation evaluations aim to "evaluate whether an intervention's operational mechanisms support achievement of the objectives or not, and understand why" (NEPF, 2011). Evaluation also helps to provide evidence for continuing support for a programme. Evaluation helps in determining whether a programme is appropriate for the target population, and whether there are any challenges with its implementation. Therefore, programme evaluation helps to assess whether or not the time and effort one places into a programme is worth it.

Using the Operation Phakisa delivery transmission mechanism to convene delivery Labs, the planning implementation, monitoring and reporting should be done in a speedy way. Therefore, the research that informs the convening of individual Labs needs to be fast-tracked; the convening of the delivery Labs should be done speedily; the establishment of delivery structures should be prioritised so as to fast track implementation; and the reporting of performance progress should be done in a prioritised manner. This should be a way in which government shows its intention for a paradigm shift to do business unusual.

However, across the seven Labs convened so far, it has been found that the speed at which delivery occurs is not what was envisaged. In some instances, the processes take longer than even business as usual. Findings of an evaluation of the Oceans Economy and observations by the Operation Phakisa Unit show that the speedy delivery which the Operation Phakisa envisages is often not realised and in most cases this is due to human and other factors. The following is a list if key issues, which validate that most of the challenges in realising the objectives of this delivery transmission mechanism, based on human factors are:

- Delay in the institutionalisation of Lab outputs;
- Bureaucracy affect decision making;
- Non-alignment between government planning and Operation Phakisa projects;
- Limited funding;
- Less utilisation of reporting information;
- Business as usual approach by delivery agents;
- Lack of ownership and buy-in across stakeholders;
- Delay in the establishment of requisite governance structures;
- Lack of escalation and non-utilisation of resolution structures;
- Ambitious but less realistic targets;
- Non-prioritisation of transformation as objectives of delivery Labs; and
- Less communication of governance structures to stakeholders.

In addition to the key issues listed above, there is no indication of the impact each of the delivery Labs had made so far. More importantly, government resources are increasingly scarce and these labs in the format that they have been held hitherto, are extremely expensive to convene. As such, it is important that the impact of each delivery Lab is assessed in order to justify the resources used in them. The assessment of impact will also motivate if the delivery transmission mechanism should be used as way in which the key priorities in the NDP are addressed.

TERMS OF REFERENCE: ANNEXURE A

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

In the evaluation, the impact of the delivery mechanism must be covered while the efficacy of the processes of this mechanism must also be assessed. The evaluation must also assess the extent to which the processes were applied consistently across all the seven delivery Labs. Where deviations are observed, this must be documented and the consequences thereof clearly articulated. The different implementation approaches in each delivery Lab must be detailed, where this is the case. Where one delivery Lab has shown tangible benefits, both of the application of the delivery mechanism and of the delivery Lab, this must be clearly documented. Where this is the case, benefits in one delivery Lab must not be documented in a way that will mar the negative results in the next delivery Lab, and vice versa. The deviation from the original design of the methodology must be documented in a way that will assist the DPME in convening future delivery Labs and in improving the design of the methodology.

While all the review questions as listed in this document must be covered in this review, this list should not limit other relevant questions which the evaluation team of the successful service provider may have in order to enrich the evaluation.

3.1 Evaluation Questions

While the list of question below is not exhaustive, the evaluation must explicitly answer all the questions listed in this document. The list of questions below must be used as a guideline. The successful bidder must propose which group of question should be asked to which group of evaluation participants. The key questions which the evaluation will seek to answer are as follows:

A. To what extent has the Operation Phakisa planning and implementation methodology been appropriately designed for the achievement of its objectives?
1. To what extent is South Africa's political context and institutional arrangements ready for a model (BFR) that brings about new delivery transmission mechanisms? Is there demonstrated political will in this regard?
2. To what extent is the Operation Phakisa methodology relevant in achieving objectives?
3. Is the methodology of Operation Phakisa consistent throughout all the Labs? What informs deviation from methodology, if applicable?
4. How were the Lab participants and Implementing Agents chosen? How transparent and appropriate was this process?
5. To what extent have resources been used in an efficient manner throughout the planning and delivery phase? Are there any ways that this could be improved?
6. Was research and development (R&D) developed for Labs? To what extent have skills development been optimally used? Has there been benefit in bringing skills and R&D under one Unit (DHET and DST)?

B. After three years of convening the last Lab of the seven Operation Phakisa delivery Labs, do you think the various Operation Phakisa Labs are likely to achieve the intended outputs and outcomes?
1. Retrospectively, how realistic were the outcome targets set out in the various Lab processes? How realistic were the timeframes?
2. Which Operation Phakisa Labs are likely to achieve outputs and outcomes within the set timeframes? Which outputs or outcomes are unlikely to ever be achieved? (where applicable)
3. What factors have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of objectives? (where applicable)
4. To what extent are the current institutional arrangements and administrative arrangements set in place to implement Operation Phakisa working as envisaged by the initial strategy documents?
5. What are the key success drivers of the initiatives? Can these be replicated easily in other sectors?
6. To what extent has there been buy-in and ownership of the Lab outcomes by key stakeholders?

C. To what extent has the Operation Phakisa delivery transmission mechanism inculcated the "business unusual" approach in government?
1. Has the programme provided the country with a blueprint model for faster and more accountable service delivery?
2. To what extent has the programme empowered civil servants and created a streamlined policy decision-making process?
3. How has the programme improved intergovernmental coordination and collaboration, including between the state and non-state entities?
4. What are the unintended consequences / externalities of the programme?

5. What has been the observed change in the attitudes of those responsible for delivery of Operation Phakisa Lab outputs?

D. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of Operation Phakisa in South Africa?
1. How desirable is it to continue to use this methodology for policy imperatives going forward?
2. What aspects of the methodology should be improved, or be improved upon in the future? What aspects of the methodology can be adapted to make future roll out of the methodology more effective?
3. What are the distinguishing factors that make one Lab more effective than the others?
4. Are the successes observed specific to a particular sector?
5. Are the successes peculiar to a particular lead department and its leadership?
6. To what extent have the convened Labs shown value for money?

3.2 Potential users of the evaluation

Table 1 summarises the main users and how they are likely to use the evaluation results. This is important in conceptualising the consultation during the evaluation and in dissemination of the results.

Table 1: Main users and stakeholders of the evaluation results

Stakeholder	Likely use of the results
Cabinet	• Policy making • Decision making • Strategic direction of the programme • Resource and capability building
National departments	• Planning for potential Operation Phakisa • Inform policy and decision-making • Improved reporting on performance • Better understanding of roles and responsibilities • Better understanding of factors that support success or failure OP model • Documentation • Resource allocation
Parliament	• Enhance oversight • Improved policy and decision making
Public	• Trust and confidence in the government programme • Accountability for public resources

3.3 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation must cover all the seven delivery Labs already convened as listed in the request for proposals, namely:
a) Unlocking the Economic Potential of South Africa's Oceans
b) Scaling Up the Ideal Clinic Realisation and Maintenance Programme
c) Leveraging on the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in Education
d) Galvanising Growth, Investment and Employment Creation along the Mining Value Chain and Mining Related Communities
e) Biodiversity Economy
f) Operation Phakisa: Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development
g) Operation Phakisa: Chemicals and Waste Economy

3.3.1 Period of review

The evaluation will focus on the Operation Phakisa implementation period, which is from August 2014 to date.

3.3.2 Programmatic themes to be covered

All the Operation Phakisa Labs convened to date as listed in the RFP and in 3.3 above. All the focus areas/work streams in each delivery Lab must be covered in the evaluation.

While focus areas are clearly articulated in each delivery Lab, such cross-cutting focus areas as Skills Development and Capacity Building and Research and Development (innovation), which are not always clearly distinguished in some delivery Labs, must also be evaluated and results thereof documented in this evaluation.

3.3.3 Geographic coverage

This Presidential programme has a national coverage as it is implemented in all the nine (9) provinces. While most of the lead departments in each delivery Lab are national government departments, implementation occurs at provincial and local government levels as well as in the private sector throughout South Africa. All the Delivery Units, Work Groups, implementing agents and members of Steering Committees will be included in the sampling. Members of the Operation Phakisa Unit in the DPME, who are the custodians of the Operation Phakisa methodology, will also be part of the sample. Where there are Secretariats for each delivery Lab, these must also be included in the sample. The Operation Phakisa Unit, the Secretariats and the Delivery Units should be utilised as key informants, who can direct and facilitate access to further participants.

Given the period within which this evaluation is expected to have generated findings, (March 2022), it is envisaged that the service provider will sample accordingly. It is anticipated that data will be collected in all nine (9) provinces and national departments using evaluation questions that are applicable in the various labs. Data should be collected at the same time by different teams in order to have finalised analysis and draft findings by March 2022. It may be advisable to use technological means to collect the data due to the current socio-economic and health conditions. However, the quality and integrity of the data collected must not be compromised.

4.   PROPOSED METHODOLOGY / APPROACH

The prospective service provider/evaluator should propose an appropriate methodology to respond to the evaluation questions (above). The service provider/evaluator is expected to use both qualitative and quantitative methods to respond to the evaluation questions. The evaluation is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with a representative sample of key stakeholders. The evaluation shall provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. Amongst others, the approach should include the following:

4.1 Document and literature review

The document review will include an analysis of the (1) Grey and published literature on the programme, (2) Reports generated from the database and websites (including performance reports, incentives report, beneficiary information, annual reports, etc.); and (3) An analysis of the legislative and policy frameworks and guidelines pertaining to the Operation Phakisa model.

DPME and other partner departments who have undertaken Operation Phakisas will make the relevant data available to the appointed service provider.

4.2 Interviews

Due to the prevailing health and economic conditions, the service provider must conduct a number of telephonic interview as well as other technological means, and focus groups with a range of stakeholders who are involved in the implementation of Operation Phakisa. A survey may be undertaken to collect data from other sector players and beneficiaries.

4.3 Quantitative and Qualitative analysis

The service provider must use both quantitative and qualitative analysis across all the sectors or thematic areas to answer the evaluation questions. Detailed financial analysis will also be expected in order to inform resource allocation and track related expenditure and its relation to performance and to ascertain value for money.

TERMS OF REFERENCE: ANNEXURE A

4.4 Learning processes

Reflective processes with interviewees, and a stakeholder validation workshop to reflect on lessons, emerging findings and how the Operation Phakisa model can be improved.

Workshops and development of the theory of change
- Participation in an inception workshop with the steering committee to develop a focused and detailed methodology to address key sub-questions. The service provider will be expected to revise their proposal following the inception workshop (if applicable) and prepare a final inception report for approval.
- Presentation of initial findings, analysis and recommendations to a steering committee, as and when it is necessary and subsequently, a stakeholder validation workshop. The service provider will utilise the feedback from the workshop to finalise the report and its recommendations.
- The service provider should note that the final report will be approved when all the steering committee members, and the peer reviewers, are satisfied with it. This may entail a few revisions of the report before it is approved and the service provider must commit to the revisions until the steering committee and other key stakeholders are satisfied with the process.

Note: Though an evaluation approach has been suggested, this does not preclude a service provider from recommending a different methodological approach, considered more responsive or more innovative. Should a service provider apply the approach provided in the ToRs, the service provider will be expected to propose a detailed methodology (innovation and creativity in this regard will be an added advantage).

5. DELIVERABLES AND TIME FRAMES

5.1 Products/ deliverables expected from the evaluation

The deliverables include the following:

- **Inception Report** by the service provider as a follow-up revised proposal with a revised evaluation plan, overall evaluation design and detailed methodology, including an analytical framework, and content structure for the final report. This forms the basis for judging the effective implementation of the intervention
- **Document review** (collect information and data based on management monitoring reports, quarterly monitoring reports, relevant legislation, etc.)
- Report structure, analytical framework, final data collection instruments and other tools
- Data Collection (including interviews with various identified stakeholders (key informants, participants, gatekeepers and case study informants) and observation and notes thereof.
- **1st Draft full evaluation report** for review with findings, recommendations and proposed revised theory of change and logframe, using the DPME template
- A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report and refine recommendations
- The **2nd draft final evaluation report**, both full and the 1st draft of the 1/5/25 format –in Word format, using the DPME template
- The **final evaluation report**, both full and in 1/5/25 format – in Word and PDF format
- Provision of all **datasets**, metadata and survey documentation (including summaries of interviews) when data is collected, which has been made anonymous for confidentiality
- A **PowerPoint** or audio-visual presentation of the results and the service provider will have to present the final report to the evaluation steering committee as well as senior management of DPME
- **Photographs** from the field visits indicating the activities of the intervention.

The full report may be up to 100 pages in length excluding appendices. 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.

5.2 Budget and payment schedule

Funding for this evaluation will be provided by the DPME, and payments will be effected by the DPME. The payment schedule is illustrated in Table 2 below.

TERMS OF REFERENCE: ANNEXURE A

Table 2: Deliverables and Timeframes

- *It must be borne in mind that payment of invoices will be dependent on the satisfactory quality of the outputs as assessed by the commissioning department and the appointed Steering Committee and is not automatic upon submission of the deliverable/s and the invoices.*
- *It is the responsibility of the service provider to ensure that the quality of the output is sound. Neither the commissioning department nor the Steering Committee should be expected to write the report on behalf of the service provider and can only make inputs aimed at enriching the outputs.*

The service provider should produce the implementation plan indicating the milestone against the deliverable. The evaluation will start in April 2021 and should be completed by March 2022. The service provider should produce the implementation plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **Table 2** below.

Description	Outcome	Expected date	% of project (Payment)
1. Approved Inception report (including capacity development plan), and service provider contract signed	Service provider to provide an inception report on how the study will be conducted.	April 2021	5%
2. Approved Theory of Change and Literature review		April 2021	10%
3. Approved report structure, Analysis plan, detailed methodology including final data collection instruments, and other tools	Service provider to provide a methodology on how data will be collected and analysed; as well as how the full report will be structured.	May 2021	15%
4. Data collection for all the 7 Operation Phakisa's in all 9 Provinces as per approved methodology and submission of Approved fieldwork report	Training of fieldworkers and collection of the necessary data as per approved data collection instruments.	June 2021-September 2021	
5. Submission of approved fieldwork report	Service provider to submit a fieldwork report based on the data collected on the field.	October 2021	15%
6. Submission and approval of the 1st draft full evaluation report	Service provider to conduct an analysis and write up of 1st draft report. Upon delivery of a **satisfactory** 1st draft report, payment will be made.	November 2021	25%
7. Validation of the emerging findings and 1st draft evaluation report by Steering Committee	Service provider needs to conduct the validation workshops and finalisation of the report and presentation of findings.	February 2022	

8.	Approval of the final full and 1/5/25 evaluation reports including proposed revised theory of change and logframe	Service provider to submit the final report on the basis that it is of **acceptable quality**, otherwise there may be more versions until the steering committee is satisfied. Project close out meeting and handover of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation, photographs, etc.	March 2022	20%
9.	Service provider presentation to the evaluation Steering Committee	Service provider to make final presentation of the report to the Steering Committee. The service provider will produce a full PowerPoint presentation and a 10-slide succinct one based on the evaluation.	March 2022	10%

6. PROJECT MANAGEMENT / REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 Management arrangement

The bid proposal submitted by the bidder must include a detailed project plan. A summary of deliverable dates must be included in Annexure B3. The start of the project will depend on the DPME procurement process. The total duration of the project as indicated in the bidder's proposal is binding (except for delays due to circumstance beyond the bidder's control).

The service provider shall be managed by DPME together with the Chairperson of the Steering Committee supported by the Project Steering Committee that shall be responsible for the sign off for the deliverables submitted. The steering committee will be chaired by DPME, who will also provide the secretariat role.

6.1.1 The role of the steering committee:

a. Recommend approval of the terms of reference for the evaluation
b. Approve peer reviewers and technical resource persons to be co-opted into the steering committee through a formalised process and based on capacities and skills identified by the same
c. Evaluate proposals and provide the assessment of these on functionality criteria to the commissioning department (DPME), recommending those who pass the minimum standard. The commissioning department will then complete the selection process
d. During the inception phase, review the proposal by the service provider and recommend changes in approach, methodology and format
e. Review the inception report, consider comments from peer reviewers, recommend changes if needed, and approve the inception report
f. Approve the project plan for the evaluation
g. Provide feedback on the methodology of the study

    h.   Approve data collection instruments and tools
    i.   Provide feedback on draft reports, including comments from peer reviewers to the service provider, and a workshop with stakeholders if appropriate
    j.   Approve the final report as a satisfactory evaluation report that fulfils the requirements reflected in the terms of reference
    k.   Provide feedback on recommendations emanating from the reports produced
    l.   Report back to their principals on all key decisions made by the committee

6.2. Reporting arrangements

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report is Ms Nox (Noqobo) Chitepo, nox@dpme.gov.za / 012 312 0204 and Ms Ahn-Lynn Poniappen, Ahn-lynn@dpme.gov.za / 012 312 0178.

7. PEER REVIEW

At least two national and/or international independent peer reviewers will be sub-contracted and paid for by the service provider, to support the quality assurance of the various deliverables of the evaluation. Peer reviewers will be contracted at R15 000 each. Peer reviewers will respond to issues of methodology, statistical analysis, as well as content related to the overall study.

The DPME will be involved in the selection and approval of peer reviewers. Furthermore, the DPME will provide oversight of the appointed peer reviewers. All deliverables/work completed by the peer reviewers will be submitted directly to the DPME.

Refer to the DPME Guideline on Peer Reviewers, from the DPME website for more details.

8. OTHER

None