

SCM /Tender Ref #:	DWYPD 02-2021/22
---------------------------	------------------

Request for proposals for:	Evaluation on Empowerment of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (Formative Evaluation on the Implementation of the Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework (GRPBMEAF))
-----------------------------------	---

1. BACKGROUND / CONTEXT

The South African government has prioritised gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights as cross-cutting issues in national, provincial, sectoral and local policy and planning instruments as well as programming interventions. The South African government commitment to the promotion of gender equality has further been demonstrated by the establishment of a comprehensive national machinery for the advancement of gender equality in South Africa composed of key structures such as the Office on the Status of Women and the Commission on Gender Equality. This commitment is further affirmed by:

- The focus on gender issues by the introduction of new legislation designed to root out gender discrimination and to promote women's rights and empowerment;
- The prioritisation of the basic needs of South Africa's poorest citizens through improving access to health, welfare, housing, water and education;
- The growth in the numbers of women occupying senior positions in government, and
- The advancement of democratisation of all institutions of the state and civil society.

While significant progress has been made in many aspects of women's social and economic empowerment, South African women continue to face serious inequality and disadvantage in a wide range of spheres, such as, in government, in business, in their communities and in their homes. These disadvantages are further complicated by, amongst other, unequal gender relations within the categories of race, disability and sexual orientation.

In South Africa, gender equality and women empowerment are the constitutional requirement that the government must strive to achieve and therefore needs to be evaluated. Equality between women and men, girls and boys is seen both as a human rights

issue and as a precondition and indicator of sustainable people-centred development. It is also an essential component for the realisation of all human rights.

The DWYPD has the responsibility to lead and coordinate the fulfilment of South African government's mandate to realize gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls and their full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms. The role of evaluation is therefore critical in assisting the Department (DWYPD) and government to understand the extent to which its policies and programmes/interventions are relevant and effective in achieving the desired gender equality, women's empowerment and human rights outcomes.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT / PURPOSE

Despite advances since 1994, South Africa faces significant development challenges, critical inequalities and social problems which have a negative impact on the lives of women and girls. The high-level problem statement which gives rise to the need for GRPBMEAF includes gender inequality and the exclusion and subordination of women at a political, economic and social level as well as weaknesses in the institutionalisation of gender mainstreaming across the state machinery, which translates into weaknesses by state actors in addressing these problems.

At the time that the Framework was developed, there was a lack of gender indicators and targets in plans to assess implementation and performance of the programmes and plans. This resulted in programmes that were not targeted or mainstreamed and suitable to address the gender inequality. Lack of gender disaggregated data further compromised the measuring of outputs and outcomes achieved in improving gender equality and women empowerment.

The GRPBMEAF introduced a new approach that seeks to ensure that existing planning, budgeting, monitoring, evaluation and auditing systems are gender responsive. Previous attempts to implement gender-responsive budgeting were not sustained as discussed in the Framework, which drew lessons from past experiences.

The lack of gender-responsive planning and budgeting in turn limits the implementation, monitoring, evaluation and auditing processes which are integral to an effective gender-responsive policy cycle. Thus, there is a need for continuous efforts to monitor progress and evaluate outcomes of interventions which contribute to women's empowerment and gender equality through the implementation of the GRPBMEAF.

It is against this background that the DWYPD intends to conduct a formative evaluation on the empowerment of women specifically focussing on the implementation of the GRPBMEAF towards empowerment of women, youth and persons with disabilities. The purpose of the formative evaluation is to assess progress and enhance knowledge to contribute towards the design and implementation of the framework going forward.

3. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF PROJECT

The following are the evaluation objectives:

- Develop the Theory of Change with a detailed programme theory to inform the design, implementation and adaptation of the programme.
- Test the components of the Theory of Change.
- Establish baseline data across areas of implementation.
- Undertake an evaluability assessment to determine and improve evaluability going forward.
- Assess implementation of the GRPBMEAF and determine effectiveness and relevance of implementation to date.

The scope of the evaluation includes the following:

- All ten pillars of the GRPBMEAF.
- National and provincial government departments.
- Selected other relevant institutions and bodies such as parliament.
- Implementation in the period from 01 April 2019 to 01 April 2021.

The service provider will be expected to:

- Enhance the current Inception report on the GRPBMEAF formative evaluation which should include a preliminary literature review; detailed evaluation design linked to the draft Theory of Change; detailed methodology and content structure of the final report.
- Develop a detailed Theory of Change in diagrammatic and narrative form. Examples of Theory of Change previously developed by the service provider must be provided.

4. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY / APPROACH

The approach used in undertaking of evaluation draws from the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) (DPME, 2020, p15), which defines evaluation as “The systematic collection and objective analysis of evidence on public policies, programmes, projects, functions and organisations to assess issues such as relevance, performance (effectiveness and efficiency), value for money, impact and sustainability, and recommend ways forward”. Evaluations may be classified into two types, namely:

- Formative Evaluation: assess ways in which a program, policy, or project can be or is implemented. They are undertaken before or while the program is under implementation, and the focus is typically on design or improvement of implementation. An example of a formative evaluation is Process Evaluation and Needs Assessment.
- Summative Evaluation: focus typically on the outcomes of a project, policy, or program, and to a lesser degree on how implementation could have been improved. An example of a summative evaluation is Outcome Evaluation and Impact Assessment.

Since the Framework is fairly new, a formative evaluation will be undertaken to contribute to improving the knowledge base of the programme, including the theory of change and performance data; understanding what works, what does not work and factors behind the performance in order to contribute to improved design, implementation and results going forward.

The formative evaluation should apply a mixed methods approach and data should be collected and analysed against, but not limited to, the following ten (10) priorities identified in the GRPBMEAF:

- Gender-responsive country planning and monitoring.
- Gender-responsive institutional planning.
- Gender-responsive policy priorities.
- Gender-responsive evaluation, knowledge and evidence.
- Gender-responsive monitoring and auditing.
- Gender-responsive budgeting.
- Other related systems including cabinet and parliamentary systems.
- Gender-responsive legislation.
- Gender-responsive performance management.
- Communication, advocacy and training.

Among the key focus areas is an assessment of whether, amongst others, there is any change in departmental plans and budgets from being gender blind to being gender targeted, gender responsive and gender transformative.

One of the important elements of planning for an evaluation is to identify key evaluation questions. For this evaluation, the proposed evaluation questions are as follows:

- To what extent has the GRPBMEAF being implemented as planned and institutionalised?
- What has the implementation process entailed?
- What is the theory of change underlying the intervention and is it working? If not, why?
- What interventions have been implemented effectively?
- What results have been achieved? (effectiveness, outputs, early outcomes)?
- What are the lessons learnt (obstacles, challenges, successes, innovations and good practices) in the implementation of the GRPBMEAF?
- How can the GRPBMEAF be strengthened?
- How can the evaluability of the GRPBMEAF be strengthened?

The proposal must clearly articulate the project design, sample, data collection tools and analytical framework proposed is fully aligned to the purpose and key evaluation questions. Further, the methodology must be innovative and add value beyond the originally intended purpose and objectives of the project.

The evaluation will focus on all government departments (national and provincial).

5. DELIVERABLES AND TIME FRAMES

Description	Expected date	% of project (Payment)
1. Enhance the Inception report for the evaluation of the empowerment of women		5%
Enhance the current Inception report on the GRPBMEAF formative evaluation which should include a literature review; detailed evaluation design linked to the draft Theory of Change; detailed methodology and content structure of the final report.	Sep 2021	
2. Data Collection		10%
• Development of data collection tools (Develop data collection instruments and analysis plan as well as other tools).	Oct 2021	
• Approval of data collection tools.	Oct 2021	
• Secondary data collection and analysis (Conduct a detailed literature Review; documentary review; international benchmarking).	Nov 2021	
• Interviews.	Nov-Dec 2021	
• Produce field work report every two (2) weeks to the Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC).	Nov 2021	
3. Data Analysis		10%
• Aggregate data collected.	Jan 2022	
4. Theory of Change		20%
• Develop Theory of Change in diagrammatic and narrative form for the evaluation.	Feb 2022	
• Facilitate workshop on the developed Theory of Change.	Feb 2022	
• Produce report on the Theory of Change.	Feb 2022	

5. Reporting		25%
• Draft evaluation report (full plus 1/5/25) and PowerPoint presentation).	Feb 2022	
• Present draft evaluation report to the ESC.	Feb 2022	
• Comment from ESC.	Feb 2022	
• Draft evaluation report including the revised Theory of Change and log frame produced and submit to the ADDG: PSCKM.	Feb 2022	
6. Final Report		30%
• Management response.	Feb 2022	
• Final Formative Evaluation Report and Improvement Plan produced.	Feb 2022	
• Approved Formative Evaluation Report and Improvement Plan produced.	Feb 2022	

6. PROJECT MANAGEMENT / REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS

7.1. Evaluation Steering Committee

The evaluation will be governed by the steering committee composed by officials from the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME), Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities (DWYPD), Department of Social Development (DSD), National Treasury (NT), Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA), Gauteng Office of the Premier (GOTP), Commission for Gender Equality (CGE), Statistics South Africa (StatsSA), Department of Tourism (DT), and Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality (EMM). The ESC will be chaired by the Chief Director: Monitoring and Evaluation from DWYPD.

The committee will serve as an oversight and provide a mechanism for advice, consultation and reporting. The ESC will meet at least monthly and may meet every two weeks to give technical support into the evaluation. The evaluator should report to the steering committee every two (2) weeks.

7.2 Evaluation Team Management

The evaluation team will be led by DWYPD Monitoring and Evaluation Chief Directorate. The Chief Directorate will have the greatest influence to incorporate various affected stakeholders in the evaluation during the evaluation planning stage all the way to dissemination. As indicated above, the evaluation will be undertaken by an external service provider. Therefore, the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit will perform an oversight role as indicated in the table below:

Official	Role
Chief Director: M&E	Provide strategic and conceptual leadership.
Director: Evaluations	Project coordinator, managing the evaluation as well as oversee ESC secretariat.
Deputy Director: Evaluations	Assist in managing the evaluation and perform ESC secretariat functions.

7. PEER REVIEW

Quality management is an important process in all evaluations. Quality assurance should be applied in the evaluation methodology as well as other critical areas to ensure quality in the evaluation. In this regards, triangulation and internal and external validation mechanisms will be used to ensure the reliability and credibility of the findings. Triangulation will imply crosschecking findings from different sources. Internal validation will take place through internal revisions/peer reviews among team members. External validation will consist of working sessions with the ESC.

8. OTHER

None.